

priated may be appropriated for any succeeding fiscal year commencing prior to July 1, 1970.

REVOLVING FUND

SEC. 510. (a) There is established a revolving fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for financing training and such other functions as are authorized or required to be performed by the Commission on a reimbursable basis by this Act and such other services as the Commission, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, determines may be performed more advantageously through such a fund.

(b) The capital of the fund shall consist of any appropriations made for the purpose of providing capital (which appropriations are hereby authorized), and such unexpended balances of appropriations or funds relating to the activities transferred to the fund and the fair and reasonable value of such stocks of supplies, equipment, and other assets and inventories on order as the Commission may transfer to the fund, less the related liabilities, unpaid obligations, and accrued annual leave of employees who are transferred to the activities financed by the fund at its inception.

(c) The fund shall be credited with—

(1) reimbursements or advance payments from available funds of the Commission, other Federal agencies, State or local governments, or other sources for supplies and services at rates which will approximate the expense of operations, including the accrual of annual leave, the depreciation of equipment, and the net losses on property transferred or donated; and

(2) receipts from sales or exchanges of property and payments for losses or damage to property accounted for under the fund.

(d) Any unobligated and unexpended balance in the fund that the Commission determines to be in excess of amounts needed for its operations shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR COST SHARING

SEC. 511. Federal funds made available to State or local governments under other programs may not be used by the State or local government for cost-sharing purposes under grant provisions of this Act. State or local government funds used for cost sharing on other federally assisted programs may not be used for cost sharing under grant provision of this Act.

METHOD OF PAYMENT

SEC. 512. Payments under this Act may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, as the Commission may determine, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF GRANT PROVISIONS

SEC. 513. Grant provisions of this Act shall become effective one hundred and eighty days following the date of enactment of this Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 7, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 6, 1967:

U.S. JUDGES

James M. Carter, of California, to be U.S. circuit judge for the ninth circuit, vice Gilbert H. Jertberg, retired.

Herbert N. Maletz, of Virginia, to be a judge of the U.S. Customs Court, vice Philip Nichols, Jr., elevated.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Paul G. Clark, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

Arthur Christopher, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the District of Columbia court of general sessions for the term of 10 years, vice Catherine B. Kelly, elevated.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate November 6, 1967:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

William C. Gardner, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions for the term of 10 years, vice Catherine B. Kelly, elevated, which was sent to the Senate on August 7, 1967.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me and to finish His work.—John 4: 34.

God of our fathers and our God, we would begin the day conscious of Thy presence and committing our lives anew to Thee. Sustain us with Thy spirit and make us ready for our responsibilities, equal to our experiences, and adequate for every task. In the midst of the heat of daily duties let not our strength fail, nor our steps falter, nor our vision fade.

Make us patient with each other and understanding, remembering that each one of us walks a lonely road and each one has struggles no one else knows.

Give to us a real reverence for personality, a deep desire to speak the truth, and an unending enthusiasm for the reign of liberty and justice in our Nation and in our world. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, November 3, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 5091. An act to amend Public Law 87-752 (76 Stat. 749) to eliminate the requirement of a reservation of certain mineral rights to the United States; and

H.R. 11627. An act to amend the act of June 16, 1948, to authorize the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain additional bridges and tunnels in the State of Maryland.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1985) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, to provide for a national program of flood insurance, and for other purposes, agrees to a conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 391. An act to amend the act of March 1, 1933 (47 Stat. 1418), entitled "An act to permanently set aside certain lands in Utah as an addition to the Navajo Indian Reservation, and for other purposes";

S. 561. An act to authorize the appropriation of funds for Cape Hatteras National Seashore; and

S. 1321. An act to establish the North Cascades National Park and Ross Lake and Lake Chelan National Recreation Areas, to designate the Pasayten Wilderness and to modify the Glacier Peak Wilderness, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes.

THE LATE HONORABLE CLARE HOFFMAN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the death of my distinguished predecessor, Clare Hoffman. He passed away last Friday evening, November 3, at Allegan, Mich., his home. He was in the 93d year of his life. He had been in poor health since the fall of 1961, when he suffered the first of several strokes which, very much against his will, incapacitated him, and he reluctantly declined to be a candidate in 1962.

Since leaving the House of Representatives he has lived in complete retirement.

Funeral services will be held tomorrow afternoon in Allegan.

Mrs. Hoffman, his wife for nearly 70 years—now herself past 90 years of age—survives him, as do his two sons who followed their father into legal careers, and several grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, Clare Hoffman was first elected to Congress in 1934, in the 60th year of his life, at an age when most men look forward to retirement, but not Clare Hoffman. He had no idea of retiring ever.

He came here after a long, prominent, and successful legal career, and served 28 years. Until his illness, his skill in debate and parliamentary procedure had no superior, as the 250 Members of the House who served with him will agree.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that within the next few days time can be arranged to eulogize the career of our late former colleague, Clare Hoffman.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include

an obituary on the Honorable Clare E. Hoffman, from the November 5 issue of the Washington Star:

EX-REPRESENTATIVE CLARE HOFFMAN, Foe of SPENDING, DIES

Former Michigan Rep. Clare Eugene Hoffman, 92, whose crusty conservatism and highly individual personal integrity combined to give him a reputation as a "lone wolf" throughout a House career that spanned 28 years, died Friday in Michigan.

Doctors said that he died of pneumonia at the Allegan (Mich.) Health Center. He had been immobilized recently after the sixth in a series of strokes that began in 1961 while he was still a vigorously active member of the House.

His long congressional career began at the age of 59 when he won election as a Republican from Michigan's 4th District in 1934. He retired in 1962.

FOUGHT BOTH PARTIES

Rep. Hoffman struggled in vain and sometimes alone not only against Roosevelt's New Deal, Truman's Fair Deal, and Kennedy's New Frontier, but also—and with equal enthusiasm—against Eisenhower's New Republicanism.

"I'm for progress, yes, but not at the cost of going deeper in debt," Hoffman once said. "This is the most selfish generation in our history. We buy everything we think we want, whether we need it or not, and charge it off to our kids."

On this principle, Rep. Hoffman voted against Social Security, farm price supports, housing subsidies, foreign aid, and a \$2,500 medal for the poet Robert Frost.

Yet, despite his uninhibited habit of debating with colleagues and his unabashed delight in upsetting Democratic and sometime Republican leadership plans, he was one of the most beloved men in the House. In his 80s, he lost none of his sharpness of wit and quickness of tongue.

NO. 1 FISHERMAN

He won a measure of fame as the "No. 1 congressional fisherman" who often went fishing at 4 a.m. to be in his House office by 8 a.m. He won respect as a hard-working legislator who as ranking Republican on the Government Operations Committee kept a close and critical eye on governmental spending.

Essentially a Republican conservative, Mr. Hoffman commanded recognition in recent years mainly as the acknowledged "leader of the third party" in the House. He and Rep. H. R. Gross, R-Iowa, were the exclusive members of that "party."

Mr. Hoffman frequently tied the House in parliamentary knots and regaled the galleries. One of his favorite devices to obtain additional time for speaking was to move to "strike out the enacting clause" of a pending bill. If such a motion had passed—and sometimes his moves came surprisingly close to adoption—it would have automatically killed the bill.

Such tactics, including inconvenient demands for quorum calls, irked his colleagues, and slowed the legislative pace. Yet, after he was stricken at his Michigan home by a heart attack, a huge "get well" card bearing signatures of all available House members was presented to him when he returned to Washington the year before his retirement. The card fittingly depicted Mr. Hoffman as saying: "Mr. Speaker, I object."

WAS COUNTY ATTORNEY

Born in Vicksburg, Pa., Sept. 10, 1875, Mr. Hoffman moved to Michigan as a youth. He obtained a law degree at Northwestern University and was admitted to the Illinois and Michigan bars in 1896. He practiced law in his home town of Allegan, Mich., and was county prosecuting attorney from 1904 to 1910.

After being elected to Congress, he easily

won re-election year after year, notwithstanding opposition of organized labor in his state. One of his favorite targets in House speeches and committee meetings was Walter Reuther, head of the United Automobile Workers.

For all of the attention he attracted in Congress, he limited his Congressional Directory biographical sketch to only three lines. His biography in "Who's Who" also was purposely brief, although it noted that in November, 1899, he married Miss Florence M. Wason, and had two sons, Carl E. and Leo W. Hoffman. He also had five grandchildren and four great-grandchildren.

His activity on the Government Operations Committee, particularly as chairman when Republicans controlled the House in 1953-54, was no more tranquil or secluded than his restless roaming of the House floor. He seldom missed a House or committee session.

In 1953, he antagonized some of his G.O.P. committee colleagues who teamed up with Democratic members to clip his control. He was deprived of authority to conduct special investigations, several of which had been aimed at charges of labor rackets.

OPPOSED REORGANIZATION

Next to his constant attacks on what he regarded as wasteful and unnecessary expenditures in numerous federal programs, his criticism centered on governmental reorganization plans proposed by Presidents. He voted against the original law giving that authority and consistently opposed every specific plan.

It was symbolic that some of the suits he wore had no pockets. He explained in 1951 that "pants pockets are kind of like the New Deal, a catch-all for all sorts of damn fool junk."

That was the year, and again in 1960, that he proposed that members of Congress cut their own salaries. He commented that: "Nobody drafted me for Congress." At the same time he defended office employment of relatives of congressmen if they were efficient and honest.

He was one of the few congressional Republicans who urged President Kennedy to appoint Robert Kennedy as attorney general. While feeling free to criticize Presidents irrespective of party he defended them personally and declared his profound respect for the office. In 1952, however, he introduced a bill for appointment of a \$30,000-a-year official to "censor" former President Truman's statements.

Several years previously he filed a libel suit, subsequently dropped, against a Michigan colleague, Democratic Rep. Lesinski, an Allegan newspaper and three labor union officers. And when arrested on a speeding charge in Hagerstown, Md., in 1953, he refused to claim congressional immunity. He protested when that charge was dropped.

As a long time congressional resident of the Capitol Hill area Mr. Hoffman occasionally called the attention of the House to what he described as "inadequate protection of citizens from hoodlums" on streets here.

Mr. Hoffman tangled with former House Republican Leader Charles Halleck without fear of reprisal and wrangled even more frequently with Speaker McCormack when majority leader. He never lost their friendship even though he made them lose their patience. His contacts with most news reporters were personally pleasant but he insisted he was right in 1948 when he unsuccessfully sponsored a bill to jail reporters who printed "leaks" from members of Congress.

JOHN THOMAS MAYS, JR., AN OUTSTANDING GEORGIAN

Mr. FLYNT. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the House of Representatives of the unexpected death of an outstanding Georgian, Mr. John Thomas Mays, Jr., at his home in Stockbridge, Ga., November 4, 1967. Named John Thomas, he was known as "Jake." I never heard him called by any other name.

Mr. Mays was a prominent merchant, a former mayor of Stockbridge, a member of the Henry County Board of Education, a lay leader and steward of the Methodist Church, an organizer, officer, and director of the First State Bank of Stockbridge, a district governor of Lions International, and a member of the Sixth District Democratic Executive Committee. He was active in the work of the Boy Scouts at troop, local, district, and regional levels. During World War II, he served in the Amphibian Forces of the U.S. Navy in the Mediterranean and Normandy landings.

He was a devoted husband and father, son and brother. He was a true and loyal friend. He was a leader in local government, education, church activities, and community life. His influence was an influence for good. He gave of his seemingly unlimited energy and enthusiasm to make his community a better place in which to live.

The area in which he had lived all of his life was shocked and saddened by his untimely and sudden death.

The son of John Thomas Mays, Sr., and Ora Walden Mays, he was born in Stockbridge on December 6, 1919. He is survived by his wife, Miriam, and their daughter, Debbie, his mother, and two brothers, Aldine and Walter.

His community has lost one of its finest citizens. I have lost a devoted friend.

Mrs. Flynt and our children join me in extending our affection and heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Mays and Debbie and to all members of his family.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT TO FILE A REPORT

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the foreign assistance appropriation bill for the year 1968.

Mr. CONTE reserved all points of order.

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

There was no objection.

RECORD OF CONGRESS ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MAHON. 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.

REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATION REQUESTS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this morning the House Committee on Appropriations approved for House consideration a foreign aid bill which includes, for the mutual assistance program, the sum of \$2.2 billion. This \$2.2 billion is \$621 million below the authorization figure and \$1 billion plus below the budget estimate.

If this figure is sustained by the House and the Congress, and if the House reduction of \$794 million on the military construction bill is sustained by the Congress, the Congress at this session, for the current fiscal year 1968 and for the bills covered, will have reduced the President's appropriation budget in the sum of \$5.6 billion. And that does not count one major bill that remains to be considered; namely, the final supplemental appropriation bill. The only major item in that bill will be funds for the anti-poverty program.

I have discussed with members of the Committee on Appropriations probable committee action on the appropriation for the anti-poverty program and I find that it is the sense of a majority of the Appropriations Committee that appropriations approved by the committee for the anti-poverty program probably will not exceed \$1.6 billion, the approximate figure for the last fiscal year 1967. In fact, there are strong indications that the figure approved by the Appropriations Committee for the entire anti-poverty program may be less than \$1.6 billion, but for the present I do not think it appropriate to estimate what the precise figure may probably be.

But assuming that the committee and the House approve \$1.6 billion for the anti-poverty program for the fiscal year 1968, we will have reduced the 1968 budget request for the anti-poverty program by \$460 million.

Recapitulating, if final action on the foreign aid, military construction, and anti-poverty appropriations eventuate approximately as I have outlined, the total reduction in the President's appropriation budget for all departments and agencies for the fiscal year 1968 would approximate \$6 billion, plus. I thought you would be interested in having this report.

APPROPRIATIONS COMPARISONS 1967-68

Another significant figure which will be of great interest to Congress and the country is the relationship of appropriations this year to the level of last year's appropriations. If fiscal 1968 appropriations at this session eventuate as indicated in the statement just made, appropriations for 1968 will be roughly \$1.3 billion below what was appropriated for fiscal 1967. This, I think, will be surprising to some.

APPROPRIATIONS—EXPENDITURE RELATIONSHIPS

Please note that I have been talking about appropriations, not expenditures. If these reductions are sustained, \$6 billion will be saved to the taxpayer. Much of it will be saved in fiscal year 1968; the rest of it will be saved in subsequent years.

While appropriations will be less for this fiscal year than last, it must not be overlooked that spending will be more. According to the latest official Bureau of the Budget figures, expenditures will be \$10.8 billion greater. However, this figure does not take into account the impact which the appropriation reductions will have on expenditures. The \$6 billion in appropriation cuts may translate into about \$2½ billion in expenditure cuts for this year.

The explanation of why spending will be greater this year than last, despite lower appropriations is as follows:

In the last 2 years, for example, the defense buildup that began in mid-1965, including the Southeast Asia war effort, the inauguration of many new domestic programs, military and civilian pay increases, and increases generally in the cost of Government programs, resulted in an increase in unexpended carryovers between mid-1965 and mid-1967 of some \$28 billion. In other words, this buildup in unexpended carryovers to be spent in years following the original appropriation results not from actions taken by the present Congress, but rather from actions of the last two sessions of Congress. These higher carryovers inevitably add to the level of spending in subsequent years, as is true, for example, with the current fiscal year 1968.

For example, the official Budget Bureau figures on Defense spending show an increase over last year of some \$4.7 billion. Appropriations thus far for fiscal 1968, on the other hand, are only some \$200 million above 1967 appropriations.

In Labor-HEW, 1968 spending is estimated to be some \$1.5 billion above 1967 spending. Appropriations, on the other hand, are up only about \$200 million.

These two instances illustrate the point I make.

SPENDING TRENDS

While appropriations for this fiscal year will apparently be below appropriations for last fiscal year, it is inevitable that the trend over a period of years will be upward as long as Congresses continue to authorize new programs and expand old programs and provides frequent pay increases for Federal employees.

Last week the House passed a bill authorizing \$500 million for flood insurance and a bill authorizing an additional \$362 million to combat air pollution. Among other new or substantially increased programs which the House has voted this year to authorize, and their fiscal year 1968 added costs, are:

	Million
Veterans benefits.....	\$319
Civilian employee pay.....	625
Military pay.....	626
Law enforcement assistance.....	75

FINAL APPROPRIATIONS ACTIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. I wonder if I might have the attention of the gentleman from

Texas. I am greatly interested in the remarks the gentleman just made. However, he stated that when Congress adjourns, Congress will have reduced appropriations approximately \$6 billion below the budget. I believe he should have said that the House of Representatives so acted, bearing in mind the other body has not finished or completed their work on several appropriation bills already considered by the House. We can anticipate almost anything before the other body completes consideration of every bill for very often they are inclined to raise House figures.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. I would not want to be unparliamentary, but the other body has agreed with many of the cuts which we have made. The other body has, in fact, thus far reduced two bills below the House figure. So while there were increases in some items, the final results have been joint efforts between the two bodies. It is true that many of the bills were raised by the other body.

RELATIONS WITH WESTERN EUROPE AND DE GAULLE'S FRANCE

Mr. WYATT. 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 Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, it is high time we in this country directed some real attention and talent to the problem of our relations with Western Europe and De Gaulle's France.

Twice in the first half of this century the United States has saved France from being conquered and made a permanent satellite of Germany. We have offered a great many American lives so that France might remain free.

What have been our thanks for these monumental efforts?

Continued attacks by De Gaulle to undermine our currency.

Throwing NATO out of France at a cost to us of over \$1 billion.

And De Gaulle's persistent efforts to force a wedge between the United States and Western Europe. All of this at the same time France fails to reach an agreement with us on the billions of dollars she owes us as a result of war debts.

We must adjust our Western European foreign policy to counteract these concentrated De Gaullist attacks on the integrity of the United States before it is too late.

CONSENT CALENDAR

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

FORT PECK INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7820) to cancel certain construction costs and

irrigation assessments chargeable against lands of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.

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

H.R. 7820

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby canceled \$558,039.08 of construction costs, and \$542.77 of accrued operation and maintenance assessments, and any accrued interest thereon chargeable to lands of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Montana.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That in accordance with provisions of the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803, 25 U.S.C. 389-389e), the order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling delinquent irrigation operation and maintenance charges in the amount of \$461.40 and any accrued interest thereon for certain lands adjacent to but outside the boundary of the Fort Peck Indian Irrigation Project, Montana, and reimbursable irrigation construction costs in the amount of \$206,902.21 against lands within the Fort Peck Indian Irrigation Project, Montana, as listed and described in schedules referred to in such order, is hereby approved.

Sec. 2. Unassessed construction costs of \$118,266.64 allocable against both the Indian- and non-Indian-owned lands in the Frazer-Wolf Point Unit of the Fort Peck Indian Irrigation Project, Montana, are hereby canceled."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 1391, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

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

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

S. 1391

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with provisions of the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803; 25 U.S.C. 389-389e), the order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling delinquent irrigation operation and maintenance charges in the amount of \$461.40 and any accrued interest thereon for certain lands adjacent to but outside the boundary of the Fort Peck Indian Irrigation project, Montana, and reimbursable irrigation construction costs in the amount of \$206,902.21 against lands within the Fort Peck Indian Irrigation project, Montana, as listed and described in schedules referred to in such order, is hereby approved.

Sec. 2. Unassessed construction costs of \$118,266.64 allocable against both the Indian- and non-Indian-owned lands in the Frazier-Wolf Point unit of the Fort Peck Indian Irrigation project, Montana, are hereby canceled.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 7820) was laid on the table.

LANDER, WYO., LAND TRANSFER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 219) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain land in Lander, Wyo., and for other purposes.

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

S. 219

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed, for not less than fair market value, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to lots 4 and 5, block 16, in the original town of Lander, Wyoming, and the improvements thereon and to apply the proceeds of such sale to the purchase of other land in or near Lander and the construction thereon of similar improvements.

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

INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE AT PHARR, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 470) to authorize the Pharr Municipal Bridge Corp. to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Pharr, Tex.

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

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

There was no objection.

INCREASE OF TIMBER SURVEY AUTHORIZATION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1136) to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 702), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 581h), relating to surveys of timber and other forest resources of the United States, and for other purposes.

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

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR THE ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS' HOSPITALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11161) to extend for 3 years the special milk programs for the Armed Forces and veterans' hospitals.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2179, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished gentleman if this is an identical bill?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, it is.

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

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

S. 2179

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1446a), is amended by striking in subsections (a) and (b) the words "December 31, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1970".

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 1161) was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 701, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO AUTHORIZE ADDITIONAL ACCUMULATION OF LEAVE IN CERTAIN FOREIGN AREAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1341) to amend section 701 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize additional accumulation of leave in certain foreign areas.

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

H.R. 1341

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 701 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out the first sentence in subsection (b) and inserting in place thereof "A member may not accumulate more than sixty days' leave."; and

(2) by adding at the end:

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned or his designated representative, a member who serves one hundred and twenty days or more in a foreign area in which there is hostile activity may accumulate ninety days' leave. Leave in excess of sixty days under this subsection is creditable only for use before the end of the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which service in the foreign area terminates."

Sec. 2. This Act is effective June 30, 1965.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute the following language:

"That section 701 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) Subsection (b) is amended by striking out "Notwithstanding any other provision of law" and inserting in place thereof "Except as provided in subsection (f)".

"(2) A new subsection (f) is added as follows:

"(f) Under uniform regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary concerned, and approved by the Secretary of Defense, a member who serves on active duty for a continuous period of at least one hundred and twenty days in an area in which he is entitled to special pay under section 310(a) of title 37 may accumulate ninety days' leave in excess of sixty days accumulated under this subsection is lost unless it is used by the member before the end of the fiscal year after the fiscal year in which the service terminated."

"Sec. 2. Section 1 of this Act applies only to active duty performed after June 30, 1966."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 1341, which will authorize a member of the Armed Forces to accumulate more than 60 days' leave when he serves longer than 120 days of continuous duty in a hostile fire area.

Today, many of our men serving in Southeast Asia are unable to take the leave that is earned while they are assigned to that area. Under present policy, military personnel assigned to Vietnam may apply for only one 7-day leave. This is in addition to an authorized absence of one 7-day period for rest and recuperation, which is not charged against their accumulated leave. Because of this lack of opportunity to take the leave that is earned, many men now lose leave which was earned.

It is an injustice to penalize our military personnel for being assigned to a hostile fire area. The dangers to which they are exposed in carrying out their mission is bad enough, without asking for further sacrifices from these dedicated servicemen.

The enactment of this legislation will not increase the military budget, but will increase the morale of our troops serving in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill, H.R. 1341.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 1341 is to amend section 701 of title 10, United States Code, to allow a member of the Armed Forces to accumulate more than 60 days' leave whenever the individual serves on active duty for a continuous period of at least 120 days in an area in which he is entitled to hostile fire pay. The bill authorizes the accumulation of leave up to 90 days. However, leave in excess of 60 days accumulated under the proposed legislation must be used by the member before the end of the fiscal year after the fiscal year in which he returns from a hostile fire area.

The proposed legislation is very similar to that passed by the House last year on which the Senate failed to act.

There is no direct cost related to this legislation.

The bill was unanimously approved by the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill H.R. 1341.

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

NAMING THE FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING, DETROIT, MICH., IN HONOR OF THE LATE PATRICK V. McNAMARA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 343) to provide that the Federal office building to be constructed in Detroit, Mich., shall be named the "Patrick V. McNamara Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Patrick V. McNamara, a U.S.

Senator from the State of Michigan from 1955 to 1966.

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

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

There was no objection.

CONSENTING TO THE ENTRY OF OHIO INTO A BUS TAXATION PRO-RATION AGREEMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12912) to give the consent of Congress to the State of Ohio to become a party to the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity as set forth in title II of the act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60), and consented to by Congress in that act and in the acts of November 1, 1965 (79 Stat. 1157), and November 2, 1966 (80 Stat. 1156).

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

H.R. 12912

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is given to the State of Ohio to become a party to the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity as set forth in title II of the Act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60), and consented to by Congress in that Act and in the Acts of November 1, 1965 (79 Stat. 1157) and November 2, 1966 (80 Stat. 1156).

With the following committee amendment:

After line 8 add the following:

"Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

AMENDING TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO SIMPLIFY LAWS RELATING TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND MARINE CORPS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8547) to amend title 10, United States Code, to simplify laws relating to members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 8547

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

ACTIVE DUTY

SECTION 1. (a) Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Chapter 39 is amended—

(A) by inserting the following new sections after section 671:

"§ 671a. Members: service extension during war

"Unless terminated at an earlier date by the Secretary concerned, the period of active service of any member of an armed force is extended for the duration of any war in

which the United States may be engaged and for six months thereafter.

"§ 671b. Members: service extension when Congress is not in session

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, when the President determines that the national interest so requires, he may, if Congress is not in session, having adjourned sine die, authorize the Secretary of Defense to extend for not more than six months enlistments, appointments, periods of active duty, periods of active duty for training, periods of obligated service, or other military status, in any component of the Armed Forces of the United States, that expire before the thirtieth day after Congress next convenes or reconvenes.

"(b) An extension under this section continues until the expiration of the period of extension specified by the Secretary of Defense unless sooner terminated by law or Executive order."; and

(B) by inserting the following new item in the analysis thereof:

"671a. Members: service extension during war."

"671b. Members: service extension when Congress is not in session."

(2) Sections 3492 and 8492 are repealed.

(3) The analysis of chapter 341 is amended by striking out the following item:

"3492. Members: service extension during war."

(4) The analysis of chapter 841 is amended by striking out the following item:

"8492. Members: service extension during war."

(b) Chapter 341 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by repealing section 3493 and striking out the following item in the analysis:

"3493. Army Reserve: commissioned officers with Corps of Engineers."

ENLISTMENTS

SEC. 2. (a) Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Chapter 31 is amended—

(A) by redesignating section 501 as section "502";

(B) by inserting the following new sections:

"§ 501. Definition

"In this chapter 'enlistment' means original enlistment or reenlistment.

"§ 503. Enlistments: recruiting campaigns

"The Secretary concerned shall conduct intensive recruiting campaigns to obtain enlistments in the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Air Force, Regular Marine Corps, and Regular Coast Guard.

"§ 504. Persons not qualified

"No person who is insane, intoxicated, or a deserter from an armed force, or who has been convicted of a felony, may be enlisted in any armed force. However, the Secretary concerned may authorize exceptions, in meritorious cases, for the enlistment of deserters and persons convicted of felonies.

"§ 505. Regular components: qualifications, term, grade

"(a) The Secretary concerned may accept original enlistments in the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Air Force, Regular Marine Corps, or Regular Coast Guard, as the case may be, of qualified, effective, and able-bodied persons who are not less than seventeen years of age in the case of male persons and not less than eighteen years of age in the case of female persons, nor more than thirty-five years of age. However, no male person under eighteen years of age, or female person under twenty-one years of age, may be originally enlisted without the written consent of his parents or guardian, if he has a parent or guardian entitled to his custody and control.

"(b) A person is enlisted in the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Air Force, Regular Marine Corps, or Regular Coast Guard in the grade or rating prescribed by the Secretary concerned.

"(c) The Secretary concerned may accept original enlistments in the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Air Force, Regular Marine Corps, or Regular Coast Guard, as the case may be—

"(1) of male persons for the duration of their minority or for a period of two, three, four, five, or six years; and

"(2) of female persons for a period of two, three, four, five, or six years.

"(d) In the Regular Army, female persons may be enlisted only in the Women's Army Corps.

"(e) The Secretary concerned may accept reenlistments in the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Air Force, Regular Marine Corps, or Regular Coast Guard, as the case may be, for periods of two, three, four, five, or six years. No enlisted member is entitled to be reenlisted for a period that would expire before the end of his current enlistment.

"§ 506. Regular components: extension of enlistments during war or national emergency

"An enlistment in the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Air Force, Regular Marine Corps, or Regular Coast Guard in effect at the beginning of a war, or entered into during a war, unless sooner terminated by the President, continues in effect until six months after the termination of that war.

"§ 507. Extension of enlistment for members needing medical care or hospitalization

"(a) An enlisted member of an armed force on active duty whose terms of enlistment expires while he is suffering from disease or injury incident to service and not due to his misconduct, and who needs medical care or hospitalization, may be retained on active duty, with his consent, until he recovers to the extent that he is able to meet the physical requirements for reenlistment, or it is determined that recovery to that extent is impossible.

"(b) This section does not prevent retention in service, without his consent, of an enlisted member of an armed force under section 972 of this title.

"§ 508. Reenlistment: qualifications

"(a) No person whose service during his last term of enlistment was not honest and faithful may be reenlisted in an armed force. However, the Secretary concerned may authorize the reenlistment in the armed force under his jurisdiction of such a person if his conduct after that service has been good.

"(b) A person discharged from a Regular component may be reenlisted in the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Air Force, Regular Marine Corps, or Regular Coast Guard, as the case may be, under such regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe.

"(c) This section does not deprive a person or any right to be reenlisted in the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Air Force, Regular Marine Corps, or Regular Coast Guard under any other provision of law.

"§ 509. Voluntary extension of enlistments: periods and benefits

"(a) Under such regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe, the term of enlistment of a member of an armed force may be extended or reextended with his written consent for any period. However, the total of all such extensions of an enlistment may not exceed four years.

"(b) When a member is discharged from an enlistment that has been extended under this section, he has the same rights, privileges, and benefits that he would have if discharged at the same time from an enlistment not so extended.

"§ 518. Temporary enlistments

"Temporary enlistments may be made only in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, as the case may be, without specification of component.

"§ 519. Temporary enlistments: during war or emergency

"Except as provided in section 505 of this title and except for enlistments as Reserves of an armed force—

"(1) temporary enlistments in an armed force entered into in time of war or of emergency declared by Congress shall be for the duration of the war or emergency plus six months; and

"(2) only persons at least eighteen years of age and otherwise qualified under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary concerned are eligible for such enlistments.";

(C) by striking the following item out of the analysis:

"501. Enlistment oath: who may administer."

and inserting the following new items in place thereof:

"501. Definition.

"502. Enlistment oath: who may administer.

"503. Enlistments: recruiting campaigns.

"504. Persons not qualified.

"505. Regular components: qualifications, term, grade.

"506. Regular components: extension of enlistments during war or national emergency.

"507. Extension of enlistment for members needing medical care or hospitalization.

"508. Reenlistment: qualifications.

"509. Voluntary extension of enlistments: periods and benefits.

"* * * * *

"518. Temporary enlistments.

"519. Temporary enlistments: during war or emergency."

(2) Chapter 333 is amended—

(A) by amending section 3253 to read as follows:

"§ 3253. Army: persons not qualified

"In time of peace, no person may be accepted for original enlistment in the Army unless he is a citizen of the United States or has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the applicable provisions of chapter 12 of title 8."

(B) by repealing sections 3252, 3254, 3255, 3256, 3262, and 3263; and

(C) by striking out the following items in the analysis:

"3252. Temporary enlistments.

"* * * * *

"3254. Army: during war or emergency.

"3255. Regular Army: recruiting campaigns.

"3256. Regular Army: qualifications, term, grade.

"* * * * *

"3262. Extension of enlistment for members needing medical care or hospitalization.

"3263. Voluntary extension of enlistment."

(3) Chapter 537 is amended by repealing sections 5531(a), 5532, 5533, 5534, 5537, 5538, and 5539 and by striking out the following items in the analysis:

"5532. Prohibited classes.

"5533. Minors.

"5534. Term: grade.

"* * * * *

"5537. Extension: during disability incident to service.

"5538. Extension: during war or national emergency.

"5539. Extension: voluntary, periods and benefits."

(4) Chapter 833 is amended—

(A) by amending section 8253 to read as follows:

"§ 8253. Air Force: persons not qualified.

"In time of peace, no person may be accepted for original enlistment in the Air Force unless he is a citizen of the United States or has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the applicable provisions of chapter 12 of title 8."

(B) by repealing sections 8252, 8254, 8255, 8256, 8262, and 8263; and

(C) by striking out the following items in the analysis:

"8252. Temporary enlistments.

"* * * * *

"8254. Air Force: during war or emergency.

"8255. Regular Air Force: recruiting campaigns.

"8256. Regular Air Force: qualifications, term, grade.

"* * * * *

"8262. Extension of enlistment for members needing medical care or hospitalization.

"8263. Voluntary extension of enlistment.

(b) Chapter 537 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by repealing sections 5531(b) and 5535 and by striking out the following items in the analysis:

"5531. Recruiting campaigns: use of advertising agencies.

"* * * * *

"5535. Evidence of age required for certain enlistment of minors."

(c) Section 906 of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

§ 906. Extension of enlistment: effect on pay and allowances

"A member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, as the case may be, who extends his enlistment under section 509 of title 10 is entitled to the same pay and allowances as though he had reenlisted. For the purposes of determining entitlement to reenlistment bonus or to travel and transportation allowances upon discharge, all such extensions of an enlistment are considered one continuous extension."

DISCHARGE AND SEPARATION

SEC. 3. (a) Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Chapter 59 is amended—

(A) by adding the following new sections at the end thereof:

"§ 1169. Regular enlisted members: limitations on discharge

"No regular enlisted member of an armed force may be discharged before his term of service expires, except—

"(1) as prescribed by the Secretary concerned;

"(2) by sentence of a general or special court martial; or

"(3) as otherwise provided by law.

"§ 1170. Regular enlisted members: minority discharge

"Upon application by the parents or guardian of a regular enlisted member of an armed force to the Secretary concerned within 90 days after the member's enlistment, the member shall be discharged for his own convenience, with the pay and form of discharge certificate to which his service entitles him, if—

"(1) there is evidence satisfactory to the Secretary concerned that the member is under eighteen years of age; and

"(2) the member enlisted without the written consent of his parent or guardian.

"§ 1171. Regular members: early discharge

"Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned and approved by the President, any regular enlisted member of an armed force may be discharged within three months before the expiration of the term of his enlistment or extended enlistment. A discharge under this section does not affect any

right, privilege, or benefit that a member would have had if he completed his enlistment or extended enlistment, except that the member is not entitled to pay and allowances for the period not served.

"§ 1172. Enlisted members: during war or emergency; discharge

"A person enlisted under section 518 of this title may be discharged at any time by the President, or otherwise according to law."; and

(B) by inserting the following items in the analysis:

"1169. Regular enlisted members: limitations on discharge.

"1170. Regular enlisted members: minority discharge.

"1171. Regular enlisted members: early discharge.

"1172. Enlisted members: during war or emergency; discharge."

(2) Sections 3811(b), 3812, 3816, 6293, 6295, 8811(b), 8812, and 8816 are repealed.

(3) The analysis of chapter 361 is amended by striking out the following items:

"3812. Army enlisted members: during war or emergency; discharge.

"3816. Regular enlisted members: minority discharge."

(4) The analysis of chapter 569 is amended by striking out the following items:

"6293. Minors enlisted without consent of parent or guardian.

"6295. Regular Navy: early discharge."

(5) The analysis of chapter 861 is amended by striking out the following items:

"8812. Air Force enlisted members: during war or emergency; discharge.

"8816. Regular enlisted members: minority discharge."

(b) Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Sections 3450, 3811(a), 3813, 3815, 6291, 6296, 6298, 6409, 8450, 8811(a), 8813, and 8815 are repealed.

(2) The analysis of chapter 339 is amended by striking out the following item:

"3450. Warrant officers: suspension of laws for promotion or mandatory retirement or separation during war or emergency."

(3) The analysis of chapter 361 is amended by striking out the following items:

"3811. Army enlisted members: discharge certificate; limitations on discharge.

"3813. Army enlisted members: dependency discharge.

"3815. Regular enlisted members: resignation of members enlisted on career basis; limitations."

(4) The analysis of chapter 569 is amended by striking out the following items:

"6291. Honorable discharges.

"6296. Furlough without pay.

"6298. Authority to live at a receiving station after honorable discharge."

(5) The analysis of chapter 573 is amended by striking out the following item:

"6409. Navy and Marine Corps; warrant officers: suspension of laws for mandatory retirement and separation during war or emergency."

(6) The analysis of chapter 839 is amended by striking out the following item:

"8450. Warrant officers: suspension of laws for promotion or mandatory retirement or separation during war or emergency."

(7) The analysis of chapter 861 is amended by striking out the following items:

"8811. Air Force enlisted members: discharge certificate; limitations on discharge

"8813. Air Force enlisted members: dependency discharge.

"8815. Regular enlisted members: resignation of members enlisted on career basis; limitations."

(c) Members of the Army or the Air Force who, on the effective date of this Act, are serving under enlistments for unspecified periods under sections 3256(b) and 8256(b) of title 10, United States Code, shall continue in that status and shall be discharged therefrom in accordance with laws applicable to such discharges on the day before the effective date of this Act.

DETAILS AND DUTIES

SEC. 4. (a) Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Chapter 41 is amended—

(A) by inserting the following new section after section 711:

"§ 711a. American National Red Cross: detail of commissioned officers

"(a) Commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force may be detailed for duty with the American National Red Cross, by the Secretary of the military department concerned, as follows:

"(1) for duty with the Service to the Armed Forces Division—

"(A) one or more officers of the Army Medical Service;

"(B) one or more officers of the Medical Department of the Navy; and

"(C) one or more officers selected from among medical officers, dental officers, veterinary officers, medical service officers, nurses, and medical specialists of the Air Force; and

"(2) to be in charge of the first-aid department—

"(A) an officer of the Medical Corps of the Army;

"(B) an officer of the Medical Corps of the Navy; or

"(C) a medical officer of the Air Force."; and

(B) by inserting the following new item in the analysis thereof:

"711a. American National Red Cross; detail of commissioned officers."

(2) Sections 3539 and 5987 are repealed.

(3) The analysis of chapter 343 is amended by striking out the following item:

"3539. American National Red Cross: detail of officers of Army Medical Service."

(4) The analysis of chapter 553 is amended by striking out the following item:

"5987. American National Red Cross; detail of officers in the Medical Corps."

(5) Chapter 49 is amended—

(A) by adding the following new section:

"§ 973. Duties: regular officers; performance of civil functions restricted

"(a) No officer on the active list of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Air Force, Regular Marine Corps, or Regular Coast Guard may accept employment if that employment requires him to be separated from his organization, branch, or unit, or interferes with the performance of his military duties.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided by law, no officer on the active list of the Regular Army, Regular Navy, Regular Air Force, Regular Marine Corps, or Regular Coast Guard may hold a civil office by election or appointment, whether under the United States, a Territory or possession, or a State. The acceptance of such a civil office or the exercise of its functions by such an officer terminates his military appointment."; and

(B) by adding the following new item at the end of the analysis:

"973. Duties: Regular officers; performance of civil functions restricted."

(6) Sections 3544 and 8544 are repealed.

(7) Section 3017(b) is amended by striking out "3544(b)" and inserting in place thereof "973(b)".

(8) Section 5036 is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(c) Performance of the duties of the Secretary by the Chief of Naval Operations, the Vice Chief of Naval Operations, or any officer of the Navy or Marine Corps designated under section 6 of title 5 shall not be considered as the holding of a civil office within the meaning of section 973(b) of this title."

(9) Section 8017(b) is amended by striking out "8544(b)" and inserting in place thereof "973(b)".

(10) The analysis of chapter 343 is amended by striking out the following item:

"3544. Duties: regular officers; performance of civil functions restricted."

(11) The analysis of chapter 843 is amended by striking out the following item:

"8544. Duties: regular officers; performance of civil functions restricted."

(12) Section 6405 is repealed.

(13) The analysis of chapter 573 is amended by striking out the following item:

"6405. Effect of acceptance of appointment in Foreign Service."

(b) Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Sections 3538, 3545, 5984, 8537, and 8545 are repealed.

(2) The analysis of chapter 343 is amended by striking out the following items:

"3538. Geological Survey: detail of officers of Ordnance Corps.

"8545. Duties: officers; superintendence of cooking for enlisted members."

(3) The analysis of chapter 553 is amended by striking out the following item:

"5984. Military institutions and colleges: details as superintendents and instructors."

(4) The analysis of chapter 843 is amended by striking out the following items:

"8537. Department of Commerce: detail in aid of civil aviation.

"8545. Duties: officers; superintendence of cooking for enlisted members."

RANK AND COMMAND

SEC. 5. (a) Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Chapter 43 is amended—

(A) by adding the following new sections at the end thereof:

"§ 747. Command: when different commands of Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard join

"When different commands of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard join or serve together, the officer highest in rank in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard on duty there, who is otherwise eligible to command, commands all those forces unless otherwise directed by the President.

"§ 749. Command: commissioned officers in same grade or corresponding grades on duty at same place

"(a) When the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, as the case may be, has on duty in the same area, field command, or organization two or more commissioned officers of the same grade who are otherwise eligible to command, the President may assign the command without regard to rank in that grade.

"(b) When officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard are on duty in the same area, field, command, or organization and two or more commissioned officers of different services, who are other-

wise eligible to command, have the same grade or corresponding grades, the President may assign the command without regard to rank in that grade."; and

(B) by adding the following new items at the end of the analysis:

"747. Command: when different commands of Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps and Coast Guard join.

"749. Command: commissioned officers in same grade or corresponding grades on duty at same place."

(2) Sections 3576, 3578, 5954, 8576, and 8578 are repealed.

(3) The analysis of chapter 345 is amended by striking out the following items:

"3576. Command: when different commands of Army and Marine Corps join.

"3578. Command: commissioned officers of Army in same grade on duty at same place."

(4) The analysis of chapter 551 is amended by striking out the following item:

"5954. Command: when different commands of Marine Corps and Army or Air Force join."

(5) The analysis of chapter 845 is amended by striking out the following items:

"8576. Command: when different commands of Air Force and Marine Corps join.

"*

"8578. Command: commissioned officers of Air Force in same grade on duty at same place."

(b) Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Sections 5941, 5950, and 5953 are repealed.

(2) The analysis of chapter 551 is amended by striking out the following items:

"5941. Assignment to command: regulations.

"*

"5950. Exemption from Supply Corps duties.

"*

"5953. Executive officer: assignment; authority."

"*

MISCELLANEOUS PROHIBITIONS AND PENALTIES

SEC. 6. (a) Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 971 is amended by inserting the designation "(a)" before the words "The period of" and adding the following new subsection:

"(b) In computing length of service for any purpose—

"(1) no officer of the Navy or Marine Corps may be credited with service as a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy or as a cadet at the United States Military Academy, United States Air Force Academy, or United States Coast Guard Academy, if he was appointed as a midshipman or cadet after March 4, 1913; and

"(2) no commissioned officer of the Army or Air Force may be credited with service as a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy or as a cadet at the United States Military Academy, United States Air Force Academy, or United States Coast Guard Academy, if he was appointed as a midshipman or cadet after August 24, 1912."

(2) Sections 3682, 6116, and 8682 are repealed.

(3) The analysis of chapter 353 is amended by striking out the following item:

"3682. Service credit: officers; service as cadet not counted."

(4) The analysis of chapter 559 is amended by striking out the following item:

"6116. Service credit: officers; service as midshipman or cadet not counted."

(5) The analysis of chapter 853 is amended by striking out the following item:

"8682. Service credit: officers; service as cadet not counted."

(6) Chapter 49 is amended—

(A) by adding the following new section:

"§ 974. Civilian employment: enlisted members

"Except as provided in section 6223 of this title no enlisted member of an armed force on active duty may be ordered or permitted to leave his post to engage in a civilian pursuit or business, or a performance in civil life, for emolument, hire, or otherwise, if the pursuit, business, or performance interferes with the customary or regular employment of local civilians in their art, trade, or profession."; and

(B) by adding the following new item at the end of the analysis:

"974. Civilian employment: enlisted members."

(7) Sections 3635, 6114, and 8635 are repealed.

(8) The analysis of chapter 349 is amended by striking out the following item:

"3635. Enlisted members: restriction on civilian employment."

(9) The analysis of chapter 559 is amended by striking out the following item:

"6114. Civilian employment: enlisted members."

(10) The analysis of chapter 849 is amended by striking out the following item:

"8635. Enlisted members: restriction on civilian employment."

MISCELLANEOUS RIGHTS AND BENEFITS

SEC. 7. (a) Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 101 is amended by adding the following new clause:

"(36) 'Dependent', with respect to a female member of an armed force, does not include her husband, unless he is in fact dependent on her for his chief support, or her child, unless his father is dead or he is in fact dependent on her for his chief support."

(2) Chapter 53 is amended—

(A) by adding the following new section:

"§ 1040. Replacement of certificate of discharge

"If satisfactory proof is presented that a person who was discharged honorably or under honorable conditions has lost his certificate of discharge from an armed force or that it was destroyed without his procurement or connivance, the Secretary of the military department concerned may give that person, or his surviving spouse, a certificate of that discharge, indelibly marked to show that it is a certificate in place of the lost or destroyed certificate. A certificate given under this section may not be accepted as a voucher for the payment of a claim against the United States for pay, bounty, or other allowance, or as evidence in any other case."; and

(B) by adding the following new item at the end of the analysis:

"1040. Replacement of certificate of discharge."

(3) Sections 3685, 3693, 6033, 8685, and 8693 are repealed.

(4) The analysis of chapter 353 is amended by striking out the following items:

"3685. Regular Army; Army Reserve: female members; definition of 'dependents'."

"*

"3693. Replacement of certificate of discharge."

(5) The analysis of chapter 555 is amended by striking out the following item:

"6033. Woman member: definition of dependents."

(6) The analysis of chapter 853 is amended by striking out the following items:

"8685. Regular Air Force; Air Force Reserve: female members; definition of 'dependents'."

"*

"8693. Replacement of certificates of discharge."

(b) Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Sections 3631, 3637, 3690, 6158, 8631, 8637, and 8690 are repealed.

(2) The analysis of chapter 349 is amended by striking out the following items:

"3631. Dealing in quartermaster supplies prohibited."

"*

"3637. Enlisted members: forfeiture of right to pension by deserters."

(3) The analysis of chapter 353 is amended by striking out the following item:

"3690. Exemption from arrest for debt: enlisted members."

(4) The analysis of chapter 561 is amended by striking out the following item:

"6158. Exemption from arrest for debt: enlisted members of Marine Corps."

(5) The analysis of chapter 849 is amended by striking out the following items:

"8631. Dealing in quartermaster supplies prohibited."

"*

"8637. Enlisted members: forfeiture of right to pension by deserters."

(6) The analysis of chapter 853 is amended by striking out the following item:

"8690. Exemption from arrest for debt: enlisted members."

THE UNIFORM

SEC. 8. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Chapter 45 is amended—

(A) by inserting the following new section after section 771:

"§ 771a. Disposition on discharge

"(a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), when an enlisted member of an armed force is discharged, the exterior articles of uniform in his possession that were issued to him, other than those that he may wear from the place of discharge to his home under section 772(d) of this title, shall be retained for military use.

"(b) When an enlisted member of an armed force is discharged for bad conduct, undesirability, unsuitability, inaptitude, or otherwise than honorably—

"(1) the exterior articles of uniform in his possession shall be retained for military use;

"(2) under such regulations as the Secretary concerned prescribes, a suit of civilian clothing and an overcoat when necessary, both to cost not more than \$30, may be issued to him; and

"(3) if he would be otherwise without funds to meet his immediate needs, he may be paid an amount, fixed by the Secretary concerned, of not more than \$25.

"(c) When an enlisted member of the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard who has been called into Federal service is released from that service, the exterior articles of uniform in his possession shall be accounted for as property issued to the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard, as the case may be, of the State or territory, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, or the District of Columbia of whose Army National Guard or Air National Guard he is a member, as prescribed in section 708 of title 32."; and

(B) by inserting the following new item in the analysis thereof:

"771a. Disposition on discharge."

(2) Chapters 347 and 847 are repealed.

(3) Section 6297 is repealed.

(4) The analysis of chapter 569 is amended by striking out the following item:

"6297. Disposition of uniform; clothing allowance; emergency funds."

(5) The chapter analysis of subtitle B and the chapter analysis of part II of subtitle B are each amended by striking out the following item:

"347. The Uniform..... 3611".

(6) The chapter analysis of subtitle D and the chapter analysis of part II of subtitle D are each amended by striking out the following item:

"847. The Uniform----- 8611".

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, strike the matter on lines 17 through 20 and substitute the following:

"(b) An extension under this section continues until the sixtieth day after Congress next convenes or reconvenes or until the expiration of the period of extension specified by the Secretary of Defense, whichever occurs earlier, unless sooner terminated by law or Executive order; and".

On page 5, line 21, strike "or national emergency".

On page 24, line 20, strike "of the military department".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

DECLARING A PORTION OF BAYOU LAFOURCHE, LA., A NONNAVIGABLE WATERWAY OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6692) declaring a portion of Bayou Lafourche, La., a nonnavigable waterway of the United States.

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

H.R. 6692

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Bayou Lafourche, in the State of Louisiana, between Canal Boulevard, city of Thibodaux, Parish of Lafourche, State of Louisiana, and the head of the bayou at its junction with the Mississippi River levee at the city of Donaldsonville, Parish of Ascension, State of Louisiana, is hereby declared to be a non-navigable waterway of the United States within the meaning of the laws of the United States.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 9, insert after the period the following: "The existing project for Bayou Lafourche, Louisiana, authorized by the Acts of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1028) and July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 480) is hereby deauthorized in the reach of Bayou Lafourche herein declared nonnavigable."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

H.R. 13653

Mr. WAMPLER. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that my colleagues the gentlemen from Kentucky [Mr. CARTER and

Mr. SNYDER] will voice objection to the passage of H.R. 13653.

This bill, of which I am a cosponsor, was carefully considered by the Tobacco Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture. Public hearings were held and it was reported favorably by both the subcommittee and the full committee.

I think H.R. 13653 is a sound bill and is in the best interest of agriculture. It provides, among other things, for the leasing of burley tobacco allotments.

Mr. Speaker, in the Ninth District of Virginia, which I am privileged to represent, there are more than 18,000 producers of burley tobacco. Tobacco is one of our most important cash crops and is, therefore, vital to the agricultural economy.

Many of the producers of burley tobacco live on small mountain farms. With the ever-increasing shortage of farm labor, producers of tobacco are having difficulty finding competent labor to help tend their crops. This is particularly true where the producers of the tobacco are elderly or infirmed—with many of these unable to produce a crop at all.

This legislation would have enabled producers of burley tobacco to lease their allotment for a period of time not to exceed 5 years. It also provided that the allotment would remain with the lessor for the purpose of determining the base allotment.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation would be of great help to many of our small tobacco farmers.

TOBACCO ALLOTMENT LEASE AND TRANSFER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13653) to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

AMENDING SECTION 319 OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT TO PERMIT NATURALIZATION FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF U.S. NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS ENGAGED IN DISSEMINATING INFORMATION WHICH SIGNIFICANTLY PROMOTES U.S. INTEREST, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2138), to amend section 319 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit naturalization for certain employees of United States nonprofit organizations engaged in disseminating information which significantly promotes United States interest, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 2138

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 319 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 244) is amended by adding a new subsection (c) to read as follows:

"(c) Any person who (1) is employed by

a bona fide United States incorporated nonprofit organization which is principally engaged in conducting abroad through communications media the dissemination of information which significantly promotes United States interests abroad and which is recognized as such by the Attorney General, and (2) has been so employed continuously for a period of not less than five years after a lawful admission for permanent residence, and (3) who files his petition for naturalization while so employed or within six months following the termination thereof, and (4) who is in the United States at the time of naturalization, and (5) who declares before the naturalization court in good faith an intention to take up residence within the United States immediately upon termination of such employment, may be naturalized upon compliance with all the requirements of this Act except that no prior residence or specified period of physical presence within the United States or any State or within the jurisdiction of the court, or proof thereof, shall be required."

(b) The title preceding section 319 is amended to read as follows: "MARRIED PERSONS AND EMPLOYEES OF CERTAIN NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS".

(c) The table of contents (Title III—Nationality and Naturalization, ch. 2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by changing the designation of section 319 to read as follows:

"Sec. 319. Married persons and employees of certain nonprofit organizations."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 13, after the words "requirements of this" strike out the word "Act" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "title".

AMENDMENT TO COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOWDY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. Dowdy: Strike out the word "title" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "Title".

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill (H.R. 2138) is to permit the naturalization of certain aliens who meet the conditions precedent—the principal one being five years of employment abroad, after a lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence, with an organization of the communications media—disseminating information.

Certain employees of U.S. nonprofit organizations—particularly Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe—although admitted to the United States for permanent residence have been necessarily, regularly stationed abroad in their employment and thus are unable to meet the physical presence requirements and in some cases the residence requirement for naturalization.

Most of the beneficiaries of the bill are anti-Communist exiles from countries now under Communist rule. They cannot either safely or in good conscience return to their native countries. They choose to live in freedom, and they wish to become American citizens. All have at some time in the past established residence in the United States, and hold re-entry permits. Their dearest wish is to become American citizens, and most especially to facilitate their children becoming citizens, so the children can have an American education and be completely American. Although they are, for the best of reasons, working abroad, they avidly take advantage of opportunities to send their young children to American schools. Typically, the children speak unaccented, colloquial English and their parents are proud of it. It should not be overlooked that these people are select people, and their children are potentially a prime asset to the American way of life.

Among these individuals are former ambassadors, diplomats, parliamentarians, academicians, professional people, writers, editors, businessmen—people of great talent and proven ability, who would be able in America to make a real contribution to society—indeed, their contribution is already notable in their present work.

This bill considers the period of employment abroad by specified organizations as constructive residence and constructive physical presence in the United States. The employees of these quasi-governmental organizations will enjoy the same special benefits that U.S. Government employees, ministers and priests engaged in religious activities, and seamen employed aboard American-flag carriers now enjoy.

This bill is concerned only with the residence requirement for naturalization. Any person benefiting from this bill, must have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence in accordance with all provisions of law, and must satisfy all naturalization requirements, including good moral character and attachment to the principles of the Constitution.

I recommend passage of the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to speak in support of the legislation I have introduced. H.R. 2130, which is before us now for action.

This measure will benefit persons employed by bona fide U.S. nonprofit organizations, such as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, engaged abroad in disseminating information which significantly promotes U.S. interests. Because of their employment overseas, employees of these organizations have been unable to satisfy the physical presence requirements necessary for naturalization. Under H.R. 2138 the aliens to benefit

must first be admitted into the United States for permanent residence and then have worked for such organizations for at least 5 years. In all other respects they must comply with provisions of our immigration and naturalization laws.

Because of their dedication the people to benefit from H.R. 2138 have sacrificed the opportunity to remain in the United States and become citizens in order to serve the nation abroad in anti-Communist endeavors. These people are, by every standard, American in thought, devotion, and allegiance, and they are especially mindful of the future of their children. They have escaped from Communist countries and have rededicated their lives to combatting it.

Mr. Speaker, I first introduced this legislation in January 1965, after I had visited the facilities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty in Munich, Germany, in 1964. At that time I had an opportunity to talk with employees of both organizations as well as an opportunity to evaluate their contributions to the interests of the United States. With this firsthand, on-the-scene appraisal of what was being accomplished, I became firmly convinced that legislation which would consider their employment overseas with these organizations as constructive residence for immigration purposes would be both in the spirit of recognizing their service to the United States abroad and in the interest of the United States.

The people who would be beneficiaries of this legislation have held important positions in many fields in their native lands. They are former diplomats, lawyers, economists, writers, and editors.

Mr. Speaker, enactment of H.R. 2138 is essential as a matter of simple justice, and it would benefit our country by giving us as new citizens dedicated and highly capable individuals who are promoting our interests and ideals abroad. I urge the approval of this long needed measure.

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

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

TRANSFER OF PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11565

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

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

right to all or any part of such allotment to any other owner or operator of a farm in the same county for transfer to such farm; and (2) may permit the owner of a farm to transfer all or any part of such allotment to any other farm owned or controlled by him.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been previously debated, but it turned on a point that was not directly related to the bill itself. The Members will recall that several weeks ago we had the bill up, but the opponents of the bill saw fit to confine their objections to a matter related to food stamps rather than the bill itself.

I personally regret that the gentleman has seen fit to demand a second, but it does give me an opportunity again to outline the bill to the House.

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

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

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

There are many peanut acreage allotments too small to constitute an economic unit in view of rising costs of producing and harvesting the crop. The Department of Agriculture reports that in 1964—the last year for which complete statistics are available—more than one-

fourth of all peanut allotments were 5 acres or less and more than one-half were 10 acres or less. This year the average size of established allotments is approximately 17.9 acres.

The problem of small allotments becomes more serious each year as the cost per acre to produce peanuts continues to rise steadily. A farmer with an allotment of 5 acres must use the same type expensive equipment, herbicides, and improved methods of cultivation as a farmer with 100 acres.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Fifth. If there is not more than a 10-percent difference in production per acre, transfers shall be on the basis of acre for acre; however, in cases where the trans-

ferred acreage goes to a farm where the production per acre exceeds that of the transferred acreage by more than 10 percent, there shall be a corresponding downward adjustment in the amount of acreage transferred to assure that no overproduction would result from the transfer.

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

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

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

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

Peanut farming has undergone very great changes in recent years.

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

Now the labor is scarce and the stacks are nonexistent.

Virtually every peanut farmer in America uses a windrow process that requires expensive machinery, and as a result an investment is required of many thousands of dollars.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The provisions of this bill are virtually parallel with those of a bill permitting

the sale and lease of cotton allotments—passed in 1965 by the 89th Congress.

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

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

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

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a few minutes today to address my colleagues.

We have under discussion here today, legislation which importantly affects not only the people of my State and Eighth Congressional District, but also our entire Nation. Since the district which I represent is directly affected, I believe that it is my duty and responsibility to speak in behalf of this legislation, H.R. 11565, the purpose of which is to authorize during the 1968 and 1969 crop-years the intracounty lease, sale, and transfer of acreage allotment for peanuts among farmers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as was pointed out in the hearings on this bill before the Agriculture Committee, the reestablishment of the peanut acreage allotments in 1949 brought in many producers who had only begun growing peanuts during the time when allotments had not been in effect. The entrance into the program of these producers created many small and inefficient allotments. I believe that the measure which we are taking up here today will make it possible for many producers to acquire enough peanut acreage to grow peanuts on a more sound economic basis. And, it will make it possible for those growers who do not want to continue growing peanuts, to transfer their resources to other crops, or to discontinue peanut production entirely without having to take a loss on their crop.

As has been done in the case of cotton, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we must act today to enable the peanut grower to be able to lease, sale, or transfer his peanut acreage allotment within his county.

This bill which we have under consideration will provide for more efficient production of a commodity which is extremely valuable to our country, especially during this time when we are involved in the war in Vietnam. The transferring of peanut allotments will permit the establishment of more economic-sized units of production which will in turn result in more efficient production on individual farms and for the industry as a whole.

We have seen in my Eighth Congressional District where small but efficient farms could increase their acreage of peanuts without incurring the heavy cost involved in buying additional land which they often do not need should this bill be passed here today.

Under the present law, Mr. Speaker, the peanut grower is unnecessarily penalized. This situation must be remedied. It had seemed to me that the best method of alleviating this problem would

have been to allow the transfer of peanut acreage allotments across county lines. Personally, I can see the need for this right in my own district. But, this is not the case of the bill which has been brought to the floor today by the committee. But, I believe that if we are not going to have the opportunity to completely alleviate the unfair restrictions on our peanut growers, then we should at least act favorably on this bill before us today which will not require additional funds, but which will be of great benefit to our peanut growers and to our economy as a whole.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. O'NEAL] for bringing to the floor of the House and presenting for its consideration this peanut acreage allotment bill in behalf of the peanut-producing farmers of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, and hope that the bill is passed.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the peanut farmers of this country need this bill very badly. Insofar as I know it is acceptable to all geographical areas and to all people interested in peanut production. It will not cost this Government a single dime. It is designed to avoid any possible increase in peanut production.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been very accurately and fully described by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. O'NEAL]. I just rise to point out the fact that the bill did come out of the Committee on Agriculture by a unanimous vote, as I recall. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I recommend that it be passed.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 11565.

The question was taken.

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

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

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 256, nays 57, not voting 119, as follows:

[Roll No. 362]

YEAS—256

Abbott	Ayres	Blanton
Albert	Baring	Boland
Anderson, Ill.	Battin	Bolling
Anderson,	Belcher	Bolton
Tenn.	Bennett	Bow
Andrews, Ala.	Berry	Brinkley
Arends	Betts	Brooks
Ashbrook	Bevill	Brown, Calif.
Ashmore	Blester	Broyhill, N.C.
Aspinall	Bingham	Broyhill, Va.

Buchanan	Henderson	Patten
Burke, Fla.	Hicks	Perkins
Burke, Mass.	Hollifield	Philbin
Burton, Calif.	Holland	Pickle
Burton, Utah	Hungate	Pirnie
Bush	Hunt	Poage
Byrnes, Wis.	Hutchinson	Poff
Cabell	Ichord	Pollock
Carey	Irwin	Price, Ill.
Carter	Jarman	Price, Tex.
Cederberg	Johnson, Calif.	Pryor
Celler	Johnson, Pa.	Pucinski
Chamberlain	Jonas	Purcell
Clancy	Jones, Ala.	Rallsback
Clausen,	Jones, N.C.	Randall
Don H.	Karsten	Rarick
Clawson, Del.	Kastenmeier	Rees
Cohelan	Kazen	Reid, Ill.
Colmer	Kee	Reifel
Corbett	Keith	Reinecke
Cunningham	King, Calif.	Reuss
Daddario	Kirwan	Riegle
Davis, Ga.	Kleppe	Rivers
Davis, Wis.	Kornegay	Roberts
Dawson	Kupferman	Robison
Denny	Kuykendall	Rodino
Devine	Kyl	Rogers, Colo.
Dickinson	Kyros	Rooney, N.Y.
Dingell	Laird	Rosenthal
Dole	Latta	Rousebush
Donohue	Leggett	Roush
Dorn	Lennon	Roybal
Dowdy	Lipscomb	Satterfield
Downing	Long, Md.	Schadeberg
Duncan	Lukens	Scherle
Eckhardt	McClure	Scott
Edwards, Ala.	McCulloch	Selden
Edwards, La.	McDonald,	Shipley
Evans, Colo.	Mich.	Shriver
Evins, Tenn.	McEwen	Sikes
Fallon	McFall	Sisk
Farbstein	McMillan	Slack
Fascell	Macdonald,	Smith, Iowa
Feighan	Mass.	Smith, Okla.
Fisher	Machen	Snyder
Flynt	Mahon	Stafford
Foley	Maillard	Staggers
Fraser	Marsh	Stanton
Friedel	Martin	Steiger, Ariz.
Fuqua	Mathias, Calif.	Stuckey
Gallfianakis	Matsunaga	Talcott
Garmatz	May	Taylor
Gathings	Mayne	Teague, Calif.
Gettys	Meeds	Thompson, Ga.
Gibbons	Miller, Ohio	Thomson, Wis.
Gilbert	Mills	Tuck
Gonzalez	Mink	Tunney
Goodell	Minshall	Udall
Griffiths	Montgomery	Ullman
Gross	Moore	Van Deerlin
Gude	Moorhead	Vander Jagt
Gurney	Morris, N. Mex.	Vigorito
Haley	Morton	Waggonner
Hall	Moss	Waldie
Hamilton	Murphy, Ill.	Walker
Hammer-	Murphy, N.Y.	Wampler
schmidt	Myers	Whalen
Hanley	Natcher	White
Hanna	Nichols	Whitener
Hansen, Idaho	O'Hara, Ill.	Williams, Pa.
Harrison	O'Hara, Mich.	Winn
Harsha	O'Konski	Wolff
Harvey	Olsen	Wyatt
Hathaway	O'Neal, Ga.	Wylie
Hawkins	Ottenger	Young
Hechler, W. Va.	Passman	Zablocki
Helstoski	Patman	Zion

NAYS—57

Andrews,	Frelinghuysen	Ryan
N. Dak.	Fulton, Pa.	St Germain
Ashley	Goodling	Scheuer
Bates	Heckler, Mass.	Schneebeli
Bell	Hosmer	Schweiker
Bray	Joelson	Schwengel
Brotzman	Langen	Springer
Brown, Mich.	Lloyd	Steiger, Wis.
Cahill	McClory	Sullivan
Cleveland	McDade	Tiernan
Collier	MacGregor	Vanik
Conte	Meskill	Whalley
Conyers	Mize	Widnall
Dellenback	Morse, Mass.	Wilson, Bob
Edwards, Calif.	Nedzi	Wyman
Erlenborn	Nelsen	Yates
Esch	Pike	Zwack
Eshleman	Quile	
Findley	Reid, N.Y.	
Ford,	Both	
William D.	Rumsfeld	

NOT VOTING—119

Abernethy	Annunzio	Boggs
Adair	Barrett	Brademas
Adams	Blackburn	Brasco
Addabbo	Blatnik	Brock

Broomfield	Grover	Pool
Brown, Ohio	Gubser	Quillen
Burleson	Hagan	Resnick
Button	Halleck	Rhodes, Ariz.
Byrne, Pa.	Halpern	Rhodes, Pa.
Casey	Hansen, Wash.	Rogers, Fla.
Clark	Hardy	Ronan
Conable	Hays	Rooney, Pa.
Corman	Hébert	Rostenkowski
Cowger	Herlong	Ruppe
Cramer	Horton	Sandman
Culver	Howard	St. Onge
Curtis	Hull	Saylor
Daniels	Jacobs	Skubitz
de la Garza	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Calif.
Delaney	Karth	Smith, N.Y.
Dent	Kelly	Steed
Derwinski	King, N.Y.	Stephens
Diggs	Kluczynski	Stratton
Dow	Landrum	Stubblefield
Dulski	Long, La.	Taft
Dwyer	McCarthy	Teague, Tex.
Edmondson	Madden	Tenzer
Ellberg	Mathias, Md.	Thompson, N.J.
Everett	Michel	Utt
Fino	Miller, Calif.	Watkins
Flood	Minish	Watson
Ford, Gerald R.	Monagan	Watts
Fountain	Morgan	Whitten
Fulton, Tenn.	Mosher	Wiggins
Gallagher	Multer	Williams, Miss.
Gardner	Nix	Willis
Gialmo	O'Neill, Mass.	Wilson
Gray	Pelly	Charles H.
Green, Oreg.	Pepper	Wright
Green, Pa.	Pettis	Wylder

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Edmondson and Mr. Corman for, with Mr. Rogers of Florida against.
 Mr. Pepper and Mr. Fountain for, with Mr. Brasco against.
 Mr. Boggs and Mr. Landrum for, with Mr. Addabbo against.
 Mr. Rhodes of Arizona and Mr. Watson for, with Mr. Barrett against.
 Mr. Gardner and Mr. Hagan for, with Mrs. Dwyer, against.
 Mr. Abernethy and Mr. Williams of Mississippi for, with Mr. Horton against.
 Mr. Brock and Mr. Mathias of Maryland for, with Mr. Fino against.
 Mr. Blackburn and Mr. Quillen for, with Mr. Halpern against.
 Mr. Cramer and Mr. Gubser for, with Mr. Button against.
 Mr. Cowger and Mr. Hardy for, with Mr. Watkins against.
 Mr. Stephens and Mr. Whitten for, with Mr. Ellberg against.
 Mr. Teague of Texas and Mr. Stubblefield for, with Mr. Nix against.
 Mr. Long of Louisiana and Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Minish against.
 Mr. Steed and Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Multer against.
 Mr. Watts for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.
 Mr. Skubitz and Mr. Pettis for, with Mr. Sandman against.
 Mr. Everett and Mr. Fulton of Tennessee for, with Mr. St. Onge against.
 Mr. Burleson and Mr. Hull for, with Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts against.
 Mr. Casey and Mr. Wright for, with Mrs. Kelly against.
 Mr. Wiggins and Mr. Curtis for, with Mr. Broomfield against.
 Mr. Pelly and Mr. Pool for, with Mr. Smith of California against.
 Mr. Dulski and Mr. de la Garza for, with Mr. Utt against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Ruppe.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Adair.
 Mr. Madden with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
 Mr. Flood with Mr. Halleck.
 Mr. Brademas with Mr. Grover.
 Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Wylder.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Taft.
 Mr. Adams with Mr. Smith of New York.
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Derwinski.
 Mr. Dent with Mr. Saylor.
 Mr. Daniels with Mr. Conable.
 Mr. Culver with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Mosher.
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Hays with Mr. King of New York.
 Mr. Diggs with Mr. Resnick.
 Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Tenzer.
 Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Karth.
 Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania.
 Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Gialmo.
 Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Howard.
 Mr. Stratton with Mr. Ronan.
 Mr. Morgan with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
 Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Jacobs.
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. McCarthy.
 Mr. Monagan with Mr. Gallagher.

Messrs. ASHLEY, SPRINGER, and BROTZMAN changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

On October 25, 1967:

H.R. 1674. An act for he relief of Frank I. Mellin, Jr.; and
 H.R. 6189. An act for the relief of Fred W. Kolb, Jr.

On October 27, 1967:

H.R. 1572. An act for the relief of Mercedes De Toffoli;
 H.R. 1653. An act for the relief of Omer Penner;
 H.R. 2477. An act for the relief of John J. McGrath;
 H.R. 6663. An act for the relief of Jesse W. Stutts, Jr.;
 H.R. 6666. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marilyn Shorette;
 H.R. 7324. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo F. Mendez, doctor of medicine; and
 H.R. 8254. An act for the relief of Jan Drobot.

On October 31, 1967:

H.R. 1948. An act for the relief of Lim Ai Ran and Lim Soo Ran;
 H.R. 1960. An act for the relief of Ange-lique Kousoulas;
 H.R. 2464. An act for the relief of Yoo Young Hui, and her daughter, Ok Young;
 H.R. 2978. An act for the relief of Yong Ok Espantoso;
 H.R. 3430. An act for the relief of Yim Mei Lam;

H.R. 3497. An act for the relief of Ramiro Velasquez Huerta;
 H.R. 4534. An act for the relief of Mary Bernadette Linehan; and
 H.R. 5216. An act for the relief of Roberto Martin Del Campo.

On November 2, 1967:

H.R. 11767. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.

On November 3, 1967:

H.R. 4772. An Act to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of

allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code;

H.R. 8718. An act to increase the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia and to provide a method for computing the annual borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia; and
 H.R. 9960. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

On November 4, 1967:

H.R. 1499. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America.

H.R. 4903. An act to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands.

H.R. 10105. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the State of Mississippi.

H.R. 10160. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion.

H.R. 13212. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PRODUCT SAFETY

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 33) to establish a National Commission on Product Safety, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S.J. RES. 33

Whereas the American consumer has a right to be protected against unreasonable risk of bodily harm from products purchased on the open market for the use of himself and his family;

Whereas manufacturers whose products are marketed substantially in interstate commerce are entitled to a reasonable degree of uniformity in the application of safety regulations to such products;

Whereas it is desirable to establish a commission to review the scope, adequacy, and uniformity of existing voluntary self-regulation and Federal, State, and local law relating to consumer protection against such hazardous products; and

Whereas it is desirable for such commission to make recommendations at it deems appropriate for remedial action by the President, the Congress, the States, and private industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a National Commission on Product Safety (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of seven members appointed by the President from among persons who are specially qualified to serve on such Commission by virtue of their education, training, or experience. Not more than four members of the Commission may be members of the same political party.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers.

(d) The President shall designate one of the members to serve as Chairman and one to serve as Vice Chairman of the Commission.

(e) Four members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the scope and adequacy of measures now employed to protect consumers against unreasonable risk of injuries which may be caused by hazardous household products. Such study and investigation shall include consideration of the following:

(1) the identity of categories of household products, except such products excluded in section 6, which may present an unreasonable hazard to the health and safety of the consuming public;

(2) the extent to which self-regulation by industry affords such protection;

(3) the protection against such hazardous products afforded at common law in the States, including the relationship of product warranty to such protection; and

(4) a review of Federal, State, and local laws relating to the protection of consumers against categories of such hazardous products, including the scope of coverage, the effectiveness of sanctions, the adequacy of investigatory powers, the uniformity of application, and the quality of enforcement.

(b) As soon as practicable, the Commission shall publish in the Federal Register a list of the categories of household products which it proposes to study and investigate. The Commission shall afford an opportunity for any interested person to submit his views concerning any category of household product on the published list.

(c) The Commission may transmit to the President and to the Congress such interim reports as it deems advisable and shall transmit its final report to the President and to the Congress not later than two years from the date of approval of this joint resolution. Such final report shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems appropriate.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission, or any two members thereof as authorized by the Commission, may conduct hearings anywhere in the United States or otherwise secure data and expressions of opinions pertinent to the study. The Commission shall publish notice of any proposed hearing in the Federal Register and shall afford a reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present relevant testimony and data. In connection therewith the Commission is authorized by majority vote—

(1) to require, by special or general orders, corporations, business firms, and individuals to submit in writing such reports and answers to questions as the Commission may prescribe; such submission shall be made within such reasonable period and under oath or otherwise as the Commission may determine;

(2) to administer oaths;

(3) to require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all documentary evidence relating to the execution of its duties;

(4) in the case of disobedience to a subpoena or order issued under this subsection, to invoke the aid of any district court of the United States in requiring compliance with such subpoena or order;

(5) in any proceeding or investigation to order testimony to be taken by deposition before any person who is designated by the Commission and has the power to administer oaths, and in such instances to compel testimony and the production of evidence in the same manner as authorized under paragraphs (3) and (4) of this subsection; and

(6) to pay witnesses the same fees and mileage as are paid in like circumstances in the courts of the United States.

(b) Any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which an inquiry

is carried on may, in case of refusal to obey a subpoena or order of the Commission issued under subsection (a) of this section, issue an order requiring compliance therewith; and any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

(c) The Commission is authorized to require directly from the head of any Federal agency available information deemed useful in the discharge of its duties. Each Federal agency is authorized and directed to cooperate with the Commission and to furnish all information requested by the Commission to the extent permitted by law.

(c) The Commission is authorized to request from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this joint resolution; and each such department, agency, or independent instrumentality is authorized to cooperate with the Commission and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such information to the Commission upon request made by the Chairman or the Vice Chairman when acting as Chairman.

(d) The Commission is authorized to enter into contracts with Federal or State agencies, private firms, institutions, and individuals for the conduct of research or surveys, the preparation of reports, and other activities necessary to the discharge of its duties.

(e)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), when the Commission finds that publication of any information obtained by it is in the public interest and would not give an unfair competitive advantage to any person, it is authorized to publish such information in the form and manner deemed best adapted for public use, except that data and information which would separately disclose the business transactions of any person, trade secrets, or names of customers shall be held confidential and shall not be disclosed by the Commission or its staff: *Provided, however,* That the Commission shall permit business firms or individuals, reasonable access to documents furnished by them for the purpose of obtaining or copying such documents as need may arise.

(2) Prior to a finding by the Commission that the publication of any information with respect to any category of household product, is in the public interest and would not give an unfair competitive advantage to any person, the Commission shall (i) notify to the extent practicable all known manufacturers of any such products of such contemplated finding together with a synopsis of the information being considered for publication, and (ii) afford an opportunity not longer than thirty days for any such manufacturer to submit views with respect to the contemplated publication.

(f) The Commission is authorized to delegate any of its functions to individual members of the Commission or to designate individuals on its staff and to make such rules and regulations as are necessary for the conduct of its business, except as herein otherwise provided.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. Each member of the Commission may receive compensation at the rate of \$100 for each day such member is engaged upon work of the Commission, and shall be reimbursed for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relat-

ing to classification and General Schedule pay rates, to appoint and fix the compensation of an Executive Director and the Executive Director, with the approval of the Commission, may employ and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission, but no individual so appointed shall receive compensation in excess of the rate authorized for GS-18 by section 5332 of such title.

(b) The Executive Director, with the approval of the Commission, is authorized to obtain services in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per diem.

(c) The head of any Federal agency is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of its personnel to assist in carrying out the duties of the Commission under this joint resolution.

(d) Financial and administrative services (including those related to budgeting and accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) shall be provided the Commission by the General Services Administration, for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement, from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Administrator of General Services. Regulations of the General Services Administration for the collection of indebtedness of personnel resulting from erroneous payments shall apply to the collection of erroneous payments made to or on behalf of a Commission employee, and regulations of said Administrator for the administrative control of funds shall apply to appropriations of the Commission, but the Commission shall not be required to prescribe such regulations.

(e) Ninety days after submission of its final report, as provided in section 2(c), the Commission shall cease to exist.

DEFINITION

SEC. 6. As used in this joint resolution, the term "household products" means products customarily produced or distributed for sale through retail sales agencies or instrumentalities for use by a consumer or any member of his family in or around the household. Such term does not include products which are subject to regulations prescribed under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.), the Flammable Fabrics Act (15 U.S.C. 1191 et seq.), the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act (15 U.S.C. 1261 et seq.), the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (15 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.), the Federal Firearms Act (15 U.S.C. 901 et seq.), the National Firearms Act (26 U.S.C. 5801 et seq.), and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 135 et seq.).

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed \$2,000,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Commission would be composed of seven members appointed by the President from among persons specially qualified for service thereon by education, training, or experience.

Four members of the Commission would constitute a quorum.

One member of the Commission would be designated by the President to serve as its Chairman and one member would be so designated to serve as Vice Chairman of the Commission.

The committee proposes an amendment to this section to provide that not more than four of the seven members of the Commission may be members of the same political party.

Under subsection (a), the Commission is required to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the scope and adequacy of measures now employed to protect consumers against unreasonable risk of injuries which might be caused by hazardous household products. This study and investigation would include consideration of, first, the identity of categories of household products which may present an unreasonable hazard to the health and safety of the consuming public; second, the extent to which self-regulation by industry affords such protection; third, the protection against hazardous household products afforded at common law in the States, including the relationship of product warranty to such protection; and fourth, a review of Federal, State, and local laws relating to the protection of consumers against categories of hazardous household products, including the scope of coverage, the effectiveness of sanctions, the adequacy of investigatory powers, the uniformity of application, and the quality of enforcement.

The Commission, or any two members thereof authorized by the Commission, could conduct hearings anywhere in the United States or otherwise secure data and expressions of opinions pertinent to the study. Notice of any proposed hearing would be published in the Federal Register and interested persons would be afforded reasonable opportunity to present relevant testimony and data. For this purpose, the Commission could—by majority vote—(1) require corporations, business firms, and individuals to submit in writing such reports and answers to questions as the Commission prescribed; (2) administer oaths; (3) require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all documentary evidence relating to the execution of its duties; (4) in the case of disobedience to a subpoena or order, invoke the aid of any district court of the United States in requiring compliance with such subpoena or order; (5) in any proceeding or investigation, order testimony to be taken by deposition before any person who is designated by the Commission and has the power to administer oaths, and in such instances, compel testimony and the production of evidence in the same manner as described in (3) and (4) above; and (6) pay witnesses the same fees and mileage as are paid in like circumstances in the courts of the United States.

Subsection (a) authorizes the Commission to appoint and fix the compensation of an Executive Director, and authorizes the Executive Director, with the approval of the Commission, to employ and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions.

Under subsection (b), the Executive Director, with the approval of the Commission, is authorized to obtain temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants or an organization thereof, including stenographic reporting services. This authority would not permit the payment for individuals to exceed the rate of \$100 per day.

Subsection (c) authorizes the head of any Federal agency to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties.

Subsection (d) provides that financial and administrative services shall be provided the Commission by the General Services Administration.

Under subsection (e), as noted above, the Commission would terminate 90 days after submission of its final report to the President and the Congress.

"Household products" is defined to mean products customarily produced or distributed for sale through retail sales agencies or instrumentalities for use by a consumer or any member of his family in or around the household.

The bill came from the committee with unanimous approval and I recommend it to the Members.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly to say that the bill did come out of our committee unanimously and I know of no opposition to it whatsoever.

Therefore, I urge passage of the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am in opposition to the Commission or to the creation of another Federal "study group" at this time and place when we are suggesting national belt tightening, in an economy weighted heavily with taxes, and when we are continuously told on the floor of the House that we must quit authorizing legislation and commissions, which means that they later must be funded by the operating committee of the House, or the Committee on Appropriations.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, this is erstwhile and will not include other things, but I have studied the bill itself as well as the committee report in great detail over the weekend, and as I understand the amendments, it is my opinion that the legislation does perhaps, if adopted, establish a dangerous precedent wherein a regulatory agency can act by fiat, or by imposition upon the Congress what I call the "veto in reverse" situation; that is, by publication under the Reorganization Act of 1949 in the Federal registry of such regulatory rules and procedures as the executive branch may wish, which will have the force and effect of law, if not, acted upon adversely by one of the Houses of the Congress within the period of 30 or 60 days.

Mr. Speaker, this seven-member Commission, the members thereof, drawing \$100 per day per diem plus expenses, which in my opinion we can ill afford at a time when we have an administration-planned \$30 billion deficit this year, can be deferred.

Also, there is a question with reference to when this type of personnel as proscribed in both the report and the bill

could be found and appointed by the President.

I would call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that upon three different occasions within the last 3 months, we have had "continuing resolutions" to extend for a certain period of time commissions previously established by Presidential appointment, some of whom were not appointed for a period of up to 7 months thereafter. They seem also to involve more funds, inevitably.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the time during which the various members are to be appointed as well as the various requests which have been made for continuing appropriations, where necessary, should be thoroughly considered by the Members of this body.

In addition to all of this, there will be the additional cost of \$2 million in the first year and for each year thereafter in the name of a "sacred cow," which in the first place is a function of the States and community law and ordinances, rather than Federal legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we do not get ourselves into another situation where we have a Food and Drug Administration acting as it does by fiat under the food, drug, and cosmetics law.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly recommend that this Commission at this particular time and place, and in view of the financial requirements of this country, be voted down at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will my friend from Missouri yield?

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

Mr. GROSS. Is this the bill that provides for an increase in the number of the members of the Commission?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that this is a joint resolution designed to set up a new Commission of seven members. This is not the one, of which there is another on the suspension list today for consideration of the House today, which increases the membership from 26 to 39 members of that particular Commission for a study of highway problems.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HALL. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman have any idea as to why \$900,000 should be spent on consultants?

Mr. HALL. No, I am sure I would not.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is another one of the reasons I rise in opposition to this particular Commission; namely, that it will be as powerful as the product of safety assignments in the bureaucracies is at this time. The Department of Commerce, which has been "bottled" of so many of its functions by reason of the recent reorganization of the executive branch, has indicated a staff of 29 persons would be appropriate. I am not sure what the supergrades in this would be, but obviously it would involve technicians.

Mr. GROSS. I know of no limitation in this bill on the number of supergrades that may be employed under this setup.

It is unconscionable that Congress should be called upon to provide 29 sup-

porting staff members. Moreover, there are a number of commissions and bureaus dealing with so-called safety. Why is it necessary to create an additional commission for this purpose?

Can we obtain answers to some of these questions?

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

Mr. HALL. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. Let me just read here what has been said in the report:

The Public Health Service has furnished estimates of injuries for this year. These estimates include 100,000 from power lawnmowers; 125,000 from home workshop machinery; 125,000 from heating devices; and, perhaps surprisingly, 100,000 (mostly children) from wringers on washing machines.

These are injuries, which occur to some people in some of the better-known categories. We put those in here because we thought the House would understand the dangers involved with such devices. In fact, I personally have had an injury myself with a power lawnmower, and so I can understand these problems. So that would be the answer to the inquiry of the gentleman, in trying to secure justification for the legislation.

And if we are going to administer this we feel that it should be done either through an agency or a commission, and we had the feeling that a commission could do a better job, and do it more independently and would not be subservient to another administration as it would be if it was not an independent commission.

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

Mr. HALL. I will be glad to yield further.

Mr. GROSS. Let me point out that children have been getting their fingers caught in washing machine wringers from the time wringers were invented, whether they be hand powered or motor powered. If more women would stay at home and take care of their children there would not be so many of them getting their fingers caught in wringers.

Mr. SPRINGER. Would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HALL. I will be glad to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Certainly the gentleman is entitled to his own views, and I know how strongly he feels with reference to the setting up of new commissions.

We went into this subject in considerable degree, may I say, in trying to analyze exactly how much work we felt there would be involved, and we felt that it could be done without a terrifically large bureaucracy, but principally this is not in the field of supervision, this is in the field of eliminating dangerous devices from machinery which we know are necessary to the economy, and that is the reason for creating the commission. We just felt it could be done, and we would rather have this done independently by a commission than by sending it down to the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HALL. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. We have bureaucrats running out of our ears in this country, and I insist there is no need to set up another commission to describe how to keep your foot out of a power mower or your fingers out of a washing machine wringer.

You can "expert" this from now until doomsday, and you will still have people who are careless and who will be injured by these devices.

I do not see any logic to support this business of establishing a brandnew Commission in the Government on the basis that this is proposed.

The Comptroller's office takes note of the staffing of this Commission. On page 9 of the report it says:

The budget analysis presented by the Department of Commerce showed an estimated cost for the Commission of \$1,956,800. The budget was based on a seven-member Commission, each receiving compensation of \$100 a day, and on the assumption that the Commission would require 29 supporting staff members and would have a life of 1½ years. We have no special information or other basis on which to evaluate the reasonableness of these assumptions. Generally, the Department did not have detailed data to support the cost estimates included in the budget analysis.

We have no special information or other basis on which to evaluate the reasonableness of these assumptions (that is the staffing assumption).

Apparently the legislative committee had little information upon which to base its opinion that 29 staff employees would be needed.

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

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, we tried to evaluate how much money was needed and how many employees they probably would have to start with.

There is a reason why the office that the gentleman has mentioned does not know whether or not that number is needed because they made no special survey. This was recommended by the Department. We tried to rely the best we could upon the facts and figures that they gave to us. We did not think they were unreasonable about it. I could not see that 29 employees were too many when they are going to survey hundreds of products, I would assume, and if this Commission is to be effective, they would have to review hundreds of products throughout the economy in order to understand and find out the dangers involved and to try to come up with remedies in this field.

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

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. What is wrong with the Federal Trade Commission taking this over? They do not seem to be doing much these days and they are apparently well supplied with money and staff. Why does not the Federal Trade Commission get into it?

Mr. SPRINGER. Before I try to answer the gentleman, in the first place, and I think plenty of Members would be of the same opinion, I would say if I were a petitioner and there was an inquiry to be made into a matter that I would rather have my case determined

by an independent agency than to go down to something like the Federal Trade Commission.

One further thing, with reference to the Federal Trade Commission, and I think I am right about this—the Federal Trade Commission simply does not work in this field of safety.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, before yielding further, I would like to comment that indeed I am sure we are all against mislabeling and improper use of these dangerous or unsafe devices.

But I think the colloquy so far has demonstrated beautifully that there is a legitimate question about the cost at this time, and about whether this is a function of the Federal Government or the States. Certainly, there is an area of honest disagreement about whether one of the bureaus in being, or the Federal Trade Commission in being, a creature of this Congress, should oversee this, or whether we should have an additional study commission, to make a further study of products and of safety. I think not.

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

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOSS. First, I would like to say to the gentleman from Iowa that the Federal Trade Commission does not have the authority to undertake the type of studies contemplated in the resolution now before the House.

Second, out of an abundance of caution, the subcommittee took unusual steps of going to the General Accounting Office and submitting estimates prepared by the department for the General Accounting Office, for a careful reevaluation on the best information they had and admittedly no one has precise information because we have not had this precise type of commission in the past.

There were numerous instances before the subcommittee in the course of those hearings supporting the need for a study.

Now it comes down really to a philosophical question of whether you feel that we should have products which protect the imprudent or whether we should leave them at the mercy of the marketplace.

The precedent for protection is a very long and very old one. We have tried through voluntary efforts, through industry, through group studies of the underwriters' laboratories, to establish standards. With the proliferation of products, it is the hope to obtain an additional body of knowledge which will lead to, first, encouragement through voluntary groups, and second, governmental action to protect the consumer. That is the purpose of the commission.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for his comment. This is a point about which we disagree. We can disagree without being disagreeable. I would like to call to the attention of Members the table on the top of page 10 of the committee report.

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

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to my esteemed colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In response to the gentleman from California, let me say that it seems to me that we would have been

better served had the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee come in with legislation to set up in the Federal Trade Commission or some other agency—but why not the Federal Trade Commission—the authority to conduct this kind of investigation instead of creating a brandnew and expensive Commission in Government with another staff to go with it. President Johnson, since he became president, in November, 1963, has already increased the payroll by nearly 500,000. When in all conscience do you propose to stop?

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

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the resolution now before us is an important part of the series of legislation designed to protect the interests of the consumer. This legislation is important, not only because it deals with an area of concern to all citizens—the safety of household products, but because it contains several attributes that I hope will serve as a standard for future consumer legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this resolution takes a reasoned and reasonable approach to an important area of consumer protection. This resolution will enable the government to deal with the problem of product safety without inhibiting the growth and development of our economy. It is not a reflex action to a crisis nor does it call for panicked action without sufficient knowledge to do a proper job. In fact, it provides for the creation of a Commission to assemble the knowledge in the field so that when the need arises we will be able to act intelligently—with the ability to produce results rather than just motion.

This resolution calls on the Commission, to be created by this resolution, to work with the industries that will be affected by its work. This approach will permit a full consideration of all factors before action is taken. It will allow an industry to present its position and bring into public view considerations that might otherwise be lost in the shuffle. It will allow the Commission to utilize the expertise that has been acquired by the industries involved. I feel that these are important factors in approaching this matter on a reasoned and reasonable basis.

There are other significant and beneficial safeguards in this resolution. The Commission is required to give industry sufficient notice before proceeding with a matter to enable both parties to deal with the matter in an atmosphere other than one of crisis. My personal experience in the "cranberry crisis" in the not too distant past has convinced me of the danger of hasty and ill-advised action that exists when prior consultation with an affected industry is not practiced.

There is much legislation that already deals with the safety of "household products"; for example, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act, to mention just two. All "household products" that are already covered by existing legislation are specifically excluded from the domain of the Products Safety Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I think that, as a final point, it is important to realize the benefits that will accrue to the States as a result of the establishment of the Product Safety Commission. One function of the Commission is to draw together all material on current efforts to insure product safety, including industry self-regulation and all State laws and regulations. One result of this function is that if a State desires to review or change its rules and regulations governing product safety, the State will then have a single source that contains information on what the industries are already doing by self-regulation, what the Federal Government is doing, and probably most important, what other States have done. As a result, all parties will be able to proceed on a rational basis, avoiding the mistakes and taking advantage of measures that have worked well.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution, its goals, and the procedures it sets up for the Product Safety Commission to follow, and I urge all of my colleagues to give it their support.

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

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

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to point out that many times in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, when the Federal Trade Commission has appeared, they have asked for cease-and-desist authority, and our committee has almost always opposed this practice.

For example, the person charged is guilty until he proves he is innocent.

We like the reverse procedure where they would have proper opportunity by adversary proceedings to protect himself. In this Commission it is the feeling of the committee that at least the public interest was better protected under this approach. I note by the press that the Secretary of Labor has made the decision that if you are below 16 years of age, you cannot operate a cornpicker, a combine, and you cannot even drive a tractor unless the horsepower is under 25 horsepower. This is what is happening in the Office of the Secretary of Labor. Orders are going out to the farmer telling him, "You cannot hire unless you meet my rules and they include practically all farm machines used in modern agriculture.

Actually, some of our best operators are the young folks on the farm. I see this exercise of authority growing and growing, and I think part of the thinking of the committee was to protect against Federal agencies exercising abuse of power.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I would simply comment further that there is no assurance in the bill that we will not have identically the same propo-

sition under the powers given the Commission by this bill, as I said in my opening remarks, as, to wit, the Director of the Food and Drug Administration, who we will be discussing under the next bill to come up under suspensions today, and who has issued regulatory regulations that have the very effect of finding drug manufacturers or food additive producers which go into animal foods guilty before he has evidence, especially if they are new drugs that are being introduced. This is one of the reasons that I oppose the bill.

I call attention to the Members in closing my remarks—and I have no further requests for time—to the Department of Commerce budget analysis of the 29 staff members which appears on page 11 of the committee report. They are high grades, to be sure.

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

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would merely like to associate myself with the statement of the gentleman from Missouri and thank him for bringing this to the attention of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, that the committee had some very sound reasons for not deciding that the Federal Trade Commission should have the authority which would be vested in this special commission.

First, we did not want it to be a continuing body or a continuing authority. We did not want to create within the Federal Trade Commission a continuing bureaucracy for this purpose.

Second, we wanted to have an outside look by experts. That is the reason that the proposal contains the funds for the hiring of qualified personnel, and also to enter into contracts with the types of agencies that would be able objectively to undertake factfinding upon which any commission would be called to base prudent and reasonable decisions.

I do not recall a single vote, either in the subcommittee or in the full committee, in opposition to this legislation. The committee acted with great care and great deliberateness. I think the committee has as much regard for the public dollar and the public interest as would be evidenced by any Member of this body on either side. I think the bill reflects a responsible considered action, as the judgment of a committee which has a proud record in this House. I think the legislation is thoroughly consistent with that record.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to sum up the arguments here. The subcommittee considered the bill very carefully and voted it out unanimously. It was brought to the full committee. The full committee discussed the bill very carefully and reported the bill out.

This is a consumer bill, to protect all the people in the United States. This is no special interest bill.

Here are just a few categories of home accidents: 125,000 in home workshops;

more than 120,000 from heating devices; and 100,000, mostly children, hurt from wringers. These are only a few categories of home accidents.

We are having hearings now on the effects of radiation from TV tubes. We have had reports of injuries involving electric knives. There are accidents from all kinds of other electrical devices. Many of these products are new.

We are only authorizing a study in this legislation. This study would be terminated not later than 2 years after this legislation is enacted. For this study not more than \$2 million is authorized to be appropriated.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much that the establishment of a brand-new commission in Government will help much. All too often these new commissions are a haven for broken-down politicians. I doubt very much that the creation of a brandnew commission is going to stop people from cutting their fingers or hands from knives electrically operated or otherwise. I do not think the gentleman thinks it will.

As far as the Federal Trade Commission is concerned, there is also a Department of Commerce that has some relation to this. They are pretty well supplied with employees, as attested to by the fact that since President Johnson took office, employment in the Federal Government has increased from 2.5 million to more than 3 million. In this Government and now on the payroll there are employees capable of taking care of this situation—in the Department of Commerce or elsewhere.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would say to the gentleman this: We have had this same argument many times about many different propositions when they came up. It was said about polio, heart disease, cancer, and stroke, that somebody else could take care of them. It was said different departments of Federal Government could do it. But here again we have decided it is important for America to do it now. We must protect the consumers of America—now.

Two million dollars is a lot of money. But this legislation cannot cost more than that and it will protect the people of this land. This will provide not only a study of products, but of laws—Federal and State and local—so as to determine whether the people, the consumers, have adequate legal remedies against hazardous household products.

We believe this is good legislation, and we do not believe one single Member of this House should vote against it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from West Virginia that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate Joint Resolution 33, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 206, nays 102, not voting 124, as follows:

[Roll No. 363]

YEAS—206

Albert	Fraser	Patman
Anderson, Ill.	Friedel	Patten
Anderson, Tenn.	Gallifanakis	Perkins
Andrews, N. Dak.	Garmatz	Philbin
Ashley	Gettys	Pickle
Aspinall	Gibbons	Poage
Ayres	Gilbert	Poff
Bates	Gonzalez	Price, Ill.
Bell	Goodell	Pryor
Bennett	Green, Oreg.	Pucinski
Betts	Griffiths	Purcell
Biester	Gude	Quile
Bingham	Halpern	Randall
Blanton	Hamilton	Rees
Boland	Hanley	Reid, N.Y.
Bolton	Harsha	Reinecke
Brinkley	Harvey	Reuss
Brooks	Hathaway	Riegle
Brotzman	Hawkins	Rivers
Brown, Calif.	Hechler, W. Va.	Rodino
Broyhill, N.C.	Helstoski	Rogers, Colo.
Broyhill, Va.	Hollifield	Rooney, N.Y.
Burke, Fla.	Holland	Rosenthal
Burke, Mass.	Holmer	Roth
Burton, Calif.	Hungate	Roush
Bush	Irwin	Roybal
Byrnes, Wis.	Jarman	Rumsfeld
Cabell	Joelson	Ryan
Cahill	Johnson, Calif.	St. Germain
Carey	Jones, Ala.	Satterfield
Carter	Karsten	Scheuer
Celler	Kastenmeier	Schneebeli
Chamberlain	Kazen	Schweiker
Clancy	Kee	Schwengel
Clausen, Don H.	Keith	Shipley
Cleveland	King, Calif.	Sikes
Cohelan	Kirwan	Sisk
Conte	Kornegay	Slack
Conyers	Kupferman	Smith, Iowa
Corbett	Kyros	Springer
Culver	Latta	Stafford
Cunningham	Leggett	Staggers
Daddario	Lukens	Stanton
Davis, Ga.	McDade	Steiger, Wis.
Dawson	McDonald, Mich.	Sullivan
Devine	McFall	Talcott
Dingell	Macdonald, Mass.	Thompson, N.J.
Dole	Machen	Tiernan
Donohue	Mathias, Calif.	Ullman
Dorn	Matsunaga	Van Deerlin
Dowdy	Mayne	Vanik
Downing	Meeds	Vigorito
Eckhardt	Meskill	Waldie
Edwards, Calif.	Mills	Walker
Edwards, La.	Mink	Wampler
Esch	Moore	Whalen
Eshleman	Moorhead	Whalley
Evans, Colo.	Morse, Mass.	White
Fallon	Moss	Whitener
Farbstein	Murphy, Ill.	Widnall
Fascell	Murphy, N.Y.	Williams, Pa.
Feighan	Natcher	Wolf
Fisher	Nedzi	Wyatt
Flynt	Nelsen	Wylie
Foley	O'Hara, Ill.	Wyman
Ford	O'Hara, Mich.	Yates
	Olsen	Young
	O'Neal, Ga.	Zablocki
William D. Fountain	Ottinger	Zwach

NAYS—102

Abbitt	Dickinson	Hutchinson
Andrews, Ala.	Duncan	Ichord
Arends	Edwards, Ala.	Jonas
Ashbrook	Erlenborn	Jones, N.C.
Ashmore	Findley	Kleppe
Baring	Frelinghuysen	Kuykendall
Battin	Fulton, Pa.	Kyl
Belcher	Fuqua	Laird
Berry	Gathings	Langen
Bevill	Goodling	Lennon
Bow	Gross	Lipscomb
Bray	Gurney	Lloyd
Brown, Mich.	Haley	McClory
Buchanan	Hall	McClure
Burton, Utah	Hammer-	McCulloch
Clawson, Del.	schmidt	McEwen
Collier	Hansen, Idaho	McMillan
Colmer	Harrison	MacGregor
Davis, Wis.	Henderson	Mahon
Dellenback	Hicks	Marsh
Denney	Hunt	Martin

May
Miller, Ohio
Minshall
Mize
Montgomery
Morris, N. Mex.
Myers
Nichols
O'Konski
Passman
Pike
Plrnie
Pollock
Price, Tex.

Rallsback
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Relfel
Roberts
Robison
Roudebush
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scott
Selden
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Okla.

Snyder
Steiger, Ariz.
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Vander Jagt
Waggoner
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Zion

NOT VOTING—124

Abernethy	Fulton, Tenn.	Nix
Adair	Gallagher	O'Neill, Mass.
Adams	Gardner	Pelly
Addabbo	Glaimo	Pepper
Annunzio	Gray	Pettis
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Pool
Blackburn	Grover	Quillen
Blatnik	Gubser	Resnick
Boggs	Hagan	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolling	Halleck	Rhodes, Pa.
Brademas	Hanna	Rogers, Fla.
Brasco	Hansen, Wash.	Ronan
Brock	Hardy	Rooney, Pa.
Broomfield	Hays	Rostenkowski
Brown, Ohio	Hébert	Ruppe
Burleson	Heckler, Mass.	St. Onge
Button	Herlong	Sandman
Byrne, Pa.	Horton	Saylor
Casey	Howard	Smith, Calif.
Cederberg	Hull	Smith, N.Y.
Clark	Jacobs	Steed
Conable	Johnson, Pa.	Stephens
Corman	Jones, Mo.	Stratton
Cowger	Karth	Stubblefield
Cramer	Kelly	Stuckey
Curtis	King, N.Y.	Taft
Daniels	Kluczynski	Teague, Tex.
de la Garza	Landrum	Tenzer
Delaney	Long, La.	Tunney
Dent	Long, Md.	Udall
Derwinski	McCarthy	Utt
Diggs	Madden	Watkins
Dow	Mailliard	Watson
Dulski	Mathias, Md.	Watts
Dwyer	Michel	Whitten
Edmondson	Miller, Calif.	Wiggins
Ellberg	Minish	Williams, Miss.
Everett	Monagan	Willis
Evins, Tenn.	Morgan	Wilson
Fino	Morton	Charles H. Wright
Flood	Mosher	Wydler
Ford, Gerald R.	Multer	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. McCORMACK and he answered "yea."

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Corman with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Monagan with Broomfield.
Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Button.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Gardner.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Wiggins.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Conable.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Pool with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.

Mr. Nix with Mr. Multer.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Daniels.
Mr. Dow with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Flood with Mr. St. Onge.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Steed.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Karth.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Morgan with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Everett with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Hardy.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Long of Maryland.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Eilberg.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Minish.

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANIMAL DRUG AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3639) to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to consolidate certain provisions assuring the safety and effectiveness of new animal drugs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3639

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 "Animal Drug Amendments of 1967."

NEW ANIMAL DRUGS

Sec. 101. (a) Section 501(a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "or (5) if it is a new animal drug which is unsafe within the meaning of section 512; or (6) if it is an animal feed bearing or containing a new animal drug, and such animal feed is unsafe within the meaning of section 512."

(b) Chapter V of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"NEW ANIMAL DRUGS"

"Sec. 512. (a) (1) A new animal drug shall, with respect to any particular use or intended use of such drug, be deemed unsafe for the purposes of section 501(a) (5) and section 402(a) (2) (D) unless—

"(A) there is in effect an approval of an application filed pursuant to subsection (b) of this section with respect to such use or intended use of such drug,

"(B) such drug, its labeling, and such use conform to such approved application, and

"(C) in the case of a new animal drug subject to subsection (n) of this section and not exempted therefrom by regulations, it is from a batch with respect to which a certificate of release issued pursuant to subsection (n) is in effect with respect to such drug.

A new animal drug shall also be deemed unsafe for such purposes in the event of removal from the establishment of a manufacturer, packer, or distributor of such drug for use in the manufacture of animal feed in any State unless at the time of such removal such manufacturer, packer, or distributor has an unrevoked written statement from the consignee of such drug, or notice from the Secretary, to the effect that, with respect to the use of such drug in animal feed, such consignee—

"(1) is the holder of an approved application under subsection (m) of this section; or

"(2) will, if the consignee is not a user of the drug, ship such drug only to a holder of an approved application under subsection (m) of this section.

"(3) An animal feed bearing or containing a new animal drug shall, with respect to any particular use or intended use of such animal feed, be deemed unsafe for the purposes of section 501(a) (6) unless—

"(A), there is in effect an approval of an application filed pursuant to subsection (b) of this section with respect to such drug, as used in such animal feed,

"(B) there is in effect an approval of an application pursuant to subsection (m) (1) of this section with respect to such animal feed, and

"(C) such animal feed, its labeling, and such use conform to the conditions and indications of use published pursuant to subsection (1) of this section and to the application with respect thereto approved under subsection (m) of this section.

"(4) A new animal drug or an animal feed bearing or containing a new animal drug shall not be deemed unsafe for the purposes of section 501(a) (5) or (6) if such article is for investigational use and conforms to the terms of an exemption in effect with respect thereto under section 512(j).

"(b) Any person may file with the Secretary an application with respect to any intended use or uses of a new animal drug. Such person shall submit to the Secretary as a part of the application (1) full reports of investigations which have been made to show whether or not such drug is safe and effective for use; (2) a full list of the articles used as components of such drug; (3) a full statement of the composition of such drug; (4) a full description of the methods used in, and the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing, and packing of such drug; (5) such samples of such drug and of the articles used as components thereof, of any animal feed for use in or on which such drug is intended, and of the edible portions or products (before or after slaughter) of animals to which such drug (directly or in or on animal feed) is intended to be administered, as the Secretary may require; (6) specimens of the labeling proposed to be used for such drug, or in case such drug is intended for use in animal feed, proposed labeling appropriate for such use, and specimens of the labeling for the drug to be manufactured, packed, or distributed by the applicant; (7) a description of practicable methods for determining the quantity, if

any, of such drug in or on food, and any substance formed in or on food, because of its use; and (8) the proposed tolerance or withdrawal period or other use restrictions for such drug if any tolerance or withdrawal period or other use restrictions are required in order to assure that the proposed use of such drug will be safe.

"(c) Within one hundred and eighty days after the filing of an application pursuant to subsection (b), or such additional period as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the applicant, the Secretary shall either (1) issue an order approving the application if he then finds that none of the grounds for denying approval specified in subsection (d) applies, or (2) give the applicant notice of an opportunity for a hearing before the Secretary under subsection (d) on the question whether such application is approvable. If the applicant elects to accept the opportunity for a hearing by written request within thirty days after such notice, such hearing shall commence not more than ninety days after the expiration of such thirty days unless the Secretary and the applicant otherwise agree. Any such hearing shall thereafter be conducted on an expedited basis and the Secretary's order thereon shall be issued within ninety days after the date fixed by the Secretary for filing final briefs.

"(d) (1) If the Secretary finds, after due notice to the applicant in accordance with subsection (c) and giving him an opportunity for a hearing, in accordance with said subsection, that—

"(A) the investigations, reports of which are required to be submitted to the Secretary pursuant to subsection (b), do not include adequate tests by all methods reasonably applicable to show whether or not such drug is safe for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the proposed labeling thereof;

"(B) the results of such tests show that such drug is unsafe for use under such conditions or do not show that such drug is safe for use under such conditions;

"(C) the methods used in, and the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing, and packing of such drug are inadequate to preserve its identity, strength, quality, and purity;

"(D) upon the basis of the information submitted to him as part of the application, or upon the basis of any other information before him with respect to such drug, he has insufficient information to determine whether such drug is safe for use under such conditions;

"(E) evaluated on the basis of the information submitted to him as part of the application and any other information before him with respect to such drug, there is a lack of substantial evidence that the drug will have the effect it purports or is represented to have under the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the proposed labeling thereof;

"(F) upon the basis of the information submitted to him as part of the application or any other information before him with respect to such drug, the tolerance limitation proposed, if any, exceeds that reasonably required to accomplish the physical or other technical effect for which the drug is intended;

"(G) based on a fair evaluation of all material facts, such labeling is false or misleading in any particular; or

"(H) such drug induces cancer when ingested by man or animal or, after tests which are appropriate for the evaluation of the safety of such drug, induces cancer in man or animal, except that the foregoing provisions of this subparagraph shall not apply with respect to such drug if the Secretary finds that, under the conditions of use specified in proposed labeling and reasonably certain to be followed in practice (1) such drug

will not adversely affect the animals for which it is intended, and (11) no residue of such drug will be found (by methods of examination prescribed or approved by the Secretary by regulations, which regulations shall not be subject to subsections (c), (d), and (h)), in any edible portion of such animals after slaughter or in any food yielded by or derived from the living animals;

he shall issue an order refusing to approve the application. If, after such notice and opportunity for hearing, the Secretary finds that subparagraphs (A) through (H) do not apply, he shall issue an order approving the application.

"(2) In determining whether such drug is safe for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the proposed labeling thereof, the Secretary shall consider, among other relevant factors, (A) the probable consumption of such drug and of any substance formed in or on food because of the use of such drug, (B) the cumulative effect on man or animal of such drug, taking into account any chemically or pharmacologically related substance, (C) safety factors which in the opinion of experts, qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of such drugs, are appropriate for the use of animal experimentation data, and (D) whether the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the proposed labeling are reasonably certain to be followed in practice. Any order issued under this subsection refusing to approve an application shall state the findings upon which it is based.

"(3) As used in this subsection and subsection (e), the term 'substantial evidence' means evidence consisting of adequate and well-controlled investigations, including field investigation, by experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the effectiveness of the drug involved, on the basis of which it could fairly and reasonably be concluded by such experts that the drug will have the effect it purports or is represented to have under the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling or proposed labeling thereof.

"(e) (1) The Secretary shall, after due notice and opportunity for hearing to the applicant, issue an order withdrawing approval of an application filed pursuant to subsection (b) with respect to any new animal drug if the Secretary finds—

"(A) that experience or scientific data show that such drug is unsafe for use under the conditions of use upon the basis of which the application was approved;

"(B) that new evidence not contained in such application or not available to the Secretary until after such application was approved, or tests by new methods, or tests by methods not deemed reasonably applicable when such application was approved, evaluated together with the evidence available to the Secretary when the application was approved, shows that such drug is not shown to be safe for use under the conditions of use upon the basis of which the application was approved or that subparagraph (H) of paragraph (1) of subsection (d) applies to such drug;

"(C) on the basis of new information before him with respect to such drug, evaluated together with the evidence available to him when the application was approved, that there is a lack of substantial evidence that such drug will have the effect it purports or is represented to have under the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling thereof;

"(D) that the application contains any untrue statement of a material fact; or

"(E) that the applicant has made any changes from the standpoint of safety or effectiveness beyond the variations provided for in the application unless he has supplemented the application by filing with the

Secretary adequate information respecting all such changes and unless there is in effect an approval of the supplemental application. The supplemental application shall be treated in the same manner as the original application.

If the Secretary (or in his absence the officer acting as Secretary) finds that there is an imminent hazard to the health of man or of the animals for which such drug is intended, he may suspend the approval of such application immediately, and give the applicant prompt notice of his action and afford the applicant the opportunity for an expedited hearing under this subsection; but the authority conferred by this sentence to suspend the approval of an application shall not be delegated.

"(2) The Secretary may also, after due notice and opportunity for hearing to the applicant, issue an order withdrawing the approval of an application with respect to any new animal drug under this section if the Secretary finds—

"(A) that the applicant has failed to establish a system for maintaining required records, or has repeatedly or deliberately failed to maintain such records or to make required reports in accordance with a regulation or order under subsection (1), or the applicant has refused to permit access to, or copying or verification of, such records as required by paragraph (2) of such subsection;

"(B) that on the basis of new information before him, evaluated together with the evidence before him when the application was approved, the methods used in, or the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing, and packing of such drug are inadequate to assure and preserve its identity, strength, quality, and purity and were not made adequate within a reasonable time after receipt of written notice from the Secretary specifying the matter complained of; or

"(C) that on the basis of new information before him, evaluated together with the evidence before him when the application was approved, the labeling of such drug, based on a fair evaluation of all material facts, is false or misleading in any particular and was not corrected within a reasonable time after receipt of written notice from the Secretary specifying the matter complained of.

"(3) Any order under this subsection shall state the findings upon which it is based.

"(f) Whenever the Secretary finds that the facts so require, he shall revoke any previous order under subsection (d), (e), or (m) refusing, withdrawing, or suspending approval of an application and shall approve such application or reinstate such approval, as may be appropriate.

"(g) Orders of the Secretary issued under this section (other than orders issuing, amending, or repealing regulations) shall be served (1) in person by any officer or employee of the department designated by the Secretary or (2) by mailing the order by registered mail or by certified mail addressed to the applicant or respondent at his last known address in the records of the Secretary.

"(h) An appeal may be taken by the applicant from an order of the Secretary refusing or withdrawing approval of an application filed under subsection (b) or (m) of this section. The provisions of subsection (h) of section 505 of this Act shall govern any such appeal.

"(i) When a new animal drug application filed pursuant to subsection (b) is approved, the Secretary shall by notice, which upon publication shall be effective as a regulation, publish in the Federal Register the name and address of the applicant and the conditions and indications of use of the new animal drug covered by such application, including any tolerance and withdrawal period or other use restrictions and, if such

new animal drug is intended for use in animal feed, appropriate purposes and conditions of use (including special labeling requirements) applicable to any animal feed for use in which such drug is approved, and such other information, upon the basis of which such application was approved, as the Secretary deems necessary to assure the safe and effective use of such drug. Upon withdrawal of approval of such new animal drug application or upon its suspension, the Secretary shall forthwith revoke or suspend, as the case may be, the regulation published pursuant to this subsection (i) insofar as it is based on the approval of such application.

"(j) To the extent consistent with the public health, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations for exempting from the operation of this section new animal drugs, and animal feeds bearing or containing new animal drugs, intended solely for investigational use by experts qualified by scientific training and experience to investigate the safety and effectiveness of animal drugs. Such regulations may, in the discretion of the Secretary, among other conditions relating to the protection of the public health, provide for conditioning such exemption upon the establishment and maintenance of such records, and the making of such reports to the Secretary, by the manufacturer or the sponsor of the investigation of such article, of data (including but not limited to analytical reports by investigators) obtained as a result of such investigational use of such article, as the Secretary finds will enable him to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of such article in the event of the filing of an application pursuant to this section. Such regulations, among other things, shall set forth the conditions (if any) upon which animals treated with such articles, and any products of such animals (before or after slaughter), may be marketed for food use.

"(k) While approval of an application for a new animal drug is effective, a food shall not, by reason of bearing or containing such drug or any substance formed in or on the food because of its use in accordance with such application (including the conditions and indications of use prescribed pursuant to subsection (i)), be considered adulterated within the meaning of clause (1) of section 402(a).

"(l) (1) In the case of any new animal drug for which an approval of an application filed pursuant to subsection (b) is in effect, the applicant shall establish and maintain such records, and make such reports to the Secretary, of data relating to experience and other data or information, received or otherwise obtained by such applicant with respect to such drug, or with respect to animal feeds bearing or containing such drug, as the Secretary may by general regulation, or by order with respect to such application, prescribe on the basis of a finding that such records and reports are necessary in order to enable the Secretary to determine, or facilitate a determination, whether there is or may be ground for invoking subsection (e) or subsection (m) (4) of this section. Such regulation or order shall provide, where the Secretary deems it to be appropriate, for the examination, upon request, by the persons to whom such regulation or order is applicable, of similar information received or otherwise obtained by the Secretary.

"(2) Every person required under this subsection to maintain records, and every person in charge or custody thereof, shall, upon request of an officer or employee designated by the Secretary, permit such officer or employee at all reasonable times to have access to and copy and verify such records.

"(m) (1) Any person may file with the Secretary an application with respect to any intended use or uses of an animal feed bearing or containing a new animal drug. Such

person shall submit to the Secretary as part of the application (A) a full statement of the composition of such animal feed, (B) an identification of the regulation or regulations (relating to the new animal drug or drugs to be used in such feed), published pursuant to subsection (i), on which he relies as a basis for approval of his application with respect to the use of such drug in such feed, (C) a full description of the methods used in, and the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing, and packing of such animal feed, (D) specimens of the labeling proposed to be used for such animal feed, and (E) if so requested by the Secretary, samples of such animal feed or components thereof.

"(2) Within ninety days after the filing of an application pursuant to subsection (m) (1), or such additional period as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the applicant, the Secretary shall either (A) issue an order approving the application if he then finds that none of the grounds for denying approval specified in paragraph (3) applies, or (B) give the applicant notice of an opportunity for a hearing before the Secretary under paragraph (3) on the question whether such application is approvable. The procedure governing such a hearing shall be the procedure set forth in the last two sentences of subsection (c).

"(3) If the Secretary, after due notice to the applicant in accordance with paragraph (2) and giving him an opportunity for a hearing in accordance with such paragraph, finds, on the basis of information submitted to him as part of the application or on the basis of any other information before him—

"(A) that there is not in effect a regulation under subsection (i) (identified in such application) on the basis of which such application may be approved;

"(B) that such animal feed (including the proposed use of any new animal drug therein or thereon) does not conform to an applicable regulation published pursuant to subsection (i) referred to in the application, or that the purposes and conditions or indications of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling of such feed do not conform to the applicable purposes and conditions or indications of use (including warnings) published pursuant to subsection (i) or such labeling omits or fails to conform to other applicable information published pursuant to subsection (i);

"(C) that the methods used in, and the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing, and packing of such animal feed are inadequate to preserve the identity, strength, quality, and purity of the new animal drug therein; or

"(D) that, based on a fair evaluation of all material facts, such labeling is false or misleading in any particular;

he shall issue an order refusing to approve the application. If, after such notice and opportunity for hearing, the Secretary finds that subparagraphs (A) through (D) do not apply, he shall issue an order approving the application. An order under this subsection approving an application with respect to an animal feed bearing or containing a new animal drug shall be effective only while there is in effect a regulation pursuant to subsection (i), on the basis of which such application (or a supplement thereto) was approved, relating to the use of such drug in or on such feed.

"(4) (A) The Secretary shall, after due notice and opportunity for hearing to the applicant, issue an order withdrawing approval of an application with respect to any animal feed under this subsection if the Secretary finds—

"(i) that the application contains any untrue statement of a material fact; or

"(ii) that the applicant has made any changes from the standpoint of safety or effectiveness beyond the variations provided

for in the application unless he has supplemented the application by filing with the Secretary adequate information respecting all such changes and unless there is in effect an approval of the supplemental application. The supplemental application shall be treated in the same manner as the original application.

If the Secretary (or in his absence the officer acting as Secretary) finds that there is an imminent hazard to the health of man or of the animals for which such animal feed is intended, he may suspend the approval of such application immediately, and give the applicant prompt notice of his action and afford the applicant the opportunity for an expedited hearing under this subsection; but the authority conferred by this sentence shall not be delegated.

"(B) The Secretary may also, after due notice and opportunity for hearing to the applicant, issue an order withdrawing the approval of an application with respect to any animal feed under this subsection if the Secretary finds—

"(i) that the applicant has failed to establish a system for maintaining required records, or has repeatedly or deliberately failed to maintain such records or to make required reports in accordance with a regulation or order under paragraph (5) (A) of this subsection, or the applicant has refused to permit access to, or copying or verification of, such records as required by subparagraph (B) of such paragraph;

"(ii) that on the basis of new information before him, evaluated together with the evidence before him when such application was approved, the methods used in, or the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing, and packing of such animal feed are inadequate to assure and preserve the identity, strength, quality, and purity of the new animal drug therein, and were not made adequate within a reasonable time after receipt of written notice from the Secretary, specifying the matter complained of; or

"(iii) that on the basis of new information before him, evaluated together with the evidence before him when the application was approved, the labeling of such animal feed, based on a fair evaluation of all material facts, is false or misleading in any particular and was not corrected within a reasonable time after receipt of written notice from the Secretary specifying the matter complained of.

"(C) Any order under paragraph (4) of this subsection shall state the findings upon which it is based.

"(5) In the case of any animal feed for which an approval of an application filed pursuant to this subsection is in effect—

"(A) the applicant shall establish and maintain such records, and make such reports to the Secretary, or (at the option of the Secretary) to the appropriate person or persons holding an approved application filed under subsection (b), as the Secretary may by general regulation, or by order with respect to such application, prescribe on the basis of a finding that such records and reports are necessary in order to enable the Secretary to determine, or facilitate a determination, whether there is or may be ground for invoking subsection (e) or paragraph (4) of this subsection.

"(B) every person required under this subsection to maintain records, and every person in charge or custody thereof, shall, upon request of an officer or employee designated by the Secretary, permit such officer or employee at all reasonable times to have access to and copy and verify such records.

"(n) (1) The Secretary, pursuant to regulations promulgated by him, shall provide for the certification of batches of a new animal drug composed wholly or partly of any kind of penicillin, streptomycin, chlortetracycline, chloramphenicol, or bacitracin, or any derivative thereof. A batch of any

such drug shall be certified if an approval of an application filed pursuant to subsection (b) is effective with respect to such drug and such drug has the characteristics of identity and such batch has the characteristics of strength, quality, and purity upon the basis of which the application was approved, but shall not otherwise be certified. Prior to the effective date of such regulations the Secretary, in lieu of certification, shall issue a release for any batch which, in his judgment, may be released without risk as to the safety and efficacy of its use. Such release shall prescribe the date of its expiration and other conditions under which it shall cease to be effective as to such batch and as to portions thereof.

"(2) Regulations providing for such certifications shall contain such provisions as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection, including provisions prescribing—

"(A) tests and methods of assay to determine compliance with applicable standards of identity and of strength, quality, and purity;

"(B) effective periods for certificates, and other conditions under which they shall cease to be effective as to certified batches and as to portions thereof;

"(C) administration and procedure; and

"(D) such fees, specified in such regulations, as are necessary to provide, equip, and maintain an adequate certification service.

Such regulations shall prescribe only such tests and methods of assay as will provide for certification or rejection within the shortest time consistent with the purpose of this subsection.

"(3) Whenever, in the judgment of the Secretary, the requirements of this subsection with respect to any drug or class of drugs are not necessary to insure that such drug conforms to the standards of identity, strength, quality, and purity applicable thereto under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations exempting such drug or class of drugs from such requirements. The provisions of subsection (c) of section 507 of this Act (other than the first sentence thereof) shall apply under this paragraph.

"(4) The Secretary shall promulgate regulations exempting from any requirement of this subsection—

"(A) drugs which are to be stored, processed, labeled, or repacked at establishments other than those where manufactured, on condition that such drugs comply with all such requirements upon removal from such establishments; and

"(B) drugs which conform to applicable standards of identity, strength, quality, and purity prescribed pursuant to this subsection and are intended for use in manufacturing other drugs.

"(5) On petition of any interested person for the issuance, amendment, or repeal of any regulation contemplated by this subsection, the procedure shall be in accordance with subsection (f) of section 507 of this Act.

"(6) Where any drug is subject to this subsection and not exempted therefrom by regulations, the compliance of such drug with sections 501(b) and 502(g) shall be determined by the application of the standards of strength, quality, and purity applicable under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the tests and methods of assay applicable under provisions of regulations referred to in paragraph (2) (A) of this subsection, and the requirements of packaging and labeling on the basis of which the application with respect to such drug filed under subsection (b) of this section was approved."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 102. Section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, is amended by—

(a) inserting "(except a new animal drug

or an animal feed bearing or containing a new drug)" after "Any drug" in subparagraph (1) of paragraph (p);

(b) inserting "(except a new animal drug or an animal feed bearing or containing a new animal drug)" after "Any drug" in subparagraph (2) of paragraph (p);

(c) striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (4) of paragraph (s) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or", and by adding a new subparagraph (5) to read as follows: "(5) a new animal drug.";

(d) inserting ", 512," after "409" in paragraph (u); and

(e) adding at the end of such section the following new paragraphs:

"(w) The term 'new animal drug' means any drug intended for use for animals other than man, including any drug intended for use in animal feed but not including such animal feed—

"(1) the composition of which is such that such drug is not generally recognized, among experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of animal drugs, as safe and effective for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling thereof; except that such a drug not so recognized shall not be deemed to be a 'new animal drug' if at any time prior to June 25, 1938, it was subject to the Food and Drug Act of June 30, 1906, as amended, and if at such time its labeling contained the same representations concerning the conditions of its use; or

"(2) the composition of which is such that such drug, as a result of investigations to determine its safety and effectiveness for use under such conditions, has become so recognized but which has not, otherwise than in such investigations, been used to a material extent or for a material time under such conditions; or

"(3) which drug is composed wholly or partly of any kind of penicillin, streptomycin, chlortetracycline, chloramphenicol, or bacitracin, or any derivative thereof, except when there is in effect a published order of the Secretary declaring such drug not to be a new animal drug on the grounds that (A) the requirement of certification of batches of such drug, as provided for in section 512(n), is not necessary to insure that the objectives specified in paragraph (3) thereof are achieved and (B) that neither subparagraph (1) nor (2) of this paragraph (w) applies to such drug.

"(x) The term 'animal feed', as used in paragraph (w) of this section, in section 512, and in provisions of this Act referring to such paragraph or section, means an article which is intended for use for food for animals other than man and which is intended for use as a substantial source of nutrients in the diet of the animal, and is not limited to a mixture intended to be the sole ration of the animal."

PROHIBITED ACTS AND PENALTIES

SEC. 103. Section 301 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, is amended by—

(1) striking out "or" before "507," and inserting ", or 512 (j), (l), or (m)" after "507 (d) or (g)" in paragraph (e), and

(2) adding "512," after "507," in paragraph (j).

ANIMAL DRUGS IN FEEDS AND RESIDUES THEREOF IN OTHER FOOD

SEC. 104. Section 402 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, is amended by—

(1) striking out the word "or" before "(iii)" in clause (A) of subparagraph (2) of paragraph (a) and inserting "; or (iv) a new animal drug" after the words "color additive" therein; and

(2) adding before the semicolon following "commodity" at the end of the proviso to clause (C) of subparagraph (2) of paragraph

(a) the following: "; or (D) if it is, or it bears or contains, a new animal drug (or conversion product thereof) which is unsafe within the meaning of section 512".

ANTIBIOTIC DRUGS FOR ANIMALS

SEC. 105. (a) Section 502 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, is amended by inserting "(except a drug for use in animals other than man)" after "represented as a drug" in paragraph (1).

(b) Section 507 of such Act is amended by inserting "(except drugs for use in animals other than man)" after "drugs" in the first sentence of subsection (a).

AMENDMENT WITH RESPECT TO VIRUS, SERUM, TOXIN, AND ANALOGOUS PRODUCTS ACTS

SEC. 106. Section 902(c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is amended by striking out "the virus, serum, and toxin Act of July 1, 1902 (U.S.C., 1934 ed., title 42, chap. 4);" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "section 351 of Public Health Service Act (relating to viruses, serums, toxins, and analogous products applicable to man); the virus, serum, toxin, and analogous products provisions, applicable to domestic animals, of the Act of Congress approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 832-833);".

EFFECTIVE DATE AND TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 107. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the amendments made by the foregoing sections shall take effect on the first day of the thirteenth calendar month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) (1) As used in this subsection, the term "effective date" means the effective date specified in subsection (a) of this section; the term "basic Act" means the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; and other terms used both in this section and the basic Act shall have the same meaning as they have, or had, at the time referred to in the context, under the basic Act.

(2) Any approval, prior to the effective date, of a new animal drug or of an animal feed bearing or containing a new animal drug, whether granted by approval of a new-drug application, master file, antibiotic regulation, or food additive regulation, shall continue in effect, and shall be subject to change in accordance with the provisions of the basic Act as amended by this Act.

(3) In the case of any drug (other than a drug subject to section 512(n) of the basic Act as amended by this Act) intended for use in animals other than man which, on October 9, 1962, (A) was commercially used in the United States, (B) was not a new drug as defined by section 201(p) of the basic Act as then in force, and (C) was not covered by an effective application under section 505 of that Act, the words "effectiveness" and "effective" contained in section 201(w) as added by this Act to the basic Act shall not apply to such drug when intended solely for use under conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in labeling with respect to such drug on that day.

(4) Regulations providing for fees (and advance deposits to cover fees) which on the day preceding the effective date applicable under subsection (a) of this section were in effect pursuant to section 507 of the basic Act shall, except as the Secretary may otherwise prescribe, be deemed to apply also under section 512(n) of the basic Act, and appropriations of fees (and of advance deposits to cover fees) available for the purposes specified in such section 507 as in effect prior to the effective date shall also be available for the purposes specified in section 512(n), including preparatory work or proceedings prior to that date.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, this bill will assemble into one place in the law all of the major provisions of the Food and Drug Act which relate to drugs for administration to animals either directly or in their feed and water.

Its principal benefits to the drug and feed industry will be to provide for regulation of these drugs through legislation separate from legislation related to human drugs so that in the event of future legislation increasing controls over human drugs, these increased controls will not automatically apply to animal drugs as would be the case under existing law.

EXISTING LAW

The definition of "drug" in existing law is very broad and covers every substance which is intended to affect the structure or functions of the body of man or any other animal and, therefore, includes not only all substances for direct administration to animals to promote health, but also includes all feeds which contain drugs. This makes every feed manufacturer in the United States who mixes any drugs into his product automatically a "drug manufacturer" subject to stringent regulation.

Similarly, the term "food additive" is very broadly defined in the Food and Drug Act, so that drugs which are used in the manufacture of animal feed are also "food additives" as defined.

The result of the foregoing means that every manufacturer of drugs for use in animal feeds and every feed manufacturer who uses such drugs, is subject to regulation under the Food Additives Amendment—section 409 of the Food and Drug Act—and the new drug section of the law—section 505 of the Food and Drug Act.

Since a substantial number of animal feeds also contain antibiotics, feed manufacturers are subject to regulations under the antibiotic section of the Food and Drug Act—section 507—with respect to certifiable antibiotics.

A number of years ago, the manufacturers involved were required to submit two separate applications to FDA for clearance of animal feeds containing any drug. Through administrative action, FDA has simplified the procedure so that only one application is required to be filed today and there is better coordination between the three divisions of FDA which pass on applications for the use of drugs in animal feeds—the Food Additive Division, the New Drug Division, and the Antibiotic Division.

A Bureau of Veterinary Medicine has been established and the very substantial delays in FDA action which formerly plagued the industry have been cut down considerably.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

H.R. 3639 consolidates into one place all provisions of existing law which cover animal drugs and animal feeds. It does not take away any of the authority FDA has under existing law but provides one mode of regulation for the basic drug manufacturers, and a different and simpler mode for feed manufacturers, and provides that action on a feed manufac-

turer's application must be completed within a statutory deadline of 90 days, rather than the 180 to 210 days permitted under existing law.

The bill adds two new terms to the Food and Drug Act, "new animal drugs" and "animal feed." In general, the basic drug manufacturer who proposes to manufacture a "new animal drug" must go through comprehensive tests of the drug of the sort required today under the new drug section of the Food and Drug Act—section 505—and the Food Additives Amendment—section 409.

Upon completion of all testing and a determination by the manufacturer that the product is ready for marketing, the manufacturer submits his data to FDA, and within 180 days FDA is required to pass on the application. The approved application may, of course, be suspended or revoked in the same manner and subject to the same procedure as currently apply to new drugs and to food additives.

When a basic new drug application has been approved, any feed manufacturer may apply for approval of his mixing the drugs in animal feeds. The most important part of his application is a cross-reference to the approved basic application and a full description of his proposed methods, facilities, and controls for manufacture of the feed. FDA is required to act within 90 days on the application.

The most important parts of this application to the FDA are, first, a review of the adequacy of the facilities of the manufacturer to provide adequate mixing of the drugs, since the quantities of drugs in relation to the quantities of feed are usually very small; and second, the controls to be used by the manufacturer to prevent contamination of feed, particularly contamination from other drugs mixed in other feeds with the same equipment. After the manufacturer's application has been approved, it may be suspended or revoked under the same provisions that apply under existing law, and if the basic manufacturer's application is revoked, this will automatically revoke the feed manufacturer's approved application as well.

The bill takes effect approximately 12 months after the date of its enactment and contains transitional provisions, stating in substance that existing approved applications will be treated as approved applications under the new procedures set out in the bill.

As reported, the bill is identical to the bill reported by this committee and passed by the House last year, except that the effective date is postponed for 12 months in this year's bill rather than 6 months is proposed in last year's bill.

In addition the committee this year adopted an amendment recommended by the American Feed Manufacturers Association relating to the export of animal drugs and animal feeds containing drugs. Existing law permits foods, drugs, and cosmetics and devices to be exported, if they comply with the laws of the foreign country and the specifications of the foreign purchaser and are labeled for export. Because of the historical development of the Food and Drug Act, drugs may not be exported unless they also

comply with U.S. laws. The committee adopted an amendment providing that animal drugs and animal feeds containing drugs may be exported under the same conditions as apply to food, devices, and cosmetics; in other words, if they meet the requirements of foreign law, meet the specifications of a foreign purchaser, and are labeled for export. The Food and Drug Administration has stated that it has some objection to this amendment on the ground that it would diminish somewhat their ability to protect foreign purchasers of veterinary drugs and feeds. The committee did not agree that this is a sufficient reason to continue the provisions of existing law prohibiting export of drugs and feeds that comply with foreign laws.

The committee recommends that the amendment be adopted, and that the bill as amended be passed by the House.

At this time I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN], whose subcommittee heard all the evidence.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the growing world population and impending food crisis have received an increasing amount of attention—and with due cause. Economic, scientific, and agricultural authorities have expressed grave concern that we will be unable to meet tomorrow's food requirements. The food industry in this country is facing an unprecedented challenge to meet demands for more meat, poultry, eggs, and dairy products. In coming to grips with this challenge, a vital and major role is played by the animal health and nutrition industry—the people responsible for safeguarding our livestock and poultry populations.

We must exercise every opportunity to help wage the battle against hunger. H.R. 3639 is such an opportunity. This bill amends the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide a single procedure for the premarketing clearance of animal drugs. It consolidates existing provisions of the act into a single section specifically designed for animal drugs and feeds containing drugs. Streamlining clearance procedures will permit more immediate availability of the safe drugs desperately needed to arrest livestock and poultry losses.

The chief objective of legislation in the food and drug area has been to regulate drugs for human use. From the Food and Drug Act of 1906 through the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 and its amendments, human drugs have been the prime consideration. Although animal drugs have always been regulated under the act, they have received stepchild treatment at best.

In 1938, when the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act was signed into law, the number and type of drugs which were being marketed for use in animals were greatly different from those available today. Research has produced a myriad of sophisticated, specialized drugs and antibiotics for use in both nonfood and food producing animals, and for use in animal feeds. The medicated feed industry as we now know it did not exist in 1938.

The development in the last 20 years of new animal drugs and new uses for

those drugs has been spectacular. Subsequent growth of the livestock and poultry industries into highly commercialized, integrated, technical operations has been equally spectacular.

The Food and Drug Administration recognized the importance of this mushrooming industry when, in 1965, it reorganized and elevated the Division of Veterinary Medicine to Bureau status.

Yet the law has not grown with the activities it regulates. Although compounds for human use are cleared under one, and only one, of the various clearance sections of the act, animal drugs in many instances are reviewed under two of the applicable sections. There are three appropriate statutory channels under which compounds for human use may be cleared. If an application for a new human drug is approved, the drug can be cleared for market within 180 days.

Clearance procedures for animal drugs, however, are diverse and overlapping. For example: Both section 505, governing new drug procedures, and section 409, concerning food additives, are involved in the primary clearance of a new drug intended for animal feeds for food-producing animals. The agency has 180 days to act under section 505 and 210 days under section 409. These periods of time run concurrently with respect to the original application and petition. However, after the safety and efficacy of the new compound have been demonstrated, the new drug application approved, and a food additive regulation issued, each feed manufacturer must obtain a secondary clearance for each of his plants either through the submission of a new drug application or a form 1800. The law provides the agency an additional 180 days for this. Consequently, statutory time required for clearance totals 390 days. Between the time the manufacturer has completed his research and development work and the time the product is available in a medicated feed, a period in excess of a year may pass.

In 1 year, Mr. Speaker, losses of livestock and poultry to diseases, parasites, and insects are estimated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to total \$2.8 billion. Disease costs dairymen \$463 million each year. Parasites and insect losses push the total to the half-billion point. Hog producers lose \$300 million per year. Cattle losses from disease, parasites, and insects average \$9 per head.

Who pays the cost? Part is paid by every individual engaged in any phase of food production, be it basic research, feed manufacturing, or packaging. Our Nation's 3 million farmers pay the greatest share, estimated at \$900 each. The consumer pays. Livestock losses reduce the food supply, and a reduced food supply raises prices in the supermarket. The Government pays, too. Though the price tag is staggeringly high, we cannot forget that the loss is not only in dollars, but in enormous quantities of belly filling food.

The animal health industry has made tremendous strides in combating livestock and poultry diseases and increasing production efficiency. But research must provide more and better drugs. Better designed approval procedures will

free more scientists for basic research and permit industry to explore many promising new fields. There are only limited product development dollars available; they may be better utilized in research rather than in conformance to duplicative and confusing administrative procedures.

Better drugs are meaningless unless they are made available for use. The cumbersome administrative procedures are needlessly delaying the movement of a new animal drug from the laboratory to the market. I have already told of the huge livestock losses suffered in 1 year. Other losses in time and vital research are costly to industry and government alike.

H.R. 3639 is designed to solve the problems created by multiple controls. It would consolidate the duplicate and triplicate controls currently imposed by sections 409, 505, and 507 of the act. It would create a single statutory standard of safety and effectiveness for animal drugs in a new section 512, thus elevating such drugs to a position equal to that of drugs and antibiotics for human use and of human food additives.

It would establish a realistic statutory mechanism for the premarketing clearance of new animal drugs and of animal feeds bearing or containing them. It would provide appropriate controls over animal drug manufacturers and over feed manufacturers using such drugs. It would prevent recurring delays in the introduction of new animal drugs and would facilitate their availability to the producers of livestock and poultry following discovery and development.

There are some important things this bill would not do. It would not require additional appropriations to effect its provisions. We anticipate, in fact, that FDA operating efficiency will be significantly increased. It would not, in any manner, reduce the rigid controls contained in existing law to safeguard public health. There are no shortcuts to safety. All safety and efficacy requirements provided for in the existing act are retained. It would not usurp any State authority. The National Association of State Departments of Agriculture has lent its support to the legislation as "essential and workable" and "important to the long-range development of our animal-type agriculture."

Legislation specifically relating to drugs for use in animals and in their feeds was introduced in the House in the 87th Congress. Hearings were held in September of 1963, and several amendments were suggested. Since then, representatives from industry, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee have worked in close cooperation to resolve differences of opinion, to improve and simplify statutory language, and to insure that all necessary safety standards are maintained. H.R. 3639 is a distillation of all points of view. It has been endorsed by the major segments of the animal health and nutrition industry, the veterinary profession, and the Food and Drug Administration. A bill differing only slightly from H.R. 3639 passed the House unanimously in the 89th Congress.

Thirteen of our esteemed colleagues have introduced measures identical to H.R. 3639 in this session of the 90th Congress. Both the Public Health and Welfare Subcommittee and the full Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee have reported out this bill unanimously.

To further delay enactment of this legislation would tax the American public and the Government many millions of dollars, and would deny food to our Nation's, and the world's, exploding populations.

I strongly urge passage of H.R. 3639.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a few questions?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, page 15 of the report explains section 301, prohibited acts and penalties, and this is in reference to the act being amended: I wonder if the gentleman will tell us what the penalties are?

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, for the first offense the penalty would be 1 year or a fine of not more than \$1,000, and for the second offense 3 years, and \$10,000. Of course, there are provisions for seizure and for injunctions, where necessary.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose the bill and I thank the gentleman for answering my question. However, I am a bit concerned—not with this legislation, and I commend the committee on this legislation—but I am quite concerned that so much time has been spent and so much effort and detail has been gone into with respect to the manufacture of drugs for animals, and so little time and effort has been spent on inspection and method of manufacture of drugs for human beings.

If we compare the penalties with those under the Pure Food and Drug Act for violations of manufacture and sale of drugs under the Pure Food and Drug Act for human beings, we find the penalties here are much stiffer.

In reading the report, we find under the Virus, Serum, Toxin Act, which is exempted under the transfer here, requirements for a licensed establishment, it says that the establishments are inspected prior to licensing and are subject to continuing inspection.

Then at the bottom of the page we are told that historically the Secretary of Agriculture has regulated such animal biotics, many of which are not used for animals that are a source of human food. Going further in the report, on new drugs, it says that:

(b) Any person may file with the Secretary an application with respect to any drug subject to the provisions of subsection (a). Such persons shall submit to the Secretary as a part of the application (1) full reports of investigations which have been made to show whether or not such drug is safe for use and whether such drug is effective in use; (2) a full list of the articles used as components of such drug; (3) a full statement of the composition of such drug; (4) a full description of the methods used in, and the facilities and controls used for the manufacture, processing, and packing of such drug;

Then, on page 29 of the report, it states:

On the basis of new information before him, evaluated together with the evidence before him when the application was approved, the methods used in, or the facilities and controls used for, the manufacture, processing, and packing of such drug are inadequate to assure and preserve its identity, strength, quality, and purity and were not made adequate.

And so on and so on.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I repeat, I do not oppose this bill. However, it is a source of irritation to know we are so concerned about production of and methods of manufacture of new drugs, for the "silken fur catfood" and for the "bow-wow dogfood," and yet, in order to obtain an FDA registry number to manufacture drugs for human consumption, one need only put down one's name, his address, the address of the plant in which it is going to be manufactured, and whether or not one intends to manufacture narcotics. By return mail the individual receives his FDA registry number, which goes on every label, saying in effect that Uncle Sam approves of this manufacturer.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation which will require inspection of these plants prior to issue of a registry number.

I commend the committee for this legislation, but I do hope the committee will spend one-half as much time looking into the manufacture of drugs for human consumption.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly understand the gentleman's concern over the need for adequate protection in both fields.

The only response I would make to the gentleman's statement would be that the legislation before us makes no changes in existing law, and the penalties are the same in both the animal and human drug fields.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I appreciate that fact, but I believe the gentleman would agree with me the changes should be made in the manufacturing requirements for drugs for human beings, so that they at least equal the requirements for the manufacture of drugs for animals.

Mr. JARMAN. I would certainly say to the gentleman that the committee stands ready to confer with him on this problem. Certainly we all have the same objectives in mind.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the bill would consolidate into one place in the law all of the principal provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act which relate to premarketing clearance of new drugs for administration to animals, either directly or in their feed and water. The bill is supported by the entire animal drug and feed manufacturing industry, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Department of Agriculture.

The bill would entail no additional cost for its administration.

During the 88th Congress, the Sub-

committee on Public Health and Safety of this committee held extensive hearings on legislation proposing the consolidation of all laws relating to premarketing clearance of new animal drugs, and considered the bill in several executive sessions. A number of revisions were made by the subcommittee in the legislation, but time did not permit the completion of action on the bill. During the 89th Congress a revised version of the bill worked out by the subcommittee was passed by the House, but time did not permit the consideration of the bill by the Senate.

In many cases, the requirements for clearance of new drugs for administration to animals are more complicated than the clearance procedures for new human drugs. These complexities have in some instances led to long delays in the clearance of new animal drugs, and the purpose of the bill is to provide a single procedure for clearance of these drugs.

By consolidating into one place in the new law all of the provisions providing for regulation of these drugs, clearances should be expedited, with resulting decreases in costs, and consequent encouragement for the development by manufacturers of new drugs for use in animals.

The bill as reported is the product of the work over four sessions of Congress of interested industry groups representing manufacturers and feed mill operators, veterinarians, and the Food and Drug Administration. It provides not only benefits for industry, but through improved procedures, benefits for the consumer in the more efficient and less costly production of livestock, poultry, eggs, and milk.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should like to point out that we have been up the hill and down the hill with this legislation for a good many years. The procedure, in the way of approval of a formula, as an example, is that at one time one manufacturer might be using a formula, and a new man would come into the field. He would have to go through a long and lengthy process, using identically the same formula, all this because of legislation and regulation which make it so difficult for the handling of new animal drugs.

This bill provides the needed legislative guides to streamline procedures for clearing animal drugs while preserving proper and necessary safeguards for public health.

It has been the purpose of our committee not to loosen up the standards and to protect the public in every possible way. This bill will do exactly that, but it will make it easier to operate—not easier in the sense of relaxing protection for the public but easier in the sense of administering it.

During the committee hearings when the Food and Drug Administration officials appeared, the question was asked by several Members, including myself, "Does this in any way relax protection for the general public?" The answer was, "It does not."

The merits of this legislation are reflected in the consensus of the animal drug industry, the feed manufacturing industry, the Food and Drug Administration and our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

It might be pointed out that procedures now in effect have actually discouraged the development of drugs which would reduce disease in animals. The bill before us will remove the roadblocks to encourage research and development. This in turn will result in healthier livestock and lower net costs for the farmer.

The rate of growth in the knowledge and ability of drug producers has outstripped present clearance procedures. More efficient methods are needed to meet the needs of a growing livestock industry, increasingly conscious of scientific techniques and their application. H.R. 3639 makes special provisions for new uses of animal drugs such as feed additives, and it unifies the clearance methods for all animal drug applications.

Commissioner Goddard of the FDA stated with reference to H.R. 3639:

This brings together in one act all of those items that affect animal drugs, feeds and the use of antibiotics therein. It clarifies and explains some procedures we are currently employing.

In the closing days of the second session of the 89th Congress, a similar measure passed the House of Representatives without a dissenting vote. Unfortunately, the other body did not find time to consider the legislation before adjourning. As I feel this is good legislation moving in the right direction, I hope the House will pass the bill and it will receive the attention it deserves on the other side of the Hill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLODY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I support the passage of H.R. 3639, the Animal Drug Amendments of 1967. H.R. 3639 represents almost 4 years of work by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, by groups representing drug manufacturers, veterinarians, and feed mill operators, as well as by officials of the Food and Drug Administration, to achieve a bill which will effectively consolidate all laws relating to premarket clearance of new animal drugs.

The need for this legislation is apparent. Under the present system of clearance, a drug to be administered to animals may be regulated as a new drug, as a feed additive, and/or an antibiotic. The cost of this complicated procedure—in many cases more complicated than clearance procedures used for new human drugs—is increased cost and delayed development of new animal drugs. These costs and delays are reflected in a reduction of farm income due to animal disease and in increased food costs to the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, we can ill afford such costs and delays due to lack of coordina-

tion in obtaining clearances for new animal drugs.

This legislation in no way sacrifices animal health and safety to expediency. The Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety, ably chaired by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN], held full and complete hearings on all aspects of this legislation in the 88th, 89th, and 90th Congresses. Legislation substantially identical to H.R. 3639 passed this House in the 89th Congress under suspension of the rules. I urge my colleagues again to support this much needed bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I arise in support of this bill, because I believe it will simplify and clarify procedures, and I compliment the committee.

In the past few years I have had occasion to become quite familiar with the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as a result of a still-continuing controversy over the manner in which the Food and Drug Administration administers the provisions of the law as they affect the safety and effectiveness of new or in-being animal drugs, additives, and food supplements.

I understand the measure before the House is primarily intended to consolidate into one place all of the principle provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act which relate to premarketing clearance of new drugs for administration to animals either directly or in their feed and water. Naturally it concerns residues therein and the effects of and on human consumption.

I may say parenthetically I think this answers part of the question of the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The statement is made in the committee report that:

The bill is supported by the entire animal drug and feed manufacturing industry.

And while I would not dispute that contention, I wish to make quite clear that this same unanimity of opinion does not prevail about the sometimes arbitrary and unreasonable manner by which Food and Drug administers these laws.

I recognize that this bill today is perhaps not the proper forum in which to seek a resolution of the inequities that have occurred in the case of a single company. But I do believe the discussion of this bill is a proper forum to detail what happens when a Federal agency resorts to harassment and contradiction so as to maintain its "can do no wrong" image.

I would offer two amendments to this bill if it were not here under suspension.

One would stipulate that where any hazard is thought to exist in the animal use of any drug or in its use in combination with any other readily available drug, such class of drugs be confined to use under direction and supervision of graduate veterinarians only.

Second, I would propose an amendment to rule that if a drug is not judged sufficiently hazardous to deserve such restriction of usage, the FDA will be prohibited from challenging a combination usage which cannot be controlled in the

first place and therefore results only in lost motion and total waste of our tax money.

This is on the principle that you are innocent, especially if you have practiced conforming usage, until you are proved guilty.

Under unanimous consent I place at this point in the RECORD the attached excerpts of a letter written on October 17, 1967, by W. P. Scott, president of Naremcro, Inc., of Springfield, Mo. Would that Dr. Goddard had at least the same concern for the employees, stockholders, and customers of this firm, that he recently evidenced for the marihuana smokers of America. The letter follows:

OCT. 17, 1967.

DR. JAMES F. GODDARD,
Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration.

MY DEAR DR. GODDARD: We have, for twelve years past had a running battle for survival with the Veterinary Medical section at FDA over their refusal to recognize the value of certain very old, very safe, effective, but *no longer new and glamorous drugs*, for use in control of poultry and livestock disease. Two of them are sold "over the counter basis" for human use, one is commonly used as a food preservative, all are "not new drug" and are in free interstate commerce, available to all producers for use either in animal feed or drinking water, and in any chosen concentration or combination.

Our sin is only that we use them in several patented combinations in proprietary formulations which have done a very excellent and much needed job in poultry and animal disease control. In "service selling", American producers have used more than \$4,000,000.00 worth of these formulations. We can't fool the people that badly, and in fact on the efficacy issues have already won two defensive actions against FDA litigation. As we understand it, efficacy is the only question that can be raised under the "grandfather clause" of the 1962 New Drug regulations.

As a result of our protests, Mr. George P. Larrick wrote our Congressman Dr. Durward G. Hall on April 13th., 1961, that these drugs and their combinations were not new drug (thus refuting six years of harassment by B. V. M.), and required no clearance by our company prior to marketing. Yet, five condemnation actions were filed by FDA in May of 1966, one each against five special formulations. In doing so, several discrepancies and actual floutings of the law have occurred.

1. Each drug is individually exempt under the "grandfather clause" of the 1962 New Drug regulations. Fully adequate data published on the safety and efficacy of each long predates the latest Food Additive or New Drug regulations.

2. Four of the formulations were positively exempted by the "grandfather clause", and the fifth is a re-arrangement of a product we started with in November 1956 which might be questionable on basis of date first sold except that there are absolutely no restrictions stated or proposed for use of one of these compounds in any food, feed, or combination with other drugs. It is, in other words, a free compound.

3. Notification that B. V. M. proposed a change in classification of each product to require Food Additive petition came in a letter signed by Dr. M. R. Clarkson, dated June 6th, following the filing of all litigation without warning in May 1966. This Action was clearly in violation of 121.3(C) subpart A, Food Additive Regulations, which require that, "except in case of imminent hazard to public health", which has not yet been shown to exist, no prior sanction or approval will be withdrawn or modified without prior notice or a statement of the reasons for

the action. We were then denied the right to submission of added data on the basis that the matter is in litigation.

Why were these actions initiated in the first place, since by admission of the government attorneys before the Tyler, Texas Court, no actual hazard was even claimed to exist, the only question being that in the opinion of the government's "expert" witnesses the combination is "not generally recognized as safe and effective" because no evidence of such can be found in the literature on the combination. We can find no requirement in the law which specifies such publication as being legal prerequisite to marketing. Hundreds of exemptions are being honored on drug combinations on which data has not been published, and clearance of "New Drugs", is invariably followed, not preceded by such publications.

4. Appearing at both trials, two government witnesses (University people), representing themselves to be "experts", did, at the second trial contradict their own testimony as presented at the first trial.

5. Neither the safety or the efficacy of the individual drugs is questioned, even by the Government. The charges are in each instance against the "combination" of drugs, in violation of 121.4 subpart A, Food Additives, which stipulates that tolerances will be questioned on food additives "that cause similar or related pharmacological effects", and 121.4(c) which discusses chemicals in the same class. In each case the chemicals involved are unrelated in pharmacological action and any adequately trained chemist can state with certainty that no chemical change or interaction can or does occur in the environment of application.

With reference to 121.4(c), no two or three of these compounds are, by any stretch of the imagination, in the same class.

6. In each case, B. V. M. demanded removal from the market of each product pending clearance through New Drug and Food Additive regulations. This, for drugs which had been on the market in the challenged combinations for from five to twelve years, and individually are thoroughly researched for safety and efficacy, and scientifically recognized on a worldwide basis in virtually all the medical and veterinary medical journals. We know of no instance in which other widely used and accepted drugs, even those justifiably suspected of being hazardous, are denied marketing pending the submission of new safety data.

7. Since each of these drugs continues in free interstate commerce and available to all producers, our company only would be deprived of their sale or use in any chosen concentration or combination by the FDA action. Thus prejudice under the law is clearly established.

8. Why were Food Additive regulations suddenly discovered to be applicable four to five years after four of these formulations were introduced in interstate commerce? Why were "New Drug" charges not filed initially against any of these products, but added before joint court action against the next two, almost five years after passage of the 1962 new drug regulations, and only after FDA decisively lost both food additive and efficacy charges in the first litigation on the same combination of drugs?

Why were legal actions continued against four other formulations after FDA clearly lost in the first, which, because it involved the same combination of drugs, had even then defeated the claimed FDA objective of protection of the public health against the hazards of this combination of drugs? Note also, that the Government did not decide to "question" the verdict in the first case, by appeal.

9. One University (expert) witness admitted under oath that he had for a number of years received a regular retainer or consultant fee from one of our largest drug

company competitors. Why does FDA use unquestionably prejudiced witnesses.

10. We, and all citizens having any knowledge of these legal actions were sickened at the spectacle of supposedly respectable University scientists callously acting to injure through use of their position, by using strictly "opinion testimony," obviously without adequate knowledge of the structure, uses or effects of the drugs or combinations of drugs they appeared to challenge.

Do influences such as grants-in-aid, retainers and consultant fees paid by our larger competitors, or National Institute of Health grants controlled by Health, Education and Welfare, play a part? Wouldn't you wonder? And what do the members of the B. V. M. Staff have to gain? Again, wouldn't you wonder?

As a result of this, we have a solid basis for damage suits against four representatives of four major Universities, and perhaps the University too in each case. This would, even if damages were denied, totally embarrass both the Colleges and B. V. M. publicly disclose that the testimony given by these people at the request of B. V. M. was something less than "the whole truth and nothing but the truth", and which might even result in perjury indictments against one or more of these witnesses.

Action in such an area will be a nasty mess, and will therefore be initiated only as a final alternative to capitulation. It is very unfortunate that medical terms so confuse our courts, that the weight of government prestige and that represented by "big name" College experts all too often become the only basis for judgment, even though to trained people in this field the testimony may be recognizably "slanted" and prejudicial.

11. Failing in efforts to present credible evidence of even the slightest hazard resulting from combination, B. V. M. departed from its pre-trial charges to single out one drug, Sodium Phthalylsulfacetamide (at the second trial) and used Dr. James Dollahite of Texas A & M University before a Tyler, Texas jury to introduce evidence of a "detectable" but unmeasurable (too small) sulfanilamide residue, which because the latter is the parent compound of all sulfa drugs, and is a common result of all sulfa drug therapy, could be cumulative, sensitize the human population and cause all kinds of reactions in as much as one-third of the human population, and even death when sulfa drugs are subsequently administered by M.D.'s for control of human disease.

a. But this same sulfa drug was cleared through new drug and food additive regulations at least seventeen years ago by the Schering Corporation, and is manufactured, sold and used by innumerable U.S. Companies, and in a number of other countries. B. V. M. knew this, and yet implied before the court that it was new drug.

Then, as a result of our appeals to members of the Congress, Mr. Paul A. Pumplan, Director of the Office of Legislative and Governmental Services wrote several letters in reply which stated:

"Prior to the 1962 Kefauver-Harris amendments to the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, proof of safety was the sole requirement for approval of a new drug. On this basis the firm was advised that the existing formulations with the exception of Sodium Phthalylsulfacetamide, were not new drugs, but were of doubtful efficacy for label claims."

One of the drugs we were advised was not new drug by FDA was Sodium Phthalylsulfacetamide.

Thus we see an implication to the respected members of our Congress which was absolutely untrue, and can be proved so by FDA correspondence both prior to and subsequent to the enactment of the 1962 New Drug regulations.

c. This sulfa is shown in all the scientific literature as having value only as an inter-

tinal antiseptic, because it is so poorly absorbed.

d. Tolerances have been set for poultry or animal use for only two of the very large family of sulfa drugs, and innumerable drug combinations in which sulfas are one or more of the active ingredients, so absolutely no foundation can be found for the veracity of Dr. Dollahite's testimony in the first place.

Sodium Phthalylsulfacetamide therefore belongs to a broad class of drugs, most of which are far more absorbable and therefore many times more hazardous than it is. Action should therefore be instituted against this entire class of drugs, or against none of them, and should be instituted at source, not with people who buy the finished compound in free interstate commerce. Only by "source control" do you achieve any assurance of industry protection, or guarantee of even the slightest degree of protection of the public health.

e. We have, since this evidence was presented in February, tried quite hard to persuade Texas A. & M. that one of two conditions must prevail. First, if the evidence is not scientifically valid, the result must unjustly deprive poultry and animal producers of an entire class of drugs which are vital to disease control, and in the human field will increase the hazard of food contamination by infectious processes, a problem which may well outweigh drug residue hazards.

Secondly however, the sulfa drugs have been extensively used in poultry and livestock for twenty or more years. Therefore, if the evidence is scientifically valid, hundreds of thousands of American people must have long ago become sensitized, still nothing is being done to eliminate the hazard to present and future generations.

Therefore, we have at hand a matter of the utmost urgency. Since we have as yet uncovered no means which promises to scientifically disqualify the Dollahite sulfa testimony before the Court, our company, FDA, all our agricultural colleges, all state departments of drug control, the entire drug industry, the feed industry, and all U.S. husbandrymen must appear before the bar of public opinion to answer for either abysmal ignorance, or a callous and unpardonable disregard for the public health and welfare.

Our backs are to the wall: We cannot wait beyond November 15th to determine the course we must follow. Therefore, if clarification of the sulfa drug issue is not forthcoming by that date, we feel that the pros and cons of the situation, together with the history and present status of these drugs in poultry and livestock use should be mailed to the editors of leading publications throughout the U.S. We have hesitated to date only because of the dire effects such action will have on our industry.

A terrific controversy will ensue of course, for such action will demand public explanation, which under the circumstances FDA cannot afford to make, or will result in loss of confidence in another supposedly responsible department of government. Either way it will result in unwelcome embarrassment to The Administration and for this totally misguided action FDA has expended not less than \$100,000.00 of our tax dollars, and has cost our company not less than \$100,000.00 in costs and damages, which we are justly entitled to recover, and will spend as much more, and cost us as much more in continuing the actions presently in process.

Therefore, I trust the virtue of our appeal for your prompt and effective investigation of the legal, moral and constitutional (equal rights) aspects of this matter will be understood and appreciated.

Yours very truly,

NAREMCO, INC.,

W. P. SCOTT, President.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to introduce companion legislation to this bill and I am happy to speak in its behalf on the floor of the House. The work and study of several years by the Congress is wrapped up in the bill and I hope the Senate will take speedy and favorable action.

Few advances in the realm of human knowledge have been more rapid and spectacular than in the field of drug research and development. Most persons generally think of the astonishing number of "wonder" drugs for human use and consumption, and only rarely does the average person consider those available to promote growth and combat disease in animals.

As I testified before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in support of this measure, the great pharmaceutical houses of America have made genuinely outstanding contributions in the discovery, development, production and distribution of drugs, serums, and antibiotics, which have raised the living standard of all mankind. It is a matter of personal pride with me that the great firm of Eli Lilly & Co. is located in my congressional district.

The Congress must make sure that necessary regulations do not become negative restrictions. Favorable action on this bill is an important and vital step to that end, and I am happy to give it my wholehearted support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 3639, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 317, nays 0, not voting 115, as follows:

[Roll No. 364]

YEAS—317

Abbitt	Brinkley	Conyers
Albert	Brooks	Corbett
Anderson, Ill.	Brotzman	Culver
Anderson, Tenn.	Brown, Calif.	Cunningham
Andrews, Ala.	Brown, Mich.	Daddario
Andrews, N. Dak.	Broyhill, N.C.	Davis, Ga.
Arends	Buchanan	Davis, Wis.
Ashbrook	Burke, Fla.	Dawson
Ashley	Burke, Mass.	Dellenback
Ashmore	Burton, Calif.	Denneny
Aspinall	Burton, Utah	Devine
Ayres	Bush	Dickinson
Baring	Byrnes, Wis.	Dingell
Bates	Cabell	Dole
Battin	Cahill	Donohue
Belcher	Carey	Dorn
Bell	Carter	Dowdy
Bennett	Cederberg	Downing
Berry	Celler	Duncan
Betts	Chamberlain	Eckhardt
Bevill	Clancy	Edmondson
Blester	Clausen,	Edwards, Ala.
Bingham	Don H.	Edwards, Calif.
Blanton	Clawson, Del.	Edwards, La.
Boland	Cleveland	Erlenborn
Bolton	Cohelan	Esch
Bow	Collier	Eshleman
Bray	Colmer	Evans, Colo.
	Conte	Evins, Tenn.
		Fallon

Farbstein	Leggett	Reuss
Fascell	Lennon	Riegle
Feighan	Lippscomb	Rivers
Findley	Lloyd	Roberts
Fisher	Long, Md.	Robison
Flynt	Lukens	Rodino
Foley	McClary	Rogers, Colo.
Ford	McClure	Rooney, N.Y.
William D.	McCulloch	Rosenthal
Fountain	McDade	Roth
Fraser	McDonald,	Roudebush
Frelinghuysen	Mich.	Roush
Friedel	McEwen	Roybal
Fulton, Pa.	McFall	Rumsfeld
Fuqua	McMillan	Ruppe
Gallifanakis	Macdonald,	Ryan
Garmatz	Mass.	St Germain
Gathings	MacGregor	Satterfield
Gettys	Machen	Schadeberg
Gibbons	Mahon	Scherle
Gilbert	Mailliard	Scheuer
Gonzalez	Marsh	Schneebeli
Goodell	Martin	Schweiker
Goodling	Mathias, Calif.	Schwengel
Green, Oreg.	Matsunaga	Scott
Griffiths	May	Selden
Gross	Mayne	Shipley
Gude	Meeds	Shriver
Gurney	Meskill	Sikes
Haley	Miller, Ohio	Sisk
Hall	Mills	Skubitz
Halpern	Mink	Slack
Hamilton	Minshall	Smith, Iowa
Hammer-	Mize	Smith, Okla.
schmidt	Montgomery	Snyder
Hanley	Moore	Springer
Hanna	Moorhead	Stafford
Hansen, Idaho	Morris, N. Mex.	Staggers
Harrison	Morse, Mass.	Stanton
Harsha	Morton	Steiger, Ariz.
Harvey	Moss	Steiger, Wis.
Hathaway	Murphy, Ill.	Stuckey
Hawkins	Murphy, N.Y.	Sullivan
Hechler, W. Va.	Myers	Talcott
Heckler, Mass.	Nacher	Taylor
Helstoski	Nedzi	Teague, Calif.
Henderson	Nelsen	Thompson, Ga.
Hicks	Nichols	Thompson, N.J.
Hollifield	O'Hara, Ill.	Thomson, Wis.
Holland	O'Hara, Mich.	Tiernan
Hungate	O'Konski	Tuck
Hunt	Olsen	Tunney
Hutchinson	O'Neal, Ga.	Udall
Ichord	Ottinger	Ullman
Irwin	Passman	Van Deerlin
Jarman	Patman	Vander Jagt
Joelson	Patten	Vanik
Johnson, Calif.	Perkins	Vigorito
Johnson, Pa.	Philbin	Waggoner
Jonas	Pickle	Waldie
Jones, Ala.	Pike	Walker
Jones, N.C.	Pirnie	Wampler
Karsten	Poage	Whalen
Kastenmeyer	Poff	Whalley
Kazen	Pollock	White
Kee	Price, Ill.	Whitener
Keith	Price, Tex.	Widnall
King, Calif.	Pryor	Williams, Pa.
Kirwan	Pucinski	Wilson, Bob
Kleppe	Quile	Winn
Kornegay	Rallsback	Wolf
Kupferman	Randall	Wyatt
Kuykendall	Rarick	Wyllie
Kyl	Rees	Yates
Kyros	Reid, Ill.	Young
Laird	Reid, N.Y.	Zablocki
Langen	Relfel	Zion
Latta	Reinecke	Zwach

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—115

Abernethy	Curtis	Halleck
Adair	Daniels	Hansen, Wash.
Adams	de la Garza	Hardy
Addabbo	Delaney	Hays
Annuzio	Dent	Hébert
Barrett	Derwinski	Herlong
Blackburn	Diggs	Horton
Blatnik	Dow	Hosmer
Boggs	Dulski	Howard
Bolling	Dwyer	Hull
Brademas	Ellberg	Jacobs
Brook	Everett	Jones, Mo.
Broomfield	Fino	Karh
Brown, Ohio	Flood	Kelly
Burleson	Ford, Gerald R.	King, N.Y.
Button	Fulton, Tenn.	Kluczynski
Byrne, Pa.	Gallagher	Landrum
Casey	Gardner	Long, La.
Clark	Glaimo	McCarthy
Conable	Gray	Madden
Corman	Green, Pa.	Mathias, Md.
Cowger	Grover	Michel
Cramer	Gubser	Miller, Calif.
	Hagan	Minish

Monagan	Rogers, Fla.	Tenzer
Morgan	Ronan	Utt
Mosher	Rooney, Pa.	Watkins
Multer	Rostenkowski	Watson
Nix	Sandman	Watts
O'Neill, Mass.	St. Onge	Whitten
Pelly	Saylor	Wiggins
Pepper	Smith, Calif.	Williams, Miss.
Pettis	Smith, N.Y.	Willis
Pool	Steed	Wilson
Purcell	Stephens	Charles H.
Quillen	Stratton	Wright
Resnick	Stubblefield	Wyder
Rhodes, Ariz.	Taft	Wyman
Rhodes, Pa.	Teague, Tex.	

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Adair.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Halleck.
 Mr. Pool with Mr. Brock.
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
 Mr. Hagan with Mr. Quillen.
 Mr. Hays with Mr. Sandman.
 Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Broomfield.
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Smith of California.
 Mr. Madden with Mrs. Dwyer.
 Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Cramer.
 Mr. Corman with Mr. Saylor.
 Mr. Dulski with Mr. Pino.
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. Utt.
 Mr. Ronan with Mr. Watkins.
 Mr. Multer with Mr. Button.
 Mr. Daniels with Mr. Horton.
 Mr. Everett with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
 Mr. Watts with Mr. Curtis.
 Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Derwinski.
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Hosmer.
 Mr. Ellberg with Mr. Grover.
 Mr. de la Garza with Mr. King of New York.
 Mr. Herlong with Mr. Conable.
 Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.
 Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Pelly.
 Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Gubser.
 Mr. Burleson with Mr. Watson.
 Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Pettis.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Cowger.
 Mr. Brademas with Mr. Wyman.
 Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Gardner.
 Mr. Adams with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Blackburn.
 Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Mosher.
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Smith of New York.
 Mr. Karth with Mr. Taft.
 Mr. Monagan with Mr. Wiggins.
 Mr. Glafimo with Mr. Wyder.
 Mr. Nix with Mr. Resnick.
 Mr. Dow with Mr. Diggs.
 Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
 Mr. Casey with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Tenzer.
 Mr. Dent with Mr. Wright.
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Willis.
 Mr. Hardy with Mr. Whitten.
 Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hull.
 Mr. Howard with Mr. Steed.
 Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Morgan with Mr. Stephens.
 Mr. Brasco with Mr. Stratton.
 Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Kluczynski.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECRET SERVICE PROTECTION FOR WIDOW AND MINOR CHILDREN OF A FORMER PRESIDENT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13165) to extend the period during which Secret Service protection may be furnished to a widow and minor children of a former President.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13165

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the authority vested in the United States Secret Service by section 3056 of title 18 of the United States Code to protect the person of a widow and minor children of a former President is extended until March 1, 1969, with respect to persons receiving such protection on the date of enactment of this Act.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

This bill was introduced at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury. It would extend until March 1, 1969, the period during which Secret Service protection may be furnished to a widow and minor children of a former President. Unless renewed, existing authority will expire on November 23 of this year.

The Secretary of the Treasury advises that Mrs. Kennedy and her minor children still receive considerable publicity and are sought out and subjected to annoyance by the idly curious, and remain possible targets of the mentally deranged. The Department believes it should be in a position to continue to furnish Secret Service protection to Mrs. Kennedy and her minor children unless she declines such protection.

The history of this protection is as follows:

Within a month after President Kennedy's assassination Congress authorized the Secret Service to protect the person of Mrs. Kennedy and her minor children as she might request, but for not in excess of 2 years from the date of enactment, which was December 11, 1963 (Public Law 88-195). By Public Law 89-186, approved September 15, 1965, Congress extended the period of authorized protection by amending 18 U.S.C. 3056 to provide generally that the Secret Service might "protect the person of a former President and his wife during his lifetime and the person of a widow and minor children of a former President for a period of 4 years after he leaves or dies in office, unless such protection is declined." It is this 4-year period that will expire on November 23 unless extended. The bill before the House will extend the period of protection only with respect to persons receiving such protection on the date of enactment; namely, Mrs. Kennedy and her children. The committee's action was unanimous.

The Secretary of the Treasury re-

quests, and the bill provides, that the duration of this protection be extended until March 1, 1969.

In connection with the 1965 extension the Department estimated that the cost of protecting Mrs. Kennedy and her children would be approximately \$210,000 annually.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that H.R. 13165 be considered favorably by the House.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding to me.

As I understand this bill, it would extend the protection to Mrs. Kennedy for an additional 17 months or until a day certain, March 1, 1969, which is about 17 months from the expiration date which would be 4 years from the time that the original law was passed by this Congress.

Mr. CELLER. The extension will be 15 months.

Mr. HALL. Does the distinguished gentleman know if the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secret Service responsible under him, queried Mrs. Kennedy as to whether or not she desired this additional protection?

Mr. CELLER. She did not initially request this protection. The Secretary of the Treasury and others felt that she should have it for her own protection and the protection of her children and so recommended to her.

Mr. HALL. Is it not true that Mrs. Kennedy turned back some of her secretarial help and expressed the feeling at that time that perhaps she did not need as much protection as was being given to her by a grateful Government?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct. All the secretarial help has been discontinued at her request.

Mr. HALL. It does seem to me, then, Mr. Speaker, it would have been well to have brought to the Members of the House some evidence as to whether this lady desired additional protection or not, in view of this other information wherein she did quite thoughtfully consider the taxpayers' money and her own circumstances in discontinuing her secretarial staff.

Mr. CELLER. It is very natural, I think, for a lady of the sensibilities of Mrs. Kennedy not to accept protection. She is a courageous lady, and she did not ask expressly for this protection. However, the Secretary of the Treasury decided that protection is actually needed and persuaded her to accept his judgment.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

Mr. BOLAND. With respect to the amounts which have been heretofore previously appropriated for office and staff, Mrs. Kennedy did express to the administration and to Members of Congress a desire that the amount which was put in by the Bureau of the Budget this year of around \$30,000 be deleted.

So, on that basis, of course, it was deleted at her request.

There was no formal request by Mrs. Kennedy for protection by the Secret Service. This request was made by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Because I am convinced her children and she needs this protection, I filed a similar bill. My bill would extend protection for 4 years. However, I support the bill as reported.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has been recommended, and is strongly endorsed by the Secretary of the Treasury because of the continued threat of injury to Mrs. Kennedy and her two children from emotionally unstable individuals who by their letters, or their actions, indicate a desire to contact or injure one or more members of the family.

The concern of these people with the Kennedys does not rise out of the family position as private citizens but out of President Kennedy's tenure as Chief Executive of this Nation. The Office of the Presidency attracts the interest of a large number of mentally disturbed persons each year and prompts many to seek to communicate with, or injure, the incumbent. To some degree this interest adheres to members of the Presidents' families. Under the circumstances of President Kennedy's death, such interest has attached to his survivors.

While undoubtedly private detective agencies could provide limited protection for the Kennedy family, none have the resources comparable to those available to the Secret Service through its field offices and its intelligence division. Secret Service agents are especially trained, as no others, to afford such protection. In addition, they have continual and immediate access to classified information on conditions and developments which indicate potential danger, arrangements not available to private concerns.

Unless this Congress extends this protection until March 1, 1969, it will expire on the 22d of this month. I urge that the House take quick action on this bill.

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

Mr. CELLER. Of course I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, as the Congressman from the 12th District of Massachusetts, and therefore the Representative in Congress of Mrs. John F. Kennedy, who resides now in Hyannis Port, I am particularly interested in this legislation.

We all remember with distaste the crowds of publicity hounds and curious thrill seekers who made Mrs. Kennedy's life here in Washington most difficult at a time when she was bravely starting a new life as the widow of our former President. It is my fervent hope that Mrs. Kennedy and her children now can find the privacy and peace which they desire in Hyannis Port, Cape Cod.

The Barnstable police do an excellent job of protecting my new constituents—but they are not equipped, and should not be expected, to provide the round-the-clock protection which the former First Lady and her two children deserve and require.

We all hope that a time will soon come when Mrs. Kennedy and Caroline and John can go about as they please with a minimum of harassment and exposure to danger. Until that time arrives, however, it is our duty and our privilege to afford them such protection as they require and desire. H.R. 13165 deserves our unanimous support, and I urge its passage.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the committee made no attempt to contact Mrs. Kennedy, the beneficiary of this legislation, in order to ascertain whether she wished to continue to be the beneficiary of it.

It seems strange indeed, for this may be in the nature of forcing something upon her that she perhaps does not want.

I am further surprised that the committee held no hearings upon this legislation to provide the Members of the House with any information concerning the so-called protection she has received, the scope of that protection, and all the costs.

Mr. Speaker, these expenditures have cost the taxpayers of this country \$210,000 a year, at a minimum. This has been going on for the period of 4 years, and with the extension provided for in this bill, it will amount to well above \$1 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee how many more extensions are proposed, how many more requests will be made of the taxpayers of this country with respect to the expenditures in connection with this protection?

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

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa that I have no knowledge of any additional sums that will be asked for and expended upon behalf of the wife of the late President Kennedy.

Mr. GROSS. Well, then, this can go on into the indefinite future; is that correct?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I doubt that very much. It is my opinion that as time goes on the idle and the curious will dwindle in number and there will be less and less danger.

I think that the gentleman from Iowa must realize that this distinguished lady becomes a cynosure and is the delight of all observers wherever she goes. We must realize that thousands of people gather around her and there is great fear and intrepidity upon the part of all of us, as she views these thousands of people, not only for herself but for her children. She, also, must feel that fear, if not for herself, then for her children. I think that in the spirit of appreciation toward the gracious lady of this Republic, who has gone through so much suffering, we should extend this modicum of our admiration and gratitude.

Mr. GROSS. I would say to the gentleman from New York that I suspect the children of the widow of a man who has given his life in Vietnam, are also

susceptible to danger from a mentally deranged person. I believe the gentleman predicted the continuance of this legislation, in part, upon the fact that someone being mentally deranged would represent danger to this family. Yes, I suspect that the widow and children of a soldier who fell in defense of his country in Vietnam are also susceptible to this sort of potential danger. Yet, we do not make any such provision for them.

Now, I want to say to the gentleman that I doubt very much that the taxpayers of this country approve the protection of the beneficiary in this case in her travels to the skiing resorts, to the French Riviera, to Cambodia, under the present circumstances.

As I understand it, there is also the use of Air Force planes in addition to the protection that is provided under the terms of this and past legislation. I would like to have had some assurance from the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary that we will not again be confronted with a bill of this nature. Apparently I am not going to receive that.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on the question of the air flight?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. I made some check on this flight, and her flights were in almost every respect paid out of her own pocket, with one exception. I will read from what was released by the Department of Defense:

The former First Lady was invited by the Head of State to visit Cambodia and an Air Force airplane was made available as a courtesy. The one-hour flight from Bangkok, Thailand, to Phnom Penh, Cambodia, was authorized by Secretary of Defense McNamara and all appropriate clearances were obtained.

In other words, this was only a 1-hour flight at the expense of the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that under the circumstances the beneficiary made the present trip because Cambodia today is a sanctuary for the Vietcong, and it may well be that we will have to invade Cambodia in order to win the present conflict. At any rate it is a sanctuary for the Communist Vietcong, who operate from bases in and are being supplied from Cambodia. Some of the heaviest losses occurring to American fighting men have been from Communists who came out of Cambodia and then fled back into that country. Yes; I am surprised that such a trip would have been undertaken at this time to add to the burdens of our taxpayers.

I am not aware, I will say to the gentleman, that the beneficiary in this case is exactly destitute. It is my understanding that she has inherited in one way and another a very substantial fortune, and I wonder how much longer the taxpayers are going to be called upon to provide continuing protection that she herself might well provide.

Mr. CELLER. Would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. CELLER. The question has been

asked, and I asked the question: Why does she not hire private protection? The answer is that private operatives cannot provide the type and quality of services made available by the Secret Service.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I would assume that in this case we protect this woman because she is the widow of a President that we could not protect, and that these children are the children of a President that we could not protect.

Mr. GROSS. That we could not protect?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I believe that we could not and did not protect him. And I would believe it would be a great trauma to the United States if either this woman or these children were killed. The gentleman who is speaking, I am sure, must be approximately as old as I am, and must remember the Hall-Mills murder case, and I would like to remind the gentleman—

Mr. GROSS. If the gentlewoman will pause for just a moment, I suspect that I am approximately a good deal older than the gentlewoman.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I would say to the gentleman that if he has had occasion recently to read concerning that case, on the day those two persons were found beneath that tree in New England, that tree itself was totally destroyed, and removed that very day.

In my opinion that is why Mrs. Kennedy moved away from Georgetown where she wanted to live, because her presence causing so much traffic in that neighborhood, so many people came past that home, that if she had not had protection then and if that property had not had protection, then it would have been destroyed.

I personally feel that it would be the same type of problem for her now. It is my understanding that the Secret Service itself makes the decision as to whether or not she can be properly protected without them.

Personally, it may cost a little money.

I would assume that the people of the United States would prefer not to have this woman and her children unprotected and killed or injured in any way, if that amount of money would protect them. Furthermore, the Secret Service is in a much better position to do this since they have the power of arrest and they have many other powers that a private guard service does not have.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure no one wants anything to happen to this family, and certainly no one wants anything to happen to the children of any other family, be they of high or low degrees. I do not think that is the issue here at all.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the citizens of this country have done very well indeed to provide personal and worldwide protection for Mrs. Kennedy for a period of 4 years and at a cost approaching \$1 million. I reiterate that she is not destitute. I urge that this bill be rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York

[Mr. CELLER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13165.

The question was taken.

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

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

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 302, nays 11, answered "present" 2, not voting 117, as follows:

[Roll No. 365]

YEAS—302

Abbott	Eshleman	Leggett
Albert	Evans, Colo.	Lennon
Anderson, Ill.	Evins, Tenn.	Lipscomb
Anderson,	Fallon	Lloyd
Tenn.	Farbstein	Long, Md.
Andrews, Ala.	Feighan	Lukens
Andrews,	Findley	McClory
N. Dak.	Fisher	McCulloch
Arends	Flynt	McDade
Ashbrook	Foley	McDonald,
Ashley	Ford,	Mich.
Ashmore	William D.	McEwen
Aspinall	Fountain	McFall
Ayres	Fraser	McMillan
Baring	Frelinghuysen	Macdonald,
Bates	Friedel	Mass.
Battin	Fulton, Pa.	MacGregor
Belcher	Fulton, Tenn.	Machen
Bell	Fuqua	Mahon
Bennett	Galifianakis	Mailliard
Berry	Garmatz	Marsh
Betts	Gathings	Martin
Bevill	Gettys	Mathias, Calif.
Biester	Gibbons	Matsunaga
Bingham	Gilbert	May
Blanton	Gonzalez	Mayne
Blatnik	Goodell	Meeds
Boland	Goodling	Meskill
Bolton	Griffiths	Mills
Bray	Gude	Mink
Brinkley	Gurney	Mize
Brooks	Haley	Montgomery
Brozman	Hall	Moore
Brown, Calif.	Halpern	Moorhead
Brown, Mich.	Hamilton	Morris, N. Mex.
Broyhill, N.C.	Hammer	Morse, Mass.
Broyhill, Va.	schmidt	Morton
Burke, Mass.	Hanley	Moss
Burleson	Hanna	Murphy, Ill.
Burton, Calif.	Harrison	Murphy, N.Y.
Burton, Utah	Harsha	Myers
Bush	Harvey	Natcher
Byrnes, Wis.	Hathaway	Nedzi
Cabell	Hawkins	Nichols
Cahill	Hechler, W. Va.	O'Hara, Ill.
Carey	Heckler, Mass.	O'Hara, Mich.
Carter	Helstoski	O'Konski
Casey	Henderson	Olsen
Cederberg	Hicks	O'Neal, Ga.
Celler	Hollifield	Ottinger
Chamberlain	Holland	Passman
Ciancy	Hull	Patman
Clausen,	Hungate	Patten
Don H.	Hunt	Perkins
Clawson, Del.	Hutchinson	Philbin
Cleveland	Ichord	Pickle
Cohelan	Irwin	Pike
Colmer	Jarman	Pirnie
Conte	Joelson	Poage
Conyers	Johnson, Calif.	Poff
Corbett	Johnson, Pa.	Pollock
Culver	Jonas	Price, Ill.
Cunningham	Jones, Ala.	Price, Tex.
Daddario	Jones, N.C.	Pryor
Davis, Ga.	Karsten	Pucinski
Davis, Wis.	Karth	Purcell
Dawson	Kastenmeier	Quile
Dellenback	Kazen	Railsback
Denney	Kee	Randall
Devine	Keith	Rarick
Dingell	King, Calif.	Rees
Dole	Kirwan	Reid, Ill.
Donohue	Kleppe	Reid, N.Y.
Dorn	Kornegay	Reifel
Dowdy	Kupferman	Reinecke
Duncan	Kuykendall	Reuss
Edmondson	Kvl	Riegle
Edwards, Ala.	Kyros	Rivers
Edwards, Calif.	Laird	Roberts
Erlenborn	Langen	Robison
Esch	Latta	Rodino

Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Satterfield
Schadeberg
Scheuer
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk

Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steiger, Wis.
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt

Vanik
Vigorito
Waggoner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Widnall
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wolf
Wyatt
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—11

Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Gross
Hansen, Idaho

McClure
Miller, Ohio
Scherle
Schneebell

Steiger, Ariz.
Teague, Calif.
Winn

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Collier

Dickinson

NOT VOTING—117

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Annunzio
Barrett
Blackburn
Boggs
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Brook
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Clark
Conable
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Curtis
Daniels
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Derwinski
Diggs
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Everett
Fascell
Fino
Flood

Ford, Gerald R.
Gallagher
Gardner
Gialmo
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grover
Gubser
Hagan
Halleck
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Hays
Hébert
Herlong
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Jacobs
Jones, Mo.
Kelly
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Landrum
Long, La.
McCarthy
Madden
Mathias, Md.
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Morgan
Mosher
Multer
Nelsen
Nix
O'Neill, Mass.

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Conable.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Wylder.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. King of New York.

Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Quillen.
 Mr. Fascell with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Sandman.
 Mr. Glaimo with Mr. Wiggins.
 Mr. Ellberg with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.
 Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Utt.
 Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Mosher.
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Fino.
 Mr. Everett with Mr. Nelsen.
 Mr. Steed with Mr. Derwinski.
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Pelly.
 Mr. Stratton with Mr. Button.
 Mr. Stephens with Mr. Watson.
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
 Mr. Daniels with Mr. Pettis.
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Watkins.
 Mr. Brademas with Mr. Taft.
 Mr. Hagan with Mr. Brock.
 Mr. Howard with Mr. Smith of New York.
 Mr. Hardy with Mr. Blackburn.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Cowger.
 Mr. Herlong with Mr. Gardner.
 Mr. Brasco with Mr. Nix.
 Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Barrett.
 Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Minish.
 Mr. Diggs with Mr. Resnick.
 Mr. Madden with Mr. Adams.
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Pool.
 Mr. Hays with Mr. Green of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
 Mr. Ronan with Mr. Multer.
 Mr. Monagan with Mr. Landrum.
 Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stuckey.
 Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Charles H. Willson.
 Mr. Wright with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey.
 Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Tenzer.
 Mr. Watts with Mr. Corman.
 Mr. Dow with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING THE DURATION OF COPYRIGHT PROTECTION IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 114) extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases.

The Clerk read as follows:

S.J. RES. 114

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in any case in which the renewal term of copyright subsisting in any work on the date of approval of this resolution, or the term thereof as extended by Public Law 87-668, or by Public Law 89-142 (or by either or both of said laws), would expire prior to December 31, 1968, such term is hereby continued until December 31, 1968.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 114, if adopted, would extend until December 31, 1968, the renewal terms of existing copyrights which have heretofore been extended to December 31, 1967, by

act of the Congress, or which would otherwise expire during 1968.

Mr. Speaker, the object of the legislation is to prevent 11th-hour lapses of copyright protection, pending completion by the other body of its work on the general copyright revision bill. That bill passed this House in April of this year. It provides a longer term for new copyrights, substituting life plus 50 years for the present 28 plus 28-year term. It also adds 19 years to the terms of existing copyrights. In other words, the House has already passed a bill that would grant a longer extension to existing copyrights than is contemplated by the joint resolution.

Mr. Speaker, two earlier House-initiated measures were enacted at earlier stages of the revision project. The first was enacted in 1962 and extended expiring terms to December 31, 1965. The second was enacted in 1965 and provided an extension that will expire on December 31, 1967, at the end of this year. The Senate informs us that it cannot complete its work on the revision bill during the remaining days of the present session, but is likely to do so early next year.

Enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 114 is therefore needed if the purpose of the earlier extension measures is to be achieved.

Mr. Speaker, this measure passed the other body without dissenting voice on October 19. Committee action was similarly unanimous.

Public hearings were held on the measure before the Copyright Subcommittee, at the request of a Member who desired to be heard in opposition, but neither he nor any other opponent of the bill appeared.

Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable action on this joint resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I endorse wholeheartedly the remarks which have been made by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER].

This legislation is absolutely necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the major revision of the copyright bill, the first in half a century, passed this House on April 11 by a vote of 379 to 29. We anticipated at that time that that bill would have been acted upon in the other body, that a conference committee would have been appointed, and that those conferees would have agreed, and the bill would have been laid on the President's desk before the end of this year.

Because of some unanticipated complexities and difficulties which arose, which made action in the other body a little tardy, it is necessary in order to preserve the equities to extend the renewal copyrights now outstanding until December 31, 1968. This involves altogether some 58,000 copyrights now in their renewal term.

I hasten to add, however, that this extension will not confer upon the holders of those copyrights any greater benefits than those which all other holders of copyrights at their renewal term will

receive from the major revision which finally becomes law, and this we confidently expect to happen early in the next session of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the unanimous consent of the Members on the legislation.

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, this is highly appropriate and necessary legislation. Without it, 58,000 copyrights will fall into the public domain, solely because the Senate has not yet been able to complete its work on the copyright revision bill which this committee reported and which passed the House on April 11.

Among the copyrights that would thus be lost if this measure is not enacted before adjournment of the present session are such valuable old favorites as "Alexander's Ragtime Band," "Down by the Old Mill Stream," "I Wonder Who's Kissing Her Now," "Shine On Harvest Moon," "By the Light of the Silvery Moon," and "Take Me Out to the Ballgame."

As our colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] points out, the joint resolution would grant an additional 1-year interim renewal of the terms of copyrights which would otherwise expire during 1968. Its enactment will permit the Senate to complete its work on the House-passed revision bill during the coming second session of the present 90th Congress. It will be the third of such extensions that have been enacted in recent years in an effort to assure all copyright owners of the benefit of the increased term which is provided by the bill which passed the House and is pending in the Senate.

I urge all Members to support the measure.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Wisconsin for yielding me this time. I want to express my high regard for the gentleman from Wisconsin and also for the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and I hope they will not take unkindly what I say in opposition to this particular legislation.

I would like to begin perhaps by asking the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] as to whether reports were solicited on this bill from the Department of Justice?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. No department reports were solicited other than from the Register of Copyrights. It was the opinion of the committee that the Department of Justice had had ample time to express itself on the general copyright revision, and may I suggest to the gentleman that their views expressed 5½ years ago have changed on this issue.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to point out to my good friend from Wisconsin that in 1962 the Department of Justice expressed strong opposition to this particular kind of legislation, and pointed out that we are essentially conferring addi-

tional rights not contemplated by law, nor sanctioned by practice, and not required by any reasonable protection legitimate of interest of those persons who are the holders of copyrights.

I do not want to burden the body by telling how old many of these copyrights are, or how long they have been in effect, but the fact of the matter is this legislation is special interest legislation. It seeks to extend large numbers of existing copyrights often of hoary and ancient vintage, it would extend copyrights already several times extended, and would prevent realization of the intention of the framers of the original copyright act, that on expiration of the appropriate period that copyrights revert to the public domain. This legislation as a matter of public policy is very bad. This establishes a new copyright policy that is not in conformity with the requirements of the American people that knowledge and information should flow freely, and that those works of literary value and genius should be protected for a reasonable period of time because of the need to stimulate and to encourage the contribution of those who participate in the creative arts.

What is happening here is this Congress is being asked to extend something which would otherwise revert to the public domain. We are being asked, in this legislation before us, to sanctify something as the exclusive property of the copyright holder when, in fact, we should be permitting it to revert to the public domain.

There is no justification for this. The Department of Justice which has always expressed opposition to this kind of legislation was not asked to assert its views. Not a single department downtown has been solicited for its views.

This body passed legislation not long ago which is not going to see the light of day in the other body, and which I rather expect is going to die. But yet we are being called upon to extend copyrights for another year on the most tenuous grounds and on the basis of the most limited hearings which are not now available in printed form. We do not have available to us the information of either the views of the departments or the reasons why the committee is bringing this legislation before us today.

This is the sheerest kind of special interest legislation.

This legislation is not in the furtherance of the public interest and is not dedicated to protecting the rights of even the original holder of the copyright because most of them are long gone—but it is dedicated to their heirs and in many instances the grandsons, grandchildren, and perhaps the great grandchildren and/or their successors and/or assigns—maybe three or four or five generations down the line, affording them continued income from something to which they contributed nothing whatsoever.

This legislation should be voted down because it is not in the public interest and I believe there is no justification for it.

I thank my friend for permitting me this time to make my views plain on this legislation.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the House has already spoken many times on the question that the gentleman from Michigan has raised. The House has decided that existing copyrights should be continued while the Congress was in process of general revision.

With reference to the copyright extensions about which the gentleman from Michigan complains, the House in April passed a bill wherein we said that the terms of such copyrights would be extended up to 19 more years.

So, Mr. Speaker, all we are doing here today is extending those copyrights for 1 additional year until the other body is able to act, and presumably at least in this case, to concur in the House action, approving general revision of the copyright law.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate Joint Resolution 114.

The question was taken.

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

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

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 308, nays 6, not voting 117, as follows:

[Roll No. 366]

YEAS—308

Abbott	Burton, Calif.	Downing
Albert	Burton, Utah	Duncan
Andrews, Ala.	Bush	Edmondson
Andrews,	Byrnes, Wis.	Edwards, Ala.
N. Dak.	Cabell	Edwards, Calif.
Arends	Cahill	Edwards, La.
Ashbrook	Carey	Erlenborn
Ashley	Carter	Esch
Ashmore	Casey	Eshleman
Aspinall	Cederberg	Evans, Colo.
Ayres	Celler	Evins, Tenn.
Baring	Chamberlain	Fallon
Battin	Clancy	Farbstein
Belcher	Clausen,	Fascell
Bell	Don H.	Feighan
Bennett	Clawson, Del.	Findley
Berry	Cleveland	Fisher
Betts	Cohelan	Flynt
Bevill	Collier	Foley
Blester	Colmer	Fountain
Bingham	Conte	Fraser
Blanton	Conyers	Frelinghuysen
Blatnik	Corbett	Friedel
Boland	Culver	Fulton, Pa.
Bow	Cunningham	Fulton, Tenn.
Bray	Daddario	Fuqua
Brinkley	Davis, Ga.	Galifianakis
Brooks	Davis, Wis.	Garmatz
Brotzman	Dawson	Gathings
Brown, Calif.	Dellenback	Gettys
Brown, Mich.	Denney	Gibbons
Broyhill, N.C.	Devine	Gilbert
Broyhill, Va.	Dickinson	Gonzalez
Buchanan	Dole	Goodell
Burke, Fla.	Donohue	Goodling
Burke, Mass.	Dorn	Green, Oreg.
Burleson	Dowdy	Griffiths

Gross	MacGregor	Roush
Gude	Machen	Roybal
Gurney	Mahon	Rumsfeld
Haley	Mailliard	Ruppe
Hall	Marsh	Ryan
Halpern	Martin	St. Germain
Hamilton	Mathias, Calif.	Satterfield
Hammer-	Matsunaga	Schadberg
schmidt	May	Scherle
Hanley	Mayne	Scheuer
Hanna	Meeds	Schneebeli
Hansen, Idaho	Meskill	Schweiker
Hansen, Wash.	Miller, Ohio	Schwengel
Harrison	Mills	Scott
Harsha	Mink	Selden
Harvey	Minshall	Shibley
Hathaway	Mize	Shriver
Hechler, W. Va.	Montgomery	Sikes
Heckler, Mass.	Moore	Sisk
Helstoski	Moorhead	Skubitz
Henderson	Morse, Mass.	Slack
Hicks	Morton	Smith, Iowa
Holifield	Moss	Smith, Okla.
Hull	Murphy, Ill.	Snyder
Hungate	Murphy, N.Y.	Springer
Hunt	Myers	Stafford
Hutchinson	Natcher	Staggers
Ichord	Nichols	Stanton
Irwin	O'Hara, Ill.	Steiger, Ariz.
Jarman	O'Hara, Mich.	Steiger, Wis.
Joelson	O'Konski	Stuckey
Johnson, Calif.	Olsen	Sullivan
Johnson, Pa.	O'Neal, Ga.	Talcott
Jonas	Ottlinger	Taylor
Jones, Ala.	Passman	Teague, Calif.
Jones, N.C.	Patman	Thompson, Ga.
Karsten	Patten	Thomson, Wis.
Kastenmeier	Perkins	Tiernan
Kazen	Philbin	Tuck
Kee	Pickle	Tunney
Keith	Pike	Udall
Kirwan	Pirnie	Ullman
Kleppe	Poage	Van Deerlin
Kornegay	Poff	Vander Jagt
Kupferman	Follock	Vanik
Kuykendall	Price, Ill.	Vigorito
Kyl	Price, Tex.	Waggonner
Kyros	Pryor	Waldie
Laird	Pucinski	Walker
Langen	Quie	Wampler
Latta	Rallsback	Whalen
Leggett	Randall	Whalley
Lennon	Rarick	White
Lippscomb	Rees	Whitener
Lloyd	Reid, Ill.	Widnall
Long, Md.	Reid, N.Y.	Williams, Pa.
Lukens	Reifel	Wilson, Bob
McClary	Reinecke	Winn
McClure	Reuss	Wolff
McCulloch	Riegle	Wyatt
McDade	Rivers	Wylie
McDonald,	Robison	Wyman
Mich.	Rodino	Yates
McEwen	Rogers, Colo.	Young
McFall	Rooney, N.Y.	Zablocki
McMillan	Rosenthal	Zion
Macdonald,	Roth	Zwach
Mass.	Roudebush	

NAYS—6

Dingell	Karth	Nedzi
Ford,	Morris, N. Mex.	Roberts
William D.		

NOT VOTING—117

Abernethy	Derwinski	Kelly
Adair	Diggs	King, Calif.
Adams	Dow	King, N.Y.
Addabbo	Dulski	Kluczynski
Anderson, Ill.	Dwyer	Landrum
Anderson,	Eckhardt	Long, La.
Tenn.	Ellberg	McCarthy
Annunzio	Everett	Madden
Barrett	Fino	Mathias, Md.
Bates	Flood	Michel
Blackburn	Ford, Gerald R.	Miller, Calif.
Boggs	Gallagher	Minish
Bolling	Gardner	Monagan
Bolton	Gialmo	Morgan
Brademas	Gray	Mosher
Brasco	Green, Pa.	Multer
Brock	Grover	Nelsen
Broomfield	Gubser	Nix
Brown, Ohio	Hagan	O'Neill, Mass.
Button	Halleck	Pelly
Byrne, Pa.	Hardy	Pepper
Clark	Hawkins	Pettis
Conable	Hays	Pool
Corman	Hébert	Purcell
Cowger	Herlong	Quillen
Cramer	Holland	Resnick
Curtis	Horton	Rhodes, Ariz.
Daniels	Hosmer	Rhodes, Pa.
de la Garza	Howard	Rogers, Fla.
Delaney	Jacobs	Ronan
Dent	Jones, Mo.	Rooney, Pa.

Rostenkowski	Stubblefield	Whitten
St. Onge	Taft	Wiggins
Sandman	Teague, Tex.	Williams, Miss.
Saylor	Tenzer	Willis
Smith, Calif.	Thompson, N.J.	Wilson,
Smith, N.Y.	Utt	Charles H.
Steed	Watkins	Wright
Stephens	Watson	Wydler
Stratton	Watts	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
 Mr. King of California with Mr. Smith of California.
 Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Bates.
 Mr. Flood with Mrs. Dwyer.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Flno.
 Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Halleck.
 Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Wiggins.
 Mr. Morgan with Mr. Adair.
 Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Taft.
 Mr. Minish with Mr. Derwinski.
 Mr. Monagan with Mr. Wydler.
 Mr. Daniels with Mr. Gubser.
 Mr. Corman with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
 Mr. Hagan with Mr. Utt.
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Hosmer.
 Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mrs. Bolton.
 Mr. St Germain with Mr. Conable.
 Mr. Hardy with Mr. Watkins.
 Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Curtis.
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Broomfield.
 Mr. Steed with Mr. Cramer.
 Mr. Stephens with Mr. Watson.
 Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Grover.
 Mr. Stratton with Mr. Pelly.
 Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Brock.
 Mr. Herlong with Mr. Saylor.
 Mr. Dulski with Mr. Pettis.
 Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
 Mr. Brademas with Mr. Mosher.
 Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Quillen.
 Mr. Adams with Mr. Nelsen.
 Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Button.
 Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Blackburn.
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Cowger.
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Horton.
 Mr. Madden with Mr. King of New York.
 Mr. Brasco with Mr. Gardner.
 Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Sandman.
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Smith of New York.
 Mr. Nix with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey.
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
 Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Multer.
 Mr. Resnick with Mr. Diggs.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Dent.
 Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Dow.
 Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Gallagher.
 Mr. Howard with Mr. Green of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Ellberg with Mr. Hays.
 Mr. Glaimo with Mr. Pool.
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. Everett.
 Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Watts.
 Mr. Whitten with Mr. Ronan.
 Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
 Mr. Willis with Mr. Wright.
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Holland.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION OF HOUSE TRAILERS AND MOBILE DWELLINGS OF MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3982) to amend section 409 of title 37, United States Code, relating to the transportation of house trailers and mobile dwellings of members of the uniformed services, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the text of section 409 of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned and in place of the transportation of baggage and household effects, a member, or in the case of his death his dependent, who would otherwise be entitled to transportation of baggage and household effects under section 406 of this title may transport a house trailer or mobile dwelling within the continental United States, within Alaska, or between the continental United States and Alaska, for use as a residence by one of the following means—

"(1) transport the trailer or dwelling and receive a monetary allowance in place of transportation at a rate to be prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, but not more than 20 cents a mile;

"(2) deliver the trailer or dwelling to an agent of the United States for transportation by the United States or by commercial means; or

"(3) transport the trailer or dwelling by commercial means and be reimbursed by the United States for the expense, including the expenses of necessary tolls, charges, and permit fees.

However, the cost of transportation under clause (2) or the reimbursement under clause (3) may not be more than the cost of transporting the maximum weight allowance of baggage and household effects prescribed by the Secretaries concerned for the member or his dependent. Any payment authorized by this section may be made in advance of the transportation concerned. For the purposes of this section, 'continental United States' means the forty-eight contiguous States and the District of Columbia.

"(b) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, a member who is ordered to make a change of permanent station from a place inside, to a place outside, or from a place outside, to a place inside, the continental United States or Alaska is entitled to both the transportation of his house trailer or mobile dwelling and the transportation of his baggage and household effects within the continental United States or Alaska. However, the total cost of moving his baggage and household effects and his house trailer or mobile dwelling within the continental United States or Alaska may not be more than the cost of transporting the maximum weight allowance of baggage and household effects authorized for the member or his dependent from—

"(1) the old duty station in the continental United States or Alaska to the location to which the house trailer or mobile dwelling is transported at the expense of the United States thence to the port of embarkation through which household goods would have been transported from the old duty station; or

"(2) the greater distance of either—

"(A) the port of debarkation to the new duty station in the continental United States or Alaska; or

"(B) the location where the house trailer

or mobile dwelling was transported at the expense of the United States to the new duty station in the continental United States or Alaska."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?
 Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide a fair cost to servicemen in the shipment of both their trailers and household effects when a member is transferred to another duty station.

Mr. Speaker, an analysis of a sample payment, paid by the U.S. Army Finance Center, indicates that 94 percent of the members of the Armed Forces shipping trailers must pay excess cost averaging \$126.71 per shipment, over and above what they might receive in reimbursement from the Government.

The Committee on Armed Services believes that the proposed legislation will eliminate most of these excess costs now borne by the members of the uniformed services and will extend to them the same privileges as those received by civilian employees of the executive branch of the Government.

The amended bill removes the present limitation of 51 cents a mile payable for transporting trailers when the Government makes arrangements by commercial means. It permits the payment of a dislocation allowance when a trailer is moved at Government expense.

It limits the allowable cost to what it would cost the Government to move the maximum weight allowance of household goods and baggage.

In other words, it would be under no circumstances more than the cost allowed a serviceman to move his household goods on a change of assignment.

The bill permits a member of the armed services to ship both a trailer and household goods and baggage when the member is ordered overseas or returns from overseas, and allows the member to be reimbursed for tolls, charges, and permit fees when the Government does not arrange for transportation by commercial means and the member makes his own personal arrangements.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was approved by the House last year, but was not acted upon by the other body.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman will be good enough to explain to me what is the general policy of moving trailers when a soldier is not being shipped overseas, but may be transferred from one State to another?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. He is allowed up to 51 cents a mile for transportation.

Mr. PUCINSKI. In other words, we do help defray the cost of moving that trailer from one State to another State now, within the continental United States?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. That is correct.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman if there was any testimony presented before the commit-

tee providing figures for comparison between moving costs in mobile units and regular moving expenses?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Yes; there was considerable testimony presented, and considered by the committee, and I have a chart. At this time I would like to ask

unanimous consent to include it in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

COST OF TRANSPORTING HOUSE TRAILERS BETWEEN 12 TYPICAL PAIRS OF POINTS IN THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Route	Mileage	Width not to exceed 10 feet 6 inches						Width not to exceed 12 feet 6 inches					
		Length						Length					
		35 to 50 feet		50 to 55 feet		55 to 60 feet		35 to 50 feet		50 to 55 feet		55 to 60 feet	
		Rate	Total	Rate	Total	Rate	Total	Rate	Total	Rate	Total	Rate	Total
1. Quantico, Va., to Camp Lejeune, N.C.	341	0.61	208.01	0.68	231.88	0.77	262.57	1.07	364.87	1.14	388.74	1.21	412.61
2. Newport, R.I., to Seattle, Wash.	3,044	.57	1,735.08	.64	1,948.16	.73	2,222.12	1.03	3,135.32	1.11	3,378.84	1.18	3,591.92
3. Pendleton, Calif., to Washington, D.C.	2,638	.57	1,503.66	.65	1,714.70	.74	1,952.12	1.03	2,717.14	1.11	2,928.18	1.18	3,112.84
4. Great Lakes, Ill., to Jacksonville, Fla.	1,006	.56	563.36	.64	643.84	.73	734.38	1.02	1,026.12	1.10	1,106.60	1.15	1,156.90
5. Westover AFB, Mass., to McClellan AFB, Calif.	2,970	.57	1,692.90	.65	1,930.50	.74	2,197.80	1.03	3,059.10	1.11	3,296.70	1.18	3,504.60
6. Fort Lawton, Wash., to Fort McPherson, Ga.	2,667	.56	1,493.52	.64	1,706.88	.72	1,920.24	1.03	2,747.01	1.11	2,960.37	1.15	3,067.05
7. Fort Leavenworth, Kans., to San Francisco, Calif.	1,834	.57	1,045.38	.65	1,192.10	.74	1,357.16	1.03	1,889.02	1.11	2,035.74	1.18	2,164.12
8. Fort Bragg, N.C., to Fort Knox, Ky.	602	.57	343.14	.65	391.30	.74	445.48	1.03	620.06	1.11	668.22	1.18	710.36
9. Presidio, Calif., to Washington, D.C.	2,839	.57	1,618.23	.65	1,845.35	.74	2,100.86	1.03	2,924.17	1.11	3,151.29	1.18	3,350.02
10. Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, to Ent AFB, Colo.	1,181	.56	661.36	.64	755.84	.73	862.13	1.02	1,204.62	1.10	1,299.10	1.15	1,358.15
11. Carswell AFB, Tex., to Davis-Monthan AFB, Ariz.	890	.56	498.40	.64	569.60	.73	649.70	1.02	907.80	1.10	979.00	1.15	1,023.50
12. Annapolis, Md., to Macon, Ga.	754	.58	437.32	.65	420.10	.73	550.42	1.03	776.62	1.10	829.40	1.16	874.64
Average.....	1,730	.57	283.00	.65	1,118.00	.74	1,250.00	1.03	1,781.00	1.11	1,919.00	1.17	2,027.00

Note: Rates include line-haul, bridge tolls, road tolls and taxes, turnpike tolls, ferry and tunnel charges, flagging charges (for trailers under 10 feet 6 inches), permits, special hazard liability coverage. Trailers exceeding 10 feet 6 inches, rates also include flagman, and vehicle at 25 cents per mile.

Source: Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service Rate and Cost Analysis, dated Aug. 18, 1967.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. This table shows the average cost of shipping trailers of certain lengths, and trailers of different widths, and from the testimony received it indicates that the costs were considerably in excess of the allowable figure of 51 cents per mile.

Mr. COLLIER. Would the gentleman say, from the figures that he has, that it would be less expensive to move a man from one duty station to another from stationary housing facilities than in the moving of a mobile unit?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman that right now, as far as the Federal regulations, it is less expensive to the Government, in moving owners of mobile homes because of our not providing adequate reimbursement to the serviceman for the cost to him. But in no case have we allowed him funds to provide for the movement of household articles in the trailer which are in excess of what it is now for any other serviceman by any other form of transportation.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the situation that prompted my question is the attitude of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense toward the approval of mobile housing for the military.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COLLIER. Perhaps if Mr. Reed had a less arbitrary attitude toward mobile housing it would be less costly and would recognize the wishes of thousands of men in the service whose preferences are ignored by the Department of Defense.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I would say that the attitude of the Department of Defense has changed quite a bit in the

last few years in regard to this, and there is authority by which the service provides trailer court areas for the installation of mobile homes.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois whether this bill will provide trailer transportation for other than the mobile units that are used for the residences of uniformed servicemen? In other words, would this bill cover the cost of transporting a trailer that is used for vacation purposes, or for hunting purposes, or for some purpose other than that of a residence of a member of the armed services?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. No, it would not and the language of the bill specifically refers to house trailers and mobile dwellings. That is specific in the bill.

Mr. VANIK. We can be assured that this will only apply to mobile dwellings used as places of residence by servicemen?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. That is the language as contained in the bill. In any case, there could only be one allowance, so if he received an allowance by some subterfuge, he would not have it for the movement of his household goods. I think this would preclude moving a hunting or fishing trailer.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would the gentleman agree that there could be a substantial saving to the Government in moving these trailers and savings to the people who have been using mobile homes if the States would take another look at

their prohibitions against moving trailers at night. Many, many States under our Federal highway system have a sun-up to sun-down rule and it does take longer to move these trailers because they cannot move during the night.

It would seem to me that with the trailers being properly illuminated so that they can be identified and together with other safety factors so they could be identified particularly at night, it does not make sense any more to have a prohibition of that kind.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. That is not one of the things that the committee has jurisdiction over and we did not go into it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Since we are going to pay for this, I think we should. I think it is a good bill and I intend to vote for it. We might ask the States to consider taking another look at this prohibition against movement of these trailers during the night hours because those rules have a direct bearing on the cost of moving these trailers.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I understand the gentleman's point.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter which has been received by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services on this particular subject from a serviceman who is familiar with the situation to which we are addressing ourselves here this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the letter to which I referred is as follows:

NOVEMBER 1, 1967.

DEAR SIR: As a serviceman who owns a house trailer I feel that something should be done to help us.

As things are now, personnel who do not have a trailer gets their household goods shipped free according to their rank but servicemen like myself suffer.

Most companies charge \$.90 per mile and

the government only pays \$.51 per mile, this leaves \$.49 out of my own pocket per mile plus if a lead car is required that is an additional \$.25 per mile.

I made a move in July from North Carolina to here at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas and I will have to pay approximately \$850.00 out of my own pocket and with a wife and two children is quite a bit even if it is spread over 6 months time.

A serviceman without a trailer making the same move, gets his household goods shipped free, he also receives a dislocation allowance and travel pay, I only received travel pay which did not cover expenses.

A serviceman who buys a house trailer is making an investment in something he can call his own and when he retires, he has this investment to use when he finally decides to buy a home and live normally.

Servicemen who have house trailers need help and they need help as soon as possible.

I feel sure that you and the other distinguished gentlemen of the Armed Services Committee could bring about a great deal of help for us.

Normally, I don't write to Congressmen but I think by my speaking out a bit that some good may come of it and I feel sure that if all servicemen who own trailers would say the same thing.

Thank you for taking time to listen to a serviceman.

Sfc. JOHN A. TROUTMAN.

ATCHISON, KANS.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I too rise in support of the bill, H.R. 3982, as amended.

As my distinguished committee chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] has stated, the bill as amended, was unanimously reported by the subcommittee and by the full Committee on Armed Services.

This is the third time that this or similar legislation has been reported to the House. In the 88th Congress the House passed similar legislation, only to have the other body of the Congress amend the bill by placing the 51-cent-a-mile limitation on the transportation of trailers by commercial means.

This amount was not and is not sufficient to cover the actual cost of moving a large family-size mobile home. Recognizing this, the House last year in the 89th Congress, again approved legislation removing the limitation of 51 cents a mile—but limiting the allowable costs to what it would cost the Government to move the maximum weight allowance for household goods and baggage. The other body again took no action.

It seems to me only fair to the serviceman owning a mobile home, often at the suggestion of the Government where there is inadequate local family housing, that he should be entitled to a similar cost benefit as one owning or renting a house. It certainly seems to me there should be available to him the same rates for moving his own home as provided for civilian employees of the Government. This bill attempts to provide that equity.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] has explained thoroughly the provisions of the amended bill. Therefore, I will not bore the Members with repetition. I know of no opposition to the proposed legislation and I, too, ask for its unanimous approval by the House.

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

Mr. HALL. I yield to the distinguished member of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of this bill and I would like to be associated with the remarks just made by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, for quite some time our servicemen who own mobile homes have been required to bear a most inequitable burden whenever they are reassigned. The bill before us today will eliminate this inequity and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it. This problem was first brought to my attention when several of my constituents wrote to me about their difficulties under the present law. Following are excerpts from one of these letters which I think fully explains the hardships placed on servicemen who own mobile homes when they are reassigned:

As it stands now, the government pays 51¢ per mile, the military man pays the rest. Our mobile home was moved from North Rose, New York to Quantico, in July, at a cost of 62¢ per mile. The remaining 11¢ came out of our pocket. Our home is really small, we couldn't afford to move a larger one at the rates the haulers charge.

If we lived in permanent housing, on or off the base, and got transferred, the movers would come in, pack everything up and load the van. The service family, besides this, gets \$105 dislocation pay. We trailer owners get nothing.

Thank you for reading this, maybe you can understand why the bill is so important to us.

As this letter indicates, under present law a serviceman who owns a mobile home is denied the dislocation allowance to which other servicemen are entitled. Further, when such a serviceman is transferred overseas he must elect to be reimbursed either for having his household goods transported to the point of debarkation or his mobile home transported to this point: the Government cannot repay him for both expenses.

Under this bill servicemen owning mobile homes would be entitled to dislocation allowances. When such servicemen are sent overseas they would also be entitled to recover the expenses they incur both in moving their household effects to the point of debarkation and their mobile home to a storage location within the United States. However, in no case would they be entitled to reimbursement which would exceed the maximum possible allowance for moving baggage and household effects alone. Thus they are not now being given preferred treatment but rather are being given the same treatment to which all other servicemen are entitled.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois

[Mr. PRICE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 3982, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 319, nays 0, not voting 113, as follows:

[Roll No. 367]

YEAS—319

Abbutt	Edwards, La.	Kyl
Albert	Erlenborn	Kyros
Anderson, Ill.	Esch	Laird
Andrews, Ala.	Eshleman	Langen
Andrews, N. Dak.	Evans, Colo.	Latta
Arends	Fallon	Leggett
Ashbrook	Farbstein	Lennon
Ashley	Fascell	Lipscomb
Ashmore	Feighan	Lloyd
Aspinall	Findley	Long, Md.
Ayres	Fisher	Lukens
Baring	Flynt	McClary
Bates	Foley	McClure
Battin	Ford	McCulloch
Belcher	William D.	McDade
Bell	Fountain	McDonald,
Bennett	Frelinghuysen	Mich.
Berry	Friedel	McEwen
Betts	Fulton, Pa.	McFall
Bevill	Fulton, Tenn.	McMillan
Blester	Fuqua	Maddonald,
Bingham	Gallianakis	Mass.
Blanton	Garmatz	MacGregor
Blatnik	Gathings	Machen
Boland	Gettys	Mahon
Bolton	Gibbons	Mailliard
Bow	Gilbert	Marsh
Bray	Gonzalez	Martin
Brinkley	Goodell	Mathias, Calif.
Brooks	Gooding	Matsunaga
Brotzman	Green, Oreg.	May
Brown, Calif.	Griffiths	Mayne
Brown, Mich.	Gross	Meeds
Broyhill, N.C.	Gude	Meskill
Broyhill, Va.	Gurney	Miller, Ohio
Buchanan	Haley	Mills
Burke, Fla.	Hall	Mink
Burke, Mass.	Halpern	Minshall
Burleson	Hamilton	Mize
Burton, Calif.	Hammer-	Montgomery
Burton, Utah	schmidt	Moore
Bush	Hanna	Moorhead
Byrnes, Wis.	Hansen, Idaho	Morris, N. Mex.
Cabell	Hansen, Wash.	Morse, Mass.
Cahill	Harrison	Morton
Carey	Harsha	Moss
Carter	Harvey	Murphy, Ill.
Casey	Hathaway	Myers
Cederberg	Hawkins	Natcher
Chamberlain	Hechler, W. Va.	Nedzi
Clancy	Heckler, Mass.	Nelsen
Clausen	Helstoski	Nichols
Don H.	Henderson	O'Hara, Ill.
Clawson, Del.	Hicks	O'Hara, Mich.
Cleveland	Holifield	O'Konski
Coleman	Holland	Olsen
Collier	Hosmer	O'Neal, Ga.
Colmer	Hull	Ottinger
Conte	Hungate	Passman
Conyers	Hunt	Patman
Corbett	Hutchinson	Patten
Culver	Ichord	Perkins
Cunningham	Irwin	Phillips
Daddario	Jarman	Pickle
Davis, Ga.	Joelson	Pike
Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Calif.	Pirnie
Dawson	Johnson, Pa.	Poage
Dellenback	Jones, Ala.	Poff
Denney	Jones, N.C.	Pollock
Devine	Karsten	Price, Ill.
Dickinson	Karth	Price, Tex.
Dingell	Kastenmeier	Pryor
Dole	Kazen	Pucinski
Donohue	Kee	Purcell
Dorn	Keith	Quie
Dowdy	King, Calif.	Railsback
Downing	Kirwan	Randall
Duncan	Kleppe	Rarick
Edmondson	Kornegay	Rees
Edwards, Ala.	Kupferman	Reid, Ill.
Edwards, Calif.	Kuykendall	Reid, N.Y.
		Reifel

Reinecke
Reuss
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Satterfield
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden

ShIPLEY
SHRIVER
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stuckey
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman

Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Widnall
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolff
Wyatt
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—113

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Barrett
Blackburn
Boggs
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Celler
Clark
Conable
Corman
Cowan
Cramer
Curtis
Daniels
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Derwinski
Diggs
Dow
Dulski
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Ellberg
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fino

Flood
Ford, Gerald R.
Fraser
Gallagher
Gardner
Gialmo
Gray
Green, Pa.
Grover
Gubser
Hagan
Halleck
Hanley
Hardy
Hays
Hébert
Herlong
Horton
Howard
Jacobs
Jones, Mo.
Kelly
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Landrum
Long, La.
McCarthy
Madden
Mathias, Md.
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Monagan
Morgan
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Nix
O'Neill, Mass.

Pelly
Pepper
Pettis
Pool
Quillen
Resnick
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
St. Onge
Sandman
Saylor
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Taft
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Utt
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whitten
Wiggins
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson
Charles H.
Wright
Wydler

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Annunzio with Mr. King of New York.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Daniels with Mr. Button.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Conable.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Gardner.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Conable.
Mr. Ellberg with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Everett with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Wylder.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Derwinski.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Wylder.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Green of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Dow.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. de la Garza.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Jacobs.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Minish.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Wright.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Stubblefield.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. St. Onge.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Tenzer.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Stratton.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 2734 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13669) to amend section 2734 of title 10 of the United States Code to permit the use of officers of any of the services on claims commissions, and for other purposes; to amend section 2734a of title 10 to authorize the use of Coast Guard appropriations for certain claims settlements arising out of Coast Guard activities; and to amend section 2736 of title 10 to authorize advance payments in cases covered by sections 2733 and 2734 of title 10 and section 715 of title 32 involving military claims.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13669

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first sentence of section 2734 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the words "appoint one or more claims commissions, each composed of one or more commissioned officers of the armed forces under his jurisdiction," and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "appoint one or more claims commissions, each composed of one or more commissioned officers of the armed forces,".

(b) Subsection (a) of section 2734 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "An officer may serve on a claims commission under the jurisdiction of another armed force only with the consent of the Secretary of his department, or his designee, but shall per-

form his duties under regulations of the department appointing the commission."

Sec. 2. Subsection (a) of section 2736 of title 10, is amended by striking the words "as the result of an accident involving an aircraft or missile under the control of that department" and inserting in lieu thereof "under circumstances"; and the caption of section 2736 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2736. Property loss; personal injury or death: advance payment."

and the chapter analysis of chapter 163 of title 10 of the United States Code is amended by striking

"2736. Property loss; personal injury or death: incident to aircraft or missile operation."

and inserting

"2736. Property loss; personal injury or death: advance payment."

Sec. 3. Section 2734(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(3) It did not arise from action by an enemy or result directly or indirectly from an act of the armed forces of the United States in combat, except that a claim may be allowed if it arises from an accident or malfunction incident to the operation of an aircraft of the armed forces of the United States, including its airborne ordnance, indirectly related to combat, and occurring while preparing for, going to, or returning from a combat mission."

Sec. 4. (a) Subsection (c) of section 2734a of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) A reimbursement or payment under this section shall be made by the Secretary of Defense out of appropriations for that purpose except that payment of claims against the Coast Guard arising while it is operating as a service of the Department of Transportation shall be made out of the appropriations for the operating expenses of the Coast Guard. The appropriations referred to in this subsection may be used to buy foreign currencies required for the reimbursement or payment."

(b) Section 2734a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by the addition of the following subsection:

"(d) Upon the request of the Secretary of Transportation or his designee, any payments made relating to claims arising from the activities of the Coast Guard and covered by subsection (a) may be reimbursed or paid to the foreign country concerned by the authorized representative of the Department of Defense out of the appropriation for claims of the Department of Defense, subject to reimbursement from the Department of Transportation."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13669 amends three sections of chapter 163, "Military Claims," of title 10, United States Code, and has the purpose of improving claims administration and settlement under those sections.

Section 2734 of title 10 is amended to provide that a military claims commission of one armed force may include officers of another branch of the Armed Forces. That section is further amended to provide that the Secretary concerned may allow a claim arising from an accident incident to the operation of a U.S.

aircraft indirectly relating to combat when the accident occurred while preparing for, going to, or returning from a combat mission.

Section 2734a of title 10 is amended to authorize the use of Coast Guard funds to reimburse or pay a foreign country under the claims settlement provision of an international agreement when the Coast Guard is a service in the Department of Transportation. That section is further amended to provide for implementation of the single service administration of claims in foreign countries by providing that the Secretary of Defense or his representative, at the request of the Secretary of Transportation, may make payments of claims relating to Coast Guard activities subject to reimbursement from the Department of Transportation.

Section 2736 of title 10 is amended by deleting the present restriction relating to aircraft and missiles of the section concerning advance payment where claims are cognizable under sections 2733 and 2734 of title 10 and section 715 of title 32, so as to make the provisions of the section applicable generally to cases where claims are allowable under those sections.

H.R. 13669 was introduced to provide for amendments to sections 2734 and 2734a of title 10 which concern foreign claims arising from activities of the U.S. Armed Forces. Section 2734, which is known as the Foreign Claims Act, presently provides for the settlement of claims by inhabitants of foreign countries resulting from activities of the Armed Forces. Subsection (a) of that act provides for the appointment of claims commissions composed of one or more commissioned officers by the Secretary concerned. Since the language presently provides that the commissioned officers appointed must be "under his jurisdiction," it has been impossible for a Secretary, or his designee, to appoint a commissioned officer of another armed force to a claims commission even though the nature of claims being considered by the commission might justify the use of a commissioned officer of that particular service. It is logical that the section be amended to permit such appointment. The bill provides for two amendments which will accomplish this purpose. The first is to delete the words requiring that the Secretary appoint only commissioned officers "under his jurisdiction" so that he can appoint officers of other Armed Forces. The second amendment is to add a new sentence to subsection (a) to provide that such an appointment requires the consent of the Secretary with jurisdiction over the officer, and it is further made clear that once appointed, the officer of the other service shall perform his duties under the regulations of the department appointing the commission. The opening sentence of section 2734 states that its provisions are intended "to promote and maintain foreign relations through the prompt settlement of meritorious claims." It was obvious that the unavoidable delay in payment of claims which, of course, must await full adjudication, could in some cases all but eliminate the desired effect

of promoting friendly relations with the nationals and countries affected. It was thought that a provision for a limited advance payment would counter such adverse effects. In its report on an earlier bill, the Department of the Air Force pointed out that section 2736 of title 10 presently provides emergency payments not in excess of \$1,000 in cases of aircraft and missile accidents.

Section 2736 provides for the advance payment in cases where a claim would be cognizable under section 2733—"Military Claims"—and section 2734—"Foreign Claims"—of title 10, and also under section 715 of title 32, which is a section patterned after the "Military Claims" section of title 10 and concerns claims arising out of National Guard activity. The Air Force recommended that the present provision now limiting emergency payments to aircraft and missile accidents be made applicable to all claims provided for in those three sections. In this connection, the Air Force pointed out that claims may arise from explosions, motor vehicle accidents, and other accidental causes which also produce an urgent need for financial assistance on the part of the injured person.

A payment as provided for in section 2736, that is, up to \$1,000, would provide authority to make meaningful advance payments in emergencies in order to alleviate hardship.

Section 2734 presently bars any claim resulting "directly or indirectly" from an act of the Armed Forces of the United States in combat. The amendment to this section is intended to meet the problem concerning possible claims arising from aircraft operations where the accident might be far removed from a combat area and still technically be "indirectly" related to combat. The Air Force, in behalf of the Department of Defense, has stated that certain circumstances exist which now justify a limited exception and suggested the necessary language to accomplish this purpose. This is the language contained in section 3 of H.R. 13669. The exception is to provide that claims may be allowed if they arise from an accident or malfunction incident to an operation of an aircraft of the Armed Forces of the United States, including its airborne ordnance indirectly related to combat occurring while preparing for, going to, or returning from a combat mission. The unique mobility of aircraft is such that the preparation for a combat mission usually occurs at great distances from the target area.

As a result, such a mission may involve the overflight of large areas of friendly countries in going to and returning from the target. Damage, loss, injury, or death to persons in such countries has resulted from accidents or malfunctions of aircraft or air ordnance in preparing for, going to, or returning from a combat mission. For example, an aircraft under such circumstances may crash or it may accidentally release bombs or there may be a premature firing of rockets. The Air Force states that it believes that clear statutory authority to pay such indirect combat claims is presently desirable. The committee agrees that this discretionary authority should be made available to the

military. The committee further notes that this amendment can be made without otherwise deviating from existing claims concepts and the traditional law relating to claims arising as the result of combat activity.

Section 4 of the bill concerning section 2734a relates to claims settled pursuant to international agreements of the NATO Status of Forces type. Section 4 of H.R. 13669 authorizes the use of Coast Guard funds for the reimbursement or payment of claims involving the Coast Guard when it is operating as a service in the Department of Transportation. There is now no authority for the payment of claims by the Department of Defense arising under international agreements which involve the Coast Guard. Section 2734 now authorizes only the Secretary of Defense to make reimbursements or payment even though the Coast Guard is an "armed force" and covered under international agreements.

As a result, since the Coast Guard operates in some foreign countries as a service in the Department of Transportation and claims caused by its personnel have been settled by foreign governments in accordance with those agreements, funding problems have been encountered in paying the bills relating to the Coast Guard which have been submitted to the military departments representing the Department of Defense. The language contained in subsection (a) of section 4 provides the necessary authority for the payment of such claims. Subsection (b) of section 4 contains language recommended by the Department of Defense which provides for a cross-servicing provision which is similar to that presently contained in section 2734(f) of title 10. The effect of this language recommended by the Air Force is to expand the single service responsibility which may be exercised by one of the military departments in all foreign countries where the international claims agreements are in effect so as to include the Coast Guard when requested by the Secretary of Transportation. The amendment provides that upon the request of the Secretary of Transportation, or his designee, any payments made relating to claims arising from the activities of the Coast Guard and covered by subsection (a) of section 2734a may be reimbursed or paid to the foreign country concerned by the authorized representative of the Department of Defense out of the appropriation for claims of the Department of Defense, subject to reimbursement from the Department of Transportation. The committee agreed that this is a logical addition and further notes that it is an amendment which is consistent with the first amendment included in section 4 of the bill.

Each of the amendments proposed in this bill is needed to meet a specific problem in the administration and settlement of military claims. Since sections 2734 and 2734a of title 10 provide authority for the consideration and settlement of claims arising in foreign areas as a result of U.S. military activity, the improvement of procedures for the settlement of such claims are clearly in the interest of the United States. The expe-

ditionous and fair handling of claims in such areas will do much to better relations between the United States and the countries concerned.

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

Mr. ASHMORE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does this bill make any change in the administrative settlement of claims other than those that the gentleman has related? I have in mind fire losses and that sort of thing. Will this change the limits of settlements in cases of that kind?

Mr. ASHMORE. No; there would be no change whatsoever.

Mr. GROSS. Would there be any limitation under section 4? I notice this language in the report:

In claims under Section 2734 where the claim is found to exceed \$15,000, it must be certified to Congress for payment—

Mr. ASHMORE. It does not change that provision.

Mr. GROSS. That is present law?

Mr. ASHMORE. Yes; and it remains the law if this bill does or does not pass.

Mr. GROSS. It will not change the limitations that we ordinarily find on the Private Calendar in the matter of administrative settlements?

Mr. ASHMORE. No, sir.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MESKILL].

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, this bill (H.R. 13669) represents one result of the continuing effort of the Judiciary Claims Subcommittee to improve the administration of the claims laws of the United States. The legislation stems from an investigation by members of the Judiciary Committee of claims settlement activities in foreign countries.

Under the bill, section 2734 of title 10 is amended to provide that a military claims commission of one armed force in a foreign country may include officers of another branch of the Armed Forces.

Claims administration in overseas areas has been improved by the use of single service responsibility in certain countries. Section 2734 provides for this type of responsibility in subsection (f), and this means that one of the military departments has full authority for claims settlement regardless of whether the claim in a particular country arose as the result of the activity of that department or as the result of the activities of the Armed Forces personnel of another department. However, a situation may arise where the Army is responsible for the settlement of claims in a foreign country and a significant proportion of the claims being asserted are attributable to Air Force activity. It would be logical to provide for the appointment of an Air Force officer as a member of the claims commission which would be called upon to consider the claims, but this is not possible under the present law. It is, therefore, logical that the section be amended to permit such appointment, and the bill provides for two amendments which will accomplish this purpose.

The next amendment to section 2734 is

to authorize settlement of a claim arising from an accident incident to the operation of a U.S. aircraft not directly related to combat activities. Combat missions often involve overflight of portions of friendly countries. Damage, loss, injury, or death to persons in such countries has resulted from accidents or malfunctions of aircraft or air ordnance in preparing for, going to, or returning from a combat mission. Presently the statute bars claims resulting directly or indirectly "from an act of the Armed Forces of the United States in combat." This bill will permit settlement of such claims.

The bill also will permit meaningful limited advance payments of foreign claims in emergencies in order to alleviate hardship. This provision was included because the claims subcommittee was advised of difficulties faced by our military authorities in situations in foreign countries when payment had to await final settlement. It was obvious that the unavoidable delay in payment of some claims which, of course, must await full adjudication, could in some cases all but eliminate the desired effect of promoting friendly relations with the nationals and countries affected. Provision for a limited advance payment will counter such adverse effects.

Finally, under existing provisions of law, there is no authority for the payment of claims arising under international agreements which involve the Coast Guard. This bill authorizes the use of Coast Guard funds for the reimbursement or payment of Coast Guard claims when it is operating as a service in the Department of Transportation.

I recommend passage of the bill.

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

Mr. MESKILL. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I would simply like to ask if under paragraph (d) of section 4 of the bill H.R. 13669, there is, in fact, any limitation in the existing law or the intended one rendered hereby, that would place an upper limit on claims paid to a foreign country by the authorized representative of the Department of Defense out of appropriations for claims of the Department of Defense subject to reimbursement by the Department of Transportation. It appears to me that there is no limitation in this section of the new law.

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

Mr. MESKILL. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ASHMORE. The amendments to this bill do not affect that part of the law. They are controlled by international agreements, I understand.

Mr. HALL. If the distinguished gentleman will yield further, I would ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, does that international agreement remain the same?

Mr. ASHMORE. Yes, it does.

Mr. HALL. Or the limitation of payments is the same as in other existing U.S. law?

Mr. ASHMORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for

his answer and I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATTON). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 13669.

The question was taken.

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

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

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 318, nays 0, not voting 114, as follows:

[Roll No. 368]

YEAS—318

Albert	Downing	Jones, N.C.
Anderson, Ill.	Duncan	Karsten
Andrews, Ala.	Eckhardt	Karth
Andrews,	Edmondson	Kastenmeier
N. Dak.	Edwards, Ala.	Kazen
Arends	Edwards, Calif.	Kee
Ashbrook	Edwards, La.	Keith
Ashley	Erlenborn	King, Calif.
Ashmore	Esch	Kirwan
Aspinall	Eshleman	Kleppe
Ayres	Evans, Colo.	Kornegay
Baring	Farbstein	Kupferman
Bates	Fascell	Kuykendall
Battin	Feighan	Kyl
Belcher	Findley	Kyros
Bell	Fisher	Laird
Bennett	Flynt	Langen
Berry	Foley	Latta
Betts	Ford,	Leggett
Bevill	William D.	Lennon
Blester	Fountain	Lipscomb
Bingham	Fraser	Lloyd
Blanton	Frelinghuysen	Long, Md.
Blatnik	Friedel	Lukens
Boland	Fulton, Pa.	McClary
Bolton	Fulton, Tenn.	McClure
Bow	Fuqua	McCulloch
Bray	Gallifanakis	McDade
Brinkley	Garmatz	McDonald,
Brooks	Gathings	Mich.
Brotzman	Gettys	McEwen
Brown, Calif.	Gibbons	McFall
Brown, Mich.	Gilbert	McMillan
Broyhill, N.C.	Gonzalez	MacGregor
Broyhill, Va.	Goodell	Machen
Buchanan	Gooding	Mahon
Burke, Fla.	Green, Oreg.	Mailliard
Burke, Mass.	Griffiths	Marsh
Burleson	Gross	Martin
Burton, Calif.	Gude	Mathias, Calif.
Burton, Utah	Gurney	Matsunaga
Bush	Haley	May
Byrnes, Wis.	Hall	Mayne
Cabell	Halpern	Meeds
Cahill	Hamilton	Meskill
Carey	Hammer	Miller, Ohio
Carter	schmidt	Mills
Casey	Hanley	Mink
Cederberg	Hanna	Minshall
Chamberlain	Hansen, Idaho	Mize
Clancy	Hansen, Wash.	Montgomery
Clausen,	Harrison	Moore
Don H.	Harsha	Moorhead
Clawson, Del.	Harvey	Morris, N. Mex.
Cleveland	Hathaway	Morse, Mass.
Cohelan	Hawkins	Morton
Collier	Hechler, W. Va.	Moss
Colmer	Heckler, Mass.	Murphy, Ill.
Conte	Helstoski	Myers
Conyers	Henderson	Natcher
Corbett	Hicks	Nedzi
Culver	Hollifield	Nelsen
Cunningham	Holland	Nichols
Daddario	Hosmer	O'Hara, Ill.
Davis, Ga.	Hull	O'Hara, Mich.
Davis, Wis.	Hungate	O'Konski
Dawson	Hunt	Olsen
Dellenback	Hutchinson	O'Neal, Ga.
Denney	Ichord	Ottiger
Devine	Irwin	Passman
Dickinson	Jarman	Patman
Dingell	Joelson	Patten
Dole	Johnson, Calif.	Perkins
Donohue	Johnson, Pa.	Philbin
Dorn	Jonas	Pickle
Dowdy	Jones, Ala.	Pike

Pirnie	Ryan	Thomson, Wis.
Poage	St Germain	Tiernan
Poff	Schadeberg	Tuck
Pollock	Scherle	Tunney
Price, Ill.	Scheuer	Udall
Price, Tex.	Schneebell	Ullman
Pryor	Schweiker	Van Deerlin
Pucinski	Schwengel	Vander Jagt
Quile	Scott	Vanik
Rallsback	Selden	Vigorito
Randall	Shipley	Waggonner
Rarick	Shriver	Waldie
Rees	Sikes	Walker
Reid, Ill.	Sisk	Wampler
Reid, N.Y.	Skubitz	Whalen
Reifel	Slack	Whalley
Reinecke	Smith, Iowa	White
Reuss	Smith, Okla.	Whitener
Riegle	Snyder	Widnall
Rivers	Springer	Williams, Pa.
Roberts	Stafford	Wilson, Bob
Robison	Staggers	Winn
Rodino	Stanton	Wolf
Rogers, Colo.	Steiger, Ariz.	Wyatt
Rooney, N.Y.	Steiger, Wis.	Wylie
Rosenthal	Stuckey	Wyman
Roth	Sullivan	Yates
Roudebush	Talcott	Young
Roush	Taylor	Zablocki
Roybal	Teague, Calif.	Zion
Rumsfeld	Thompson, Ga.	Zwach
Ruppe	Thompson, N.J.	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—114

Abblitt	Fino	O'Neill, Mass.
Abernethy	Flood	Pelly
Adair	Ford, Gerald R.	Pepper
Adams	Gallagher	Pettis
Addabbo	Gardner	Pool
Anderson, Tenn.	Gialmo	Purcell
Annunzio	Gray	Quillen
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Resnick
Blackburn	Grover	Rhodes, Ariz.
Boggs	Gubser	Rhodes, Pa.
Bolling	Hagan	Rogers, Fla.
Brademas	Halleck	Ronan
Brasco	Hardy	Rooney, Pa.
Brock	Hays	Rostenkowski
Broomfield	Hébert	St. Onge
Brown, Ohio	Herlong	Sandman
Button	Horton	Satterfield
Byrne, Pa.	Howard	Saylor
Celler	Jacobs	Smith, Calif.
Clark	Jones, Mo.	Smith, N.Y.
Conable	Kelly	Steed
Corman	King, N.Y.	Stephens
Cowger	Kluczynski	Stratton
Cramer	Landrum	Stubblefield
Curtis	Long, La.	Taft
Daniels	McCarthy	Teague, Tex.
de la Garza	Macdonald,	Tenzer
Delaney	Mass.	Utt
Dent	Madden	Watkins
Derwinski	Mathias, Md.	Watson
Diggs	Michel	Watts
Dow	Miller, Calif.	Whitten
Dulski	Minish	Wiggins
Dwyer	Monagan	Williams, Miss.
Ellberg	Morgan	Willis
Everett	Mosher	Wilson
Evens, Tenn.	Multer	Charles H.
Fallon	Murphy, N.Y.	Wright
	Nix	Wylder

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Horton.
Mrs. Kelly with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Daniels with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Everett with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Taft.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Wylder.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Button.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Conable.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Brook.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Gardner.
Mr. Abblitt with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Dow.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Jacobs.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Barrett.
Mr. Minish with Mr. Pepper.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Morgan.
Mr. Multer with Mr. St. Onge.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Wright.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Monagan with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Brasco.

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Delaney.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Ellberg.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Pool.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stratton.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Tenzer.
Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Stubblefield.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING HIGHWAY SAFETY ACT OF 1966

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1552) to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1966, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1552

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 404 of the Highway Safety Act (23 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) is amended by—

(1) striking subsection (a) (1) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) (1) There is established in the Department of Transportation a National Highway Safety Advisory Committee, composed of the Secretary or an officer of the Department appointed by him, who shall be Chairman, the Federal Highway Administrator, and thirty-five members appointed by the President, no more than four of whom shall be Federal officers or employees. The appointed members, having due regard for the purposes of this chapter, shall be selected from among representatives of various State and local governments, including State legislatures, of public and private interests contributing to, affected by, or concerned with highway safety, including the national organizations of passenger car, bus, and truck owners, and of other public and private agencies, organizations, or groups demonstrating an active interest in highway safety, as well as research scientists and other individuals who are expert in this field."

(2) striking subsection (a) (2) (A) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) (A) Each member appointed by the President shall hold office for a term of three years, except that (i) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (ii) the terms of office of members first taking office after the date of enactment of this section shall expire as follows: Twelve at the end of one year after the date such committee members are appointed by the President, twelve at the end of two years after the date such committee members are appointed by the President, and eleven at the end of three years after the date such committee members are appointed, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, and (iii) the term of any member shall be extended until the date on which the successor's appointment is effective. None of the members appointed by the President who has served a three-year term, other than Federal officers or employees, shall be eligible for reappointment within one year following the end of his preceding term."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is reported unanimously by the House Committee on Public Works and is legislation to increase the size of the National Highway Safety Advisory Committee which was set up pursuant to the Highway Safety Act of 1966, and also to revise in a technical way the limitation on the first-year term, to make it possible to extend the term of the members who were appointed for the short 1-year period to this committee.

As a matter of fact, the committee was not composed until April 1967, and under the terms of the 1966 act the terms of these initial 1-year members would expire in September of this year unless this bill is passed.

Mr. Speaker, this bill makes it possible to continue to have available the expertise of these members of the committee, and in addition thereto to secure the additional representation on the committee of highway user groups that are presently not adequately represented on the committee.

I think the language of the bill is intended primarily to make it a matter of congressional mandate that organizations like the American Automobile Association and the American Truckers Association and other heavy users of the highways have representation on this advisory committee.

I do not think any additional authorization of funds is involved in this bill.

The bill itself provides merely for the payment of expenses and a per diem to the members of the committee. It precludes the payment of such a per diem or expenses to governmental personnel who are part of this committee.

The Committee on Public Works felt that this was a bill with merit. It felt

that the highway casualty and accident problem that we have today is a major problem that demanded the best brains we could get as advisers to the Secretary of Transportation, and it felt that it was a mistake not to have a congressional mandate requiring representation on this committee of the heavy users of the highway.

Mr. Speaker, we feel that this is a bill that will be passed overwhelmingly by the House.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I simply rise to indicate that the minority's position is similar to that which was explained by the gentleman from Oklahoma. It was noncontroversial before the committee. Therefore, we urge its passage.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I supported the National Highway Safety Advisory Committee when it was created by Congress. But I am opposed to this bill because I can think of no reason in the world why this commission should be increased from the present 29 members to 35, with an additional expenditure—and I want to be corrected if I am wrong—I assume they will be paid as the other members of the commission are paid. So there must be an increased cost either by way of travel or by way of compensation for the members of this expanded advisory commission.

Can anyone tell me why there should be a 35-member commission? I am sure it is unwieldy with 29.

In answer to the gentleman from Oklahoma and his suggestion that the additional six members are requested for the purpose of representing other segments of the economy or society, I would say to him that there is no reason why the vacancies presently existing on the 29-member commission cannot be filled by persons representing those national interests that are not now represented.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman has a good point. I would agree that it would be possible to place representatives of the automobile operators, the American Automobile Association and the ATA, on this Commission when we get expired terms as they develop. But I think there is only one way to be sure that representatives of those organizations go on, and that is for Congress to say that there shall be representation of them on this Commission. This is what we are doing with this bill. We are requiring that these groups and these organizations be represented on the Commission, and we are providing that the additional members shall be appointed from groups of this sort.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but you are adding another six members to a commission that already totals 29. I cannot recall another commission of such numbers in the Federal Government.

If the gentleman had brought a bill to

the floor under a rule so that we could offer amendments to it, I would not be opposed to specifying the additional groups that ought to be represented. But I cannot go along with an increase of six members on what I believe is already an unwieldy and unnecessarily expensive commission. That is my opposition to this bill.

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

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. The feeling of the Public Works Committee about the rule was that with a unanimous committee, with feeling on both sides of the aisle of the committee unanimous, we felt this was a desirable thing, that it was assertion of a congressional feeling that we should have representation of our truck operators and automobile operators on this committee, which, incidentally, is required by the bill to meet only once a year. It involves a cost that will measure in hundreds of dollars—or possibly of thousands of dollars with the addition of these members, and the committee thought this was a matter that could be handled by suspension, without any usurpation of prerogatives of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Unanimity is fine, but not in this case. I can see absolutely no reason for a 35-member commission, and the additional expenses. Why set a precedent of 35 members on a commission simply to accommodate a situation that President Johnson ought to have taken care of when he appointed the 29?

I hope the House defeats this bill, and I suggest that then the Public Works Committee return with a bill that continues the limitation of 29 members and thereby saves the taxpayers at least a little money.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to know if this expanded Commission on Highway Safety will have anything to do with the trust fund or with the interstate and defense highway system that the executive branch has recently suggested be placed in abeyance as an economy measure, even though the funds come from gasoline taxes supposedly placed in a trust fund, which would then have no effect on the General Treasury.

If so, I submit we cannot have it both ways.

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

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this is not involved in any way with the highway trust fund financing, that this is an advisory committee which is set up to be financed entirely out of the appropriations for the Department of Transportation.

Mr. HALL. But it does deal with at least advice and consent to the Bureau of Roads of the Department of Transportation concerning the construction and at least labeling or marking, if we may say that, of the highways. Is that not correct?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Its principal mission, if the gentleman will yield further, is to make recommendations, to advance ideas, to improve safety practices on our highways, both in terms of construction and in terms of the practices that are followed for improvement of safety.

Mr. HALL. Certainly. Part of this has to do with gradient angles, curves, arc on which the roads curve, signing, turn-arounds, underpasses and overpasses, dual lanes, and all the safety factors, on Federal interstate and defense highways which have to do with moving on land from one coast to another.

I suggest and submit again to the gentleman and Members of the House, we really are asking to have it both ways, when that construction is placed in abeyance—as badly as we are liable to need these roads—as an economy measure, when they are based supposedly on a trust fund gained from gasoline taxes paid by users of the roads, and not the General Treasury.

Therefore, I think it is more important to be economical and not add the additional per diem or the additional members.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 1552, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 252, nays 65, not voting 115, as follows:

[Roll No. 369]
YEAS—252

Adams	Cleveland	Gettys
Albert	Cohelan	Gibbons
Anderson, Ill.	Colmer	Gilbert
Andrews, Ala.	Conte	Gonzalez
Andrews,	Conyers	Goodell
N. Dak.	Corbett	Green, Oreg.
Arends	Culver	Griffiths
Ashley	Daddario	Gude
Aspinall	Davis, Ga.	Halpern
Ayres	Dawson	Hamilton
Baring	Dellenback	Hammer-
Bates	Dingell	schmidt
Battin	Donohue	Hanley
Belcher	Dorn	Hanna
Bell	Dowdy	Hansen, Idaho
Bennett	Downing	Hansen, Wash.
Bevill	Eckhardt	Harsha
Blester	Edmondson	Harvey
Bingham	Edwards, Ala.	Hathaway
Blanton	Edwards, La.	Hawkins
Blatnik	Erlenborn	Hechler, W. Va.
Brinkley	Esch	Heckler, Mass.
Brooks	Eshleman	Helstoski
Brotzman	Evans, Colo.	Henderson
Brown, Calif.	Farbstein	Holifield
Brown, Mich.	Fascell	Holland
Broyhill, N.C.	Feighan	Hosmer
Broyhill, Va.	Findley	Hull
Buchanan	Fisher	Hungate
Burke, Mass.	Flynt	Ichord
Burleson	Foley	Irwin
Burton, Calif.	Ford	Jarman
Burton, Utah	William D.	Jeolson
Bush	Fountain	Johnson, Calif.
Cabell	Fraser	Johnson, Pa.
Cahill	Frelinghuysen	Jonas
Carey	Friedel	Jones, Ala.
Carter	Fulton, Pa.	Jones, N.C.
Casey	Fulton, Tenn.	Karsten
Chamberlain	Fuqua	Karth
Clausen	Galifianakis	Kastenmeier
Don H.	Gathings	Kazen

Kee	O'Hara, Ill.	Schwengel
Keith	O'Hara, Mich.	Seiden
King, Calif.	Olsen	Shibley
Kirwan	O'Neal, Ga.	Shriver
Kornegay	Passman	Sikes
Kupferman	Patman	Sisk
Kyros	Patten	Slack
Latta	Perkins	Smith, Iowa
Leggett	Philbin	Smith, Okla.
Lennon	Pickle	Snyder
Long, Md.	Pike	Springer
Lukens	Pirnie	Stafford
McClary	Poage	Staggers
McClure	Poff	Stuckey
McDade	Pollock	Sullivan
McDonald,	Price, Ill.	Talcott
Mich.	Pryor	Taylor
McFall	Pucinski	Thompson, N.J.
McMillan	Purcell	Tieman
Macdonald,	Quile	Tuck
Mass.	Randall	Tunney
MacGregor	Rees	Udall
Machen	Reid, N.Y.	Ullman
Mahon	Reinecke	Van Deerlin
Marsh	Reuss	Vanik
Mathias, Calif.	Rhodes, Ariz.	Vigorito
Matsunaga	Riegle	Waggonner
Meeds	Rivers	Waldie
Meskill	Roberts	Wampler
Mills	Robison	Whalen
Mink	Rodino	Whalley
Minshall	Rogers, Colo.	White
Mize	Rooney, N.Y.	Whitener
Montgomery	Rosen, N.Y.	Widnall
Moore	Roth	Williams, Pa.
Moorhead	Roush	Wilson, Bob
Morris, N. Mex.	Roybal	Wolff
Morse, Mass.	Rumsfeld	Wyatt
Morton	Ruppe	Wyman
Moss	Ryan	Yates
Murphy, Ill.	St Germain	Young
Natcher	Scheuer	Zablocki
Nedzi	Schneebell	Zion
Nichols	Schweiker	Zwack

NAYS—65

Ashbrook	Haley	Ottenger
Ashmore	Hall	Price, Tex.
Berry	Harrison	Railsback
Betts	Hicks	Rarick
Bolton	Hunt	Reid, Ill.
Bow	Hutchinson	Reifel
Bray	Kleppe	Roudebush
Burke, Fla.	Kuykendall	Schadeberg
Byrnes, Wis.	Kyl	Scherle
Cederberg	Laird	Scott
Clancy	Langen	Skubitz
Clawson, Del.	Lipscomb	Stanton
Collier	Lloyd	Steiger, Ariz.
Cunningham	McCulloch	Steiger, Wis.
Davis, Wis.	Mailliard	Teague, Calif.
Denney	Martin	Thompson, Ga.
Devine	May	Thomson, Wis.
Dickinson	Mayne	Vander Jagt
Dole	Miller, Ohio	Walker
Duncan	Myers	Winn
Goodling	Nelsen	Wylie
Gross	O'Konski	

NOT VOTING—115

Abbt	Edwards, Calif.	Mathias, Md.
Abernethy	Eilberg	Michel
Adair	Everett	Miller, Calif.
Addabbo	Evens, Tenn.	Minish
Anderson,	Fallon	Monagan
Tenn.	Fino	Morgan
Annunzio	Flood	Mosher
Barrett	Ford, Gerald R.	Multer
Blackburn	Gallagher	Murphy, N.Y.
Boggs	Gardner	Nix
Boland	Garmatz	O'Neill, Mass.
Bolling	Gialmo	Pelly
Brademas	Gray	Pepper
Brasco	Green, Pa.	Pettis
Brock	Grover	Pool
Broomfield	Gubser	Quillen
Brown, Ohio	Gurney	Resnick
Button	Hagan	Rhodes, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Halleck	Rogers, Fla.
Celler	Hardy	Ronan
Clark	Hays	Rooney, Pa.
Conable	Hébert	Rostenkowski
Corman	Herlong	St. Onge
Cowger	Horton	Sandman
Cramer	Howard	Satterfield
Curtis	Jacobs	Saylor
Daniels	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Calif.
de la Garza	Kelly	Smith, N.Y.
Delaney	King, N.Y.	Steed
Dent	Kluczynski	Stephens
Derwinski	Landrum	Stratton
Diggs	Long, La.	Stubblefield
Dow	McCarthy	Taft
Dulski	McEwen	Teague, Tex.
Dwyer	Madden	Tenzer

Utt	Whitten	Wilson,
Watkins	Wiggins	Charles H.
Watson	Williams, Miss.	Wright
Watts	Willis	Wylder

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Wylder.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Daniels with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Grover.
Mrs. Kelly with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Everett with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Button.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Conable.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Minish with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Gardner.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Ellberg.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Watts.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Monagan.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Dow.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Tenzer.
Mr. Abbt with Mr. Brademas.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Annunzio.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Addabbo.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. St. Onge.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Steed.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Edwards of California.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Stubblefield.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Ronan.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Gialmo.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMALL-BOAT HARBOR AT MANELE BAY, LANAI, HAWAII

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 423) authorizing the use of additional funds to defray certain increased costs associated with the construction of the small-boat harbor at

Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 423

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the project for a small-boat harbor at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii, constructed by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in accordance with the provisions of section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (Public Law 86-645), is hereby modified to provide for the assumption by the Federal Government of the cost of certain additional work necessitated by unforeseen project conditions and in excess of the monetary limits authorized by Public Law 86-645, at an estimated additional Federal cost of \$172,000: Provided, That responsible local interests make a cash contribution toward the cost of such additional work in the amount of \$124,845.

Sec. 2. Funds authorized to carry out section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960, as amended, shall be available to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] is recognized.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, very briefly this is a noncontroversial bill and was passed unanimously by the House Committee on Public Works.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, S. 423, which authorizes the payment by the U.S. Government of \$172,000 to defray the cost of certain construction work on the small-boat harbor at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii, which was necessitated by changed project conditions.

When this small-boat harbor project at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii, was initially authorized under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960—Public Law 86-645—the limitation on Corps of Engineers authority for use of funds under this type of project was set at a ceiling of \$200,000. This was sufficient authority for the Corps of Engineers under the project as originally contemplated. In carrying out the terms of a contract awarded by the corps for the construction of this project, the contractor encountered certain unforeseen foundation conditions. The existence of harder material requiring blasting ultimately resulted in a greater total project cost than originally estimated by the Corps of Engineers.

The corps and the contractor have agreed on the amount of cost of additional work necessitated by the changed project conditions, which is \$289,845. Based on this increase in cost, the total project cost is now estimated at \$742,845, of which \$372,000 is Federal and \$370,845 is non-Federal. This additional cost for construction of \$289,845 would be shared, \$172,000 Federal and \$124,845 non-Federal—\$7,000 is for engineering and design and associated costs.

In 1965 the River and Harbor Act—Public Law 89-298—increased the authorization for small navigation projects under section 107 from \$200,000 to \$500,-

000. The Manele Bay project would be covered by this new ceiling; however, since the original authorization for the project was limited to \$200,000 Federal participation, further authorization is required at this time so that the Corps of Engineers will have authority to proceed with Federal funds under the \$500,000 ceiling in the 1965 River and Harbor Act. This is the sole purpose for the authorization contained in S. 423. The State of Hawaii has passed a capital improvements budget bill which includes the amount of \$124,845 as the share of the State of Hawaii for the additional construction work costs.

I, therefore, strongly urge approval of S. 423 to authorize the Federal share of \$172,000 in order to satisfy the contractor's legal entitlement in this matter.

The bill authorizes the payment by the U.S. Government of \$172,000 to defray the cost of certain construction work on the small-boat harbor at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii, which was necessitated by changed project conditions.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I rise merely to concur in what the gentleman from Minnesota has expressed in support of the legislation. There was no opposition expressed in the committee.

I think there might be a couple of significant points worth making, the first of which being that the work was actually undertaken by contract in 1964. This, of course, was under section 107 of the Public Works legislation where you actually had a limitation of \$200,000 on a project. If this project had come up, or the problem had risen 1 year later, the bill would not be before the Congress at this time, because the limitation was increased, leaving the chief of the corps with a limitation of \$500,000, subject to his approval.

I believe also the fact that the problem, as expressed by the gentleman from Minnesota, in which the corps ultimately ran into some difficulties that they had not anticipated and actually spent some \$7,000 in engineering to evaluate the problem, that fact that the State has in effect approved the project and will participate to the extent of some \$125,000, I think our only position is to support this legislation because the job has been done and the money needs to be paid. All that is required is the authorization. We see no other way out of the dilemma.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman from California very much.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. What are we asked to do here? Pick up the check for the contractor who made the mistake, or what is the story?

Mr. BLATNIK. The contractor did not make a mistake. The Corps of Engineers made the mistake in the original proposals.

Mr. GROSS. Did the contractor rely exclusively upon the Corps of Engineers?

Mr. BLATNIK. They usually do in

matters involving hydrographic and geological data. In the matter of subsurface data the contractor usually depends on the Corps of Engineers, as far as he is concerned, for the conditions in which the work is to be done.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that we have \$200,000 invested in this project, and the bill would provide that the taxpayers put up another \$172,000? Is that correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. We split the extra cost, the overage which was due to a change in the contract initially called for by the Corps of Engineers because of an underestimation of rock structure. The overage would be divided between the Federal Government and the local participants on the same ratio as the original project cost, 58 percent to 42 percent.

Mr. GROSS. Who in the Corps of Engineers has been penalized because of this mistake, if it was a mistake? I cannot understand why the contractor did not find out what he was getting into.

Mr. BLATNIK. The contractor proceeded on the basis of what he was assured by the Corps of Engineers were the conditions. They both agreed that they ran into this hard rock all the way through the project.

The Corps of Engineers did the work. They did underestimate, or they did not adequately estimate the conditions. The contractor was not expected to go behind the Corps of Engineers on that.

Mr. GROSS. Why does not the contractor go to the State of Hawaii for \$173,000 instead of coming to our taxpayers?

Mr. BLATNIK. The contractor has gone to them.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from a letter from the Secretary of the Army to the Senate Public Works Committee, in which the Secretary says:

The contractor was not placed on actual or constructive notice with respect to contract funding limitations and must look solely to the Federal Government for payment of his just claim. The State of Hawaii was effectively induced, by errors of the Federal Government during project design and cost estimation, to commit itself to unforeseeable gross overruns in project expenditures. The State has, nevertheless, shared in the project far beyond original cost expectations and is equitably entitled to acceptance by the Federal Government of the sharing arrangement proposed by this legislation.

In other words, as stated in this letter, the contractor has already gone to the State, which has participated far beyond what was originally anticipated.

The total cost will be \$742,000 and the State will participate to the extent of \$371,000, and the Federal Government will participate to an equal amount of \$371,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman, what kind of boat harbor is this? Is it a yacht harbor?

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it is a small boat harbor, with a draft of about 8 feet, for small boats in the island of Lanai.

Mr. GROSS. Who uses it?

Mrs. MINK. There are no yacht owners on the island of Lanai. It will be used by the residents who own small boats.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 423, which would authorize the use of additional funds to defray certain increased costs associated with the construction of the small-boat harbor at Manele Bay, located along the southeasterly coast of the island of Lanai, in the State of Hawaii.

I introduced a similar measure in the House.

This legislation would authorize the payment to the contractor involved of the sum of \$172,000 in full settlement of the Federal share of the cost of additional work necessitated by changed conditions associated with the construction of the small-boat harbor at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii. Construction of this small-boat harbor was initially authorized under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960, which carried a Federal cost limitation of not more than \$200,000 for small navigation projects. S. 423 provides the further authorization that is needed to enable the Corps of Engineers to proceed with Federal funds under the \$500,000 ceiling in the 1965 River and Harbor Act.

In carrying out the terms of the construction contract, the contractor encountered certain unforeseen foundation conditions. The existence of the harder material required blasting which ultimately resulted in a greater total project cost than originally estimated by the Corps of Engineers. The contractor satisfactorily completed the work, and it was accepted as of December 14, 1965.

Our Committee on Public Works is of the opinion that both the Federal Government and the contractor acted in good faith in this matter, but that circumstances beyond the control of the Corps of Engineers prevented the contractor from receiving full compensation for the work.

Since the passage of S. 423 by the Senate, the State of Hawaii has passed a capital improvements budget bill which includes the amount of \$124,845 as the share of the State of Hawaii for the additional work costs, and Governor Burns of Hawaii has requested that early favorable action be taken on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of S. 423.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to explain the purpose of this bill which is to authorize additional compensation for unforeseen costs involved in the construction of a small boat harbor at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii.

This public works project was authorized under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960, which among other conditions, set a limitation of \$200,000 as the Federal share, exclusive of cost of aids to navigation. The State of Ha-

wail agreed to provide \$239,000 of the estimated total project cost of \$443,000.

The contract for this work was awarded by the Corps of Engineers in 1964 to Associated Engineers and Contractors, Inc., of Seattle, for an amount estimated at that time at \$299,520 based on the Government's survey and planning. The contract specified the types of dredging and disposal that would be necessary, and also stated that there would be no prohibition to "the removal of excepted material by special means, including blasting, at prices agreed upon and approved in accordance with the article of the contract entitled 'Changed Conditions.'"

The contractor encountered in less than 2 months hard substrata material which had not been anticipated, and notified the government of this changed condition. Subsequent negotiations led to an agreement that blasting would be required for completion of the work, and the construction costs were tentatively adjusted to \$376,555.62 with the State of Hawaii agreeing to provide the extra funds. The contractor completed the job with an extension of time by agreement, and submitted a revised contract price far in excess of the original amount.

The Secretary of the Army agreed that it was the Corps of Engineers which was "materially in error" in its original estimate of the cost of the additional work, and a formal agreement was reached to the effect that \$290,000 would be acceptable compensation to the contractor if payment could be made before May 23, 1968. The State of Hawaii, which has already borne 55.15 percent of the total project cost, agreed to contribute an additional share if the total contribution were revised on the basis of the original cost-sharing ratio of the contract which provided for 58 percent Federal and 42 percent State share. The State of Hawaii has already passed a capital improvements budget bill including its portion of \$124,845, and S. 423 would authorize the Federal payment of \$172,000 to meet the unanticipated excess cost.

It should be noted that Public Law 86-645 has been superseded by Public Law 89-298, the River and Harbor Act of 1965, which set a new Federal limitation of \$500,000 on small navigation projects, but this new ceiling cannot be applied retroactively and the Department of the Army lacks authority under section 107 of the 1960 act to settle the contractor's claim without special legislation. Approval of S. 423 would place the total cost of the Manele Bay construction to the Federal Government at about \$372,000, still well under the present statutory limitation, while the cooperation of the Hawaii State government in this matter pegs the State total cost at \$371,000, or just about 50 percent of the total.

I feel that my State has shown admirable initiative in agreeing to bear these additional costs which the Corps of Engineers admits have been incurred by its own error in estimation of the project, and the Secretary of the Army agreed in his letter to Senate Public Works Chairman JENNINGS RANDOLPH:

The contractor was not placed on actual or constructive notice with respect to contract

funding limitations and must look solely to the Federal Government for payment of his just claim. The State of Hawaii was effectively induced, by errors of the Federal Government during project design and cost estimation, to commit itself to unforseeable gross overruns in project expenditures. The State has, nevertheless, shared in the project far beyond original cost expectations and is equitably entitled to acceptance by the Federal Government of the sharing arrangement proposed by this legislation.

In all fairness to the contractor and to my State of Hawaii, Mr. Speaker, I urge approval of this bill to provide the \$172,000 in Federal funds necessary to settle a claim agreed to as fair by all parties.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, who is handling the bill, if hearings were held on the House side. I have read the report and I have studied the bill, and I understand there is a report from the other body, but I find no hearings for study or perusal on the House side, so it must have been in executive session only, in which departmental witnesses were heard. Is this a correct statement?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct. There was testimony given, in addition to the report, in executive session in the House.

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

I wonder if the gentleman, while he is on his feet, will tell us why this was not included in the regular public works authorization or appropriation bill?

Mr. BLATNIK. I cannot answer that offhand. Perhaps the gentleman on the other side of the aisle [Mr. CLAUSEN] can.

Mr. HALL. Why was it not in the authorization bill or appropriation bill? We have to authorize, to give the authority, as we all understand, before we can appropriate.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have not had a public works authorization for this bill. This is under section 107, which is under the jurisdiction of the Chief of the corps. All that is required is authority, and funds will come from the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I continue in opposition to this bill, because it has been specifically developed that the Pineapple Island is owned and primarily used by a private corporation, which is now having some additional tourist attractions, and this small boat harbor is not for defense purposes or anything similar, but is being funded while we are at war and running a planned high deficit.

The question naturally arises, and I ask the distinguished gentleman again, whether or not this actually happened on the basis of the Corps of Engineers' underestimate or whether it happened on the basis of lack of knowledge of coral heads in the bay or hard rock for the channel, as required?

Mr. BLATNIK. They ran into working conditions of solid, continuous hard rock, which was unexpected, unanticipated and unknown to the Corps of Engineers when they described the amount of work and the estimated cost. On that basis the Corps of Engineers agreed an increased cost was warranted and justified.

Mr. HALL. I have read repeatedly in the report, I say to the gentleman, about the Corps of Engineers agreeing that this contractor should be found safe for his additional time and expense, but does the gentleman mean to tell me that a modern contracting engineer will submit a bid—and I presume there were competitive bids—for a construction job like this without making test borings or site soundings or without a knowledge of the coral head or hard rock in any bay or channel approach? If so, does not the principle of caveat emptor pertain in this bid as it would in any construction bid?

Mr. BLATNIK. Not necessarily.

I am willing to respond to the question. It is a good question.

It is not rigid policy or principle that is followed that the contractor would go out in some instances and make his own determination geologically of the substrata.

The SPEAKER. The time yielded by the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BLATNIK. In this instance the Corps of Engineers prescribed the working conditions for the work to be done, and the estimated cost. The contractor agreed. All the requirements and criteria were established and stated by the Corps of Engineers.

There is no basis, in circumstances such as that, when the corps has full authority to authorize work and payment up to \$200,000 at that time, and now \$500,000, to go behind the Corps of Engineers' figures or estimates.

Mr. HALL. Of course, the discussion of the Engineer limitation as between \$200,000 and \$500,000 is after the fact. I believe we can stipulate that between ourselves. It is not pertinent to this argument, except it is a happenstance which developed thereafter.

Certainly we also know that the Corps of Engineers often specifies work or even makes estimates of tonnages to be moved. These are stipulated in the contract.

I should think that either the accountable officer in the Corps of Engineers should be held responsible for such erroneous figures, without core drillings, or site soundings, in the area; or, that the contractor should be penalized by having to pay this money, or absorb his loss. I certainly do not feel it should come out of the pockets of the taxpayers, even on a matching basis.

I find no fault with the State of Hawaii in its planned program to match this deficit, except that the hand is out to the taxpayers of the entire United States of America, for the pleasure of the yacht set, while we are at war.

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

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

Mr. HARSHA. I take this time to inform the gentleman that the general practice is for the contractors to take the cost estimates and engineering data provided to them by the Corps of Engineers and to submit bids on the basis of that information. As I understand it, this was done in this case.

The contractor in good faith relied

upon the specifications and the estimates and the engineering provided by the Corps of Engineers. A contract on that basis was agreed to.

It was not until some months afterward that the contractor, who delved into the problem more deeply, found out that some of the substructure, which the Corps of Engineers had relied upon, was not in the condition the corps felt it was in. He then entered into extended negotiations with the Corps of Engineers, and there was no question in the mind of the corps that the conditions were substantially changed from when the original contract was entered into. They entered into a subsequent contract in good faith with the contractor.

There was no lapse of efficiency on the part of the contractor. Rather, it was his efficiency that found these changed conditions.

As a result of that, it is the feeling of the committee that the Government agency is responsible and that the contractor, who acted in good faith and entered into a contract in good faith, and promptly called the changed conditions to the attention of the Government, is entitled to be adequately and fairly reimbursed.

That is the purpose of this legislation. Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for his additional contribution.

I still submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is calling on the taxpayers of the United States to the tune of \$172,000 to make up for a bad bid by a certain contractor. Perhaps if we let some of them pay for their own mistakes or if we rendered them accountable because they are responsible, they would think twice before they made a bad bid.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I simply state that we have a letter from the Secretary of the Army to our committee indicating that the contractor actually notified the Corps of Engineers of the problem he was running into within 2 months after he started on the project.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 423.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 291, nays 25, not voting 116, as follows:

[Roll No. 370]

YEAS—291

Adams	Bates	Brinkley
Albert	Battin	Brooks
Anderson, Ill.	Belcher	Brotzman
Andrews, Ala.	Bell	Brown, Calif.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Bennett	Brown, Mich.
Arends	Betts	Broyhill, N.C.
Ashley	Bevill	Broyhill, Va.
Ashmore	Biester	Buchanan
Aspinall	Bingham	Burke, Fla.
Ayres	Blanton	Burke, Mass.
Baring	Blatnik	Burleson
	Bolton	Burton, Calif.

Burton, Utah	Hosmer	Price, Tex.
Bush	Hull	Pryor
Byrnes, Wis.	Hungate	Pucinski
Cabell	Hunt	Purcell
Cahill	Ichord	Quile
Carey	Jarman	Rallsback
Carter	Joelson	Randall
Casey	Johnson, Calif.	Rarick
Cederberg	Johnson, Pa.	Rees
Clancy	Jonas	Reid, Ill.
Clausen,	Jones, Ala.	Reid, N.Y.
Don H.	Jones, N.C.	Reifel
Clawson, Del.	Karsten	Reinecke
Cleveland	Karth	Reuss
Cohelan	Kastenmeier	Rhodes, Ariz.
Colmer	Kazen	Riegle
Conte	Kee	Rivers
Conyers	Keith	Roberts
Corbett	King, Calif.	Robison
Culver	Kirwan	Rodino
Cunningham	Kleppe	Rogers, Colo.
Daddario	Kornegay	Rooney, N.Y.
Davis, Ga.	Kuyfman	Rosenthal
Dawson	Kuykendall	Roth
Dellenback	Kyros	Roush
Denny	Latta	Roybal
Dickinson	Leggett	Rumsfeld
Dingell	Lennon	Ruppe
Donohue	Lipscomb	Ryan
Dorn	Lloyd	St Germain
Dowdy	Long, Md.	Schadeberg
Downing	Lukens	Scheuer
Duncan	McClary	Schneebeli
Eckhardt	McClure	Schweiker
Edmondson	McCulloch	Schwengel
Edwards, Ala.	McDade	Scott
Edwards, La.	McDonald,	Selden
Erlenborn	Mich.	Shipley
Esch	McEwen	Shriver
Eshleman	McFall	Sikes
Evans, Colo.	McMillan	Sisk
Farbstein	Macdonald,	Skubitz
Fascell	Mass.	Slack
Feighan	MacGregor	Smith, Iowa
Findley	Machen	Smith, Okla.
Fisher	Mahon	Snyder
Flynt	Marsh	Springer
Foley	Martin	Stafford
Ford,	Mathias, Calif.	Staggers
William D.	Matsunaga	Stanton
Fountain	May	Steiger, Ariz.
Fraser	Mayne	Steiger, Wis.
Frelinghuysen	Meeds	Stuckey
Friedel	Meskill	Sullivan
Fulton, Pa.	Miller, Ohio	Talcott
Fulton, Tenn.	Mills	Taylor
Fuqua	Mink	Teague, Calif.
Galifianakis	Minshall	Thompson, Ga.
Gathings	Mize	Thompson, N.J.
Gettys	Montgomery	Tiernan
Gibbons	Moore	Tuck
Gilbert	Moorhead	Tunney
Gonzalez	Morris, N. Mex.	Udall
Goodell	Morton	Ullman
Green, Oreg.	Moss	Van Deulin
Griffiths	Murphy, Ill.	Vander Jagt
Gude	Natcher	Vanik
Gurney	Nedzi	Vigorito
Haley	Neisen	Waggonner
Halpern	Nichols	Waldie
Hamilton	O'Hara, Ill.	Walker
Hammer-	O'Hara, Mich.	Wampler
schmidt	Olsen	Whalen
Hanna	O'Neal, Ga.	Whalley
Hansen, Idaho	Passman	White
Hansen, Wash.	Patman	Whitener
Harsha	Patten	Widnall
Harvey	Pepper	Williams, Pa.
Hathaway	Perkins	Wilson, Bob
Hawkins	Philbin	Wolf
Hechler, W. Va.	Pickle	Wyatt
Heckler, Mass.	Pike	Wyman
Helstoski	Pirnie	Yates
Henderson	Poage	Young
Hicks	Poff	Zablocki
Hollifield	Pollock	Zion
Holland	Price, Ill.	Zwach

NAYS—25

Ashbrook	Goodling	Myers
Berry	Gross	O'Konski
Bow	Hall	Roudebush
Bray	Harrison	Scherle
Chamberlain	Hutchinson	Thomson, Wis.
Collier	Kyl	Winn
Davis, Wis.	Laird	Wyllie
Devine	Langen	
Dole	Morse, Mass.	

NOT VOTING—116

Abbt	Annunzio	Brademas
Abernethy	Barrett	Brasco
Adair	Blackburn	Brook
Addabbo	Boggs	Broomfield
Anderson,	Boland	Brown, Ohio
Tenn.	Bolling	Button

Byrne, Pa.	Halleck	Quillen
Celler	Hanley	Resnick
Clark	Hardy	Rhodes, Pa.
Conable	Hays	Rogers, Fla.
Corman	Hébert	Ronan
Cowger	Herlong	Rooney, Pa.
Cramer	Horton	Rostenkowski
Curtis	Howard	St. Onge
Daniels	Irwin	Sandman
de la Garza	Jacobs	Satterfield
Delaney	Jones, Mo.	Saylor
Dent	Kelly	Smith, Calif.
Derwinski	King, N.Y.	Smith, N.Y.
Diggs	Kluczynski	Steed
Dow	Landrum	Stephens
Dulski	Long, La.	Stratton
Dwyer	McCarthy	Stubblefield
Edwards, Calif.	Madden	Taft
Ellberg	Mailliard	Teague, Tex.
Everett	Mathias, Md.	Tenzer
Evins, Tenn.	Michel	Utt
Fallon	Miller, Calif.	Watkins
Fino	Minish	Watson
Flood	Monagan	Watts
Ford, Gerald R.	Morgan	Whitten
Gallagher	Mosher	Wiggins
Gardner	Multer	Williams, Miss.
Garmatz	Murphy, N.Y.	Willis
Gialmo	Nix	Wilson,
Gray	O'Neill, Mass.	Charles H.
Green, Pa.	Ottenger	Wright
Grover	Pelly	Wyder
Gubser	Pettis	
Hagan	Pool	

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Adair.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Irwin with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Flood with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Daniels with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Conable.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Hébert with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Wyder.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Button.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Abbt with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Gardner.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Everett.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Ellberg.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Hanley.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Jacobs.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Brasco.
Mr. Dow with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Wright.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Pool.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Steed.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Ottinger.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Minish with Mr. Ronan.

Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Monagan.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Multer.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. St. Onge.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.

Mr. REID of New York changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT OF FOOD AID PROGRAMS DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1966—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 179)

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

Mr. HALL. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Is the message a transmittal of a report, or is it one of the special messages from the President?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands the message does transmit a report.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in the opinion of the Chair, it is not necessary to have the Members here in that case to hear the report read?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair did not give an opinion.

The Clerk will read the message.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress a report of our food aid programs during calendar year 1966.

This report marks a year in which the productivity of American agriculture and the generosity of the American people have done much to help others to help themselves.

Food and fiber valued at \$1.5 billion were provided to needy people in more than 100 countries. Since 1954 the United States has provided almost \$16 billion in farm products to 116 countries which together contain almost half of the world's population.

To millions of human beings, this sharing has meant survival in the face of drought or other natural disaster. To countless children it has meant freedom from the weakness, disease, and mental retardation which are the tragic consequences of malnutrition.

In 1966, however, U.S. food aid programs entered a new and more critical stage. The world's food problem was growing, not diminishing. Despite our efforts, serious food shortages threatened many countries. The problem of feeding rapidly growing populations was compounded by serious drought in India and Pakistan—the worst drought on the South Asian subcontinent in this century.

The world faced two related problems:

To stimulate agricultural production in the food-deficit countries so that they will eventually be able to grow their own food, or to buy it through the normal channels of world commerce; and

To provide direct food shipments sufficient to ward off starvation and severe malnutrition during the interim period until the deficit countries achieve self-sufficiency.

After a long and careful study, the United States undertook to carry its share of the burden in a worldwide war on hunger. I sent to the Congress a special message proposing that the United States lead an all-out effort to reverse the dire trend in the race between world population and world food supply. The response of the Congress gave us the tools to wage that war.

There are six main elements of the new strategy.

Emphasis on self-help: The war on hunger must be fought and won within the countries where hunger exists. Our food aid and other forms of assistance must go primarily to those who do the most to help themselves. The key to victory over hunger is self-help.

Policy for a nonsurplus era: In the past, our food aid programs have been based on the existence of food surpluses in the United States. These surpluses are gone. Until the less-developed countries are able to provide for themselves, our domestic farm programs must be geared to insure that we produce enough to meet pressing foreign needs as well as the demand here at home.

Population programs: Rapid population growth can make the dream of plenty a nightmare of famine. This is an enormous problem. It is clearly a matter for the conscience of each family and each nation. We will never dictate an answer, nor intrude on the decision others must make for themselves. But many countries have voluntarily decided that the time has come to confront the population challenge. We stand ready to respond to the requests for help from these nations in formulating and carrying out effective programs.

Integration of all U.S. assistance programs: Relief from immediate suffering is only part of the war on hunger. It gives precious time and strength for a larger task. The developing countries must use this time to gather the resources and skills to improve their agricultural production so that they can ultimately stand on their own feet. This is the goal of our technical and economic assistance. Clearly, our food aid must be closely related to these other forms of help in a single, carefully integrated approach to the entire food problem.

Increased private investment: There is no easy or simple answer to the scourge of poverty and hunger. No single program, no single plan, and no single government holds the key. We must marshal the sum of our experience. We must bring to bear more and more the capital and know-how of private enterprise—both in the United States and in the developing nations themselves.

A multinational effort: The food deficit is a world problem. Developed nations must join in an international undertaking to combat hunger and modernize agriculture. The United States cannot shoulder this responsibility alone. In meeting the world's food needs, the common interest lies in common effort. In

sum, we propose to enlist the very best talent—private and public, of all nations, rich and poor.

As I have stressed, our own food aid is only a part of a wider attack on the causes of hunger. We made effective use of this new approach in the sales agreements signed in 1966. In the program with India, for example, our food assistance complements India's own strenuous measures to increase agricultural production. We also made a special effort to encourage help to India from other developed nations.

We seek new agreements with other countries in the same spirit. Our goal is to achieve both self-help in the developing countries and close integration of our own aid with the assistance of other wealthy countries.

The developing nations are helping themselves. Given a critical margin of capital, technical skill, and interim food shipments from the advanced countries, the threat of mass hunger will eventually diminish. Over the past 12 years, Public Law 480 has meant the difference between life and death for millions all around the world. That challenge and that momentous obligation are still with us.

I know that Americans have the dedication, the patience, the skills, and the wisdom to see the job through. Working together with rich nations and poor, all equally determined that mankind will conquer its oldest enemy, we will win the war on hunger.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 6, 1967.

The message, together with the accompanying papers, was, without objection, referred by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY'S FINE RECORD OF STABILITY AND PATRIOTISM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, in these days of marches and demonstrations in opposition to the policies of the United States in the Vietnam crisis the college campuses have been the situs of much of such activity. The prevalence of such conduct at many of our institutions of higher learning has caused many to assume that our American college students are lacking in patriotism.

On Friday, November 3, 1967, the Nation was given concrete proof that patriotism and loyalty to country is still in existence in the hearts and minds of our college youth. This proof was furnished by the students at Appalachian State University in Boone, N.C.

The press reports told the story of the display of loyalty to country by several hundred Appalachian students when nomadic antiwar protesters invaded the campus to undertake to poison the minds

of the students there. These loyal American students responded by demanding that the invaders leave the campus and as they left the students sang the patriotic song, "God Bless America."

As the Appalachian students were displaying their support of their country, the wise leadership of Dean of Student Affairs O. K. Webb brought both the invaders and the students to a resolution of the situation in such manner as to avoid violence or other misconduct. The action of Dean Webb causes me to express regret that we do not have more men of his sound judgment serving in such positions in other colleges and universities in our country.

Dean Webb and the Appalachian students have brought credit to themselves and their university. Their actions in this situation is characteristic of the students and faculty of their great university. No institution of higher learning in our Nation has a finer record of stability and patriotism than that of Appalachian State University.

I salute the faculty and student body of Appalachian for their patriotism, judgment, and maturity in handling what might have been a difficult situation on other campuses. The nomadic troublemakers who claimed to represent an organization known as the Southern Student Coordinating Committee were given the firm opposition at Appalachian that all loyal Americans should applaud.

The fighting Americans in Vietnam are entitled to the type of support on our college campuses that the students at Appalachian gave them last Friday. As they get the news from home that hundreds of North Carolina collegians are willing to actively give them support their morale will surely be higher as they go forth to battle to preserve freedom.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SETS THE RECORD STRAIGHT ABOUT THE YELLOW PERIL NONSENSE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during ceremonies honoring our Nation's latest Medal of Honor winner recently, President Johnson spoke out against the phony issue that has been raised about our presence in Vietnam—the so-called yellow peril.

The President declared:

We have fought side by side with Asians at Bataan and Corregidor, in Korea, and now in Vietnam. . . . We have utterly repudiated the racist nonsense of an earlier era.

The President continued:

Indeed, we have made a commitment in Asia because we believe . . . that no men, whatever the pigmentation of their skins, should be delivered over to totalitarianism; that freedom is not a prize reserved for white Europeans or Americans in our private enclaves of affluence.

And he concluded:

Race has no place in our purpose. The American commitment is clear.

Mr. Speaker, I warmly endorse President Johnson's words. I commend him for speaking out so forcefully on this matter. My hope is that it will erase—once and for all—any notion held by any American that their government is involved in a racial war in Asia—or anywhere else.

This charge is the height of irresponsibility and absurdity. There is simply no justification whatsoever to believe that American troops are in Asia to contain a yellow peril. We are there to contain aggression—of whatever color or political stripe. We are there to defend the freedom of those who have sought our help and who happen to be Asians.

The only peril in Asia is the threat to the peace if aggression is allowed to proceed unchecked and unchallenged. This is the real peril, Mr. Speaker, and it has been avoided by the courageous stand taken by Lyndon B. Johnson.

History will prove this stand to be the correct one. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion those who attack our foreign policy in Vietnam bear two heavy responsibilities:

First. They must consider the effect of their statements on the determination of the enemy to continue their aggression.

Second. If they do not advocate surrender and withdrawal, I ask, What alternative policy do they advocate?

TAXES, MONEY, AND STABILIZATION

Mr. TALCOTT. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, our whole Nation—government, business, industry, and the private citizenry—is now suffering the consequences of the "new economics" espoused by the present administration.

The chaotic fiscal situation demands that every Member of Congress study thoroughly the consequences if we permit the fiscal, monetary and the budgetary practices of the Johnson-Humphrey administration to persist.

University of Chicago Prof. Milton Friedman's economic theories and expertise have withstood the exigencies and buffeting of time and reality better than the theories and practices of the Keynes-Heller school which are failing us so badly now.

Those who still believe that the Federal budget can be used as an instrument to insure economic stability in the United States and abroad should read this provocative and illuminating column by Professor Friedman published Sunday in the Washington Post.

With unanimous consent, I include Professor Friedman's timely and scholarly article at this point in the RECORD:

TAXES, MONEY, AND STABILIZATION

(By Milton Friedman)

Most current discussion of President Johnson's proposed tax surcharge takes it for granted that the Federal budget is an effective and sensitive instrument for promoting economical stability and that the only issues in dispute are whether the economy needs restraint and if so whether the restraint should be imposed via higher taxes, lower spending, or tight money.

For example, in his thoughtful and sophisticated presentation of the case for a tax increase in these columns three weeks ago, James Tobin wrote, "If tax policy is to be used, as it must be, for economic stabilization . . ." (my italics)—not a word about whether it can be so used. Apparently, he regards that as so obvious as to require no discussion.

Yet it is by no means obvious. Indeed, in my opinion it is false. For both political and economic reasons, tax policy cannot be used successfully for economic stabilization. Perhaps at some future date, when we know far more than we now do about the workings of the economy, the situation will be different. But under existing conditions, the attempt to use tax policy for economic stabilization is likely to do harm, not good; it is likely simply to introduce an additional source of instability.

The political difficulties are the more obvious but perhaps the less important. In early 1966, many new economists favored a tax increase to stem what they regarded as growing inflationary pressure. The Federal Reserve System shared this view and justified its tight money policy of 1966 by the failure of the President to recommend and of Congress to enact a tax increase. Despite this near consensus among economic experts, the political climate of the time was hostile to a tax increase and none was recommended. Similarly, in 1962 the economic experts declared that a tax cut was imperative. A tax cut finally came in 1964, delayed by the time required to marshal political support.

These political difficulties have led many new—and some old—economists to propose that the President be given the power to raise or lower tax rates within a limited range at his discretion. Some such step is indeed essential if frequent changes in tax rates are to be used as a regular instrument of economic policy. But even if the President were granted such discretion, political considerations would hardly be eliminated from the decision when to raise and when to lower tax rates. And the granting of such discretion would involve a major change in the distribution of political power. To those of us who believe that too much power has already been concentrated in the hands of the Executive and who fear a continuation of this trend, the change would be very much for the worse. It could be justified only if there are clear and compelling economic reasons for bearing the political cost.

The economic difficulties with using tax policy for stabilization are more basic. The 1966 episode suggests the problem. The tax increase recommended by experts did not occur, and government expenditures continued to mount. As a result, fiscal policy became increasingly expansive as measured by the high employment deficit—perhaps, as I suggested in a 1946 article, the best single measure of the impact of Federal budget policy on the economy. Yet output stopped growing and price rises moderated. There clearly was an economic slowdown in the first half of 1967, though it may not have been severe enough to qualify as a full-fledged recession, fiscal policy went in one direction, the economy in precisely the opposite.

This episode can be multiplied many-fold. Examine the behavior of the full employment budget over the postwar period and

compare it with the behavior of the economy. You will find that there is little connection between the changes in the one and in the other. For example, in 1948, there was a sizeable tax cut—followed by a recession. In 1955 and 1956, and again in 1962 and 1963, there were substantial high employment surpluses—and economic boom. By hindsight, it is possible to explain the discrepancies by adding other factors that were at work. But if tax policy is to be used for economic stabilization, foresight rather than hindsight is needed.

Mr. Tobin and other proponents of the tax increase write as if tax changes had a clear and predictable impact on the economy, as if they could assert with confidence beforehand what effect such and such a change in taxes will have on national income, on employment, and on prices. True, they will grant, there were "special circumstances" in 1966 and 1967, but this time is different.

The claims are extravagant. Yet, so far as I know—and this may surprise most readers—no systematic evidence whatsoever has been offered to support them. We must take it all on faith.

Those of us who have been working on monetary problems have at least tried to assemble some empirical evidence to justify our assertion that there is a strong—though by no means precise and completely regular—relation between changes in the quantity of money and in national income. In the course of our studies, we have also turned up much evidence that this relation is far closer and stronger than the relation between budget changes and national income. For example, each of the glaring discrepancies listed above between fiscal action and the course of the economy can be accounted for by the behavior of the quantity of money. And there are no similar discrepancies between monetary growth and economic change. Recessions have been consistently preceded by a deceleration of monetary growth; expansion, by an acceleration of monetary growth.

Is it not time that the new economists offered some evidence to support their claims?

But, you may answer, is evidence really needed? How can there be any doubt about the potency of tax changes? A tax increase now will reduce the income available to taxpayers to spend. Surely, that will reduce the pressure of demand that is pulling up prices. True, but that is only part of the story. If a tax increase takes some of the heat off the drive to hold down government expenditures, the effect on taxpayers will be partly or wholly cancelled by higher government spending. If this offset is incomplete, so that a tax increase adds more to revenues than it does to government spending, then the government would not have to borrow as much to finance its expenditures. But in that case, those who would have loaned funds to the government now have such funds available. Some part may be used to finance the payment of the higher taxes—to that extent, the taxes will not reduce private spending. The rest will add to available loanable funds, easing the strain on credit markets. For a given monetary policy, interest rates will be lower. Reduced spending by taxpayers will be offset, at least in part, by the increased spending of those who now borrow the funds released.

In general, there will still remain some net effect because lower interest rates will induce the public to hold higher cash balances relative to their income than they otherwise would have done—as they view it, they will finance some of the extra taxes by running down cash balance. But, unless the tax change affects monetary policy, this net effect is likely to be small, irregular, and uncertain. That is, I believe the reason why the statistical evidence shows such an irregular relation between budget policy and economic

activity when allowance is made for the effects of monetary policy.

The tax change may affect monetary policy. However, it clearly need not do so. The Federal Reserve System has the power to increase the quantity of money at the rate it desires, whatever the state of the Federal budget within any range that appears at all likely—a proposition for which again there is ample empirical evidence.

Monetary policy, by which I mean changes in the quantity of money, seems to have had a far more potent effect on national income and prices than fiscal policy. The slowdown in the first half of 1967, despite an expansionary fiscal policy, followed a drastic reduction in the rate of monetary growth imposed by the Federal Reserve System in April, 1966—and this result was predicted in advance by those of us who have attached major importance to changes in the quantity of money as a determinant of changes in national income in current prices. The renewal of economic expansion in mid 1967 followed a drastic acceleration in the rate of monetary growth imposed by the Federal Reserve System in January, 1967—and again this result was predicted in advance. It is this rapid rate of monetary growth, not the state of the Federal budget, that raises the spectre of serious inflation. If this rate of monetary growth continues, we shall experience significant inflation, regardless, within wide limits, of what happens to taxes and government spending. If monetary growth tapers off decidedly, inflation will be checked, again almost regardless of what happens to taxes and government spending.

These sweeping assertions may give the impression that I believe that monetary growth is a precise and infallible predictor of subsequent income and prices. That is very far from the case. On the average, there is a close relation between the rate of change in the quantity of money and the rate of change in national income in current prices some six or more months later. However, that average conceals much variability in both the time delay and the magnitude of response. The response may come after three months or it may be delayed 12 or 18 months. A one percentage point increase in the rate of monetary growth may be followed by a negligible change in the rate of income growth or by a change of 3 or more percentage points.

Such sweeping assertions can nonetheless be made with great confidence because the recent rate of monetary growth differs so widely from the rate that would avoid inflation. Evidence for the past century suggests that on the average a rate of growth of about 4 or 5 percent in the quantity of money (defined as currency plus all commercial bank deposits, demand and time) is consistent with stable prices. Since January, 1967, the quantity of money has been growing at the rate of 12.5 per cent. It does not require a very close or precise relation between monetary change and income change to predict that continuation of such a rate of growth will produce severe inflationary pressure.

Because the effect of monetary change is delayed, and because its relation to income change is loose, it has been possible for the Fed to vary considerably the rate of monetary change without its being obvious that it was thereby contributing to instability in the economy. Yet with hindsight, we can see that the Fed has tended to react late to changes in economic circumstances and then, when it did react, to over-react—as in April, 1966 and again in January, 1967. Instead of offsetting other forces making for instability, the Fed has itself been a major source of instability.

My own conclusion is that we simply do not know enough to be able to use either fiscal policy or monetary policy as a flexible and sensitive instrument to control the course of the economy. "Fine tuning" is a wonderfully evocative phrase, but we do not

have the knowledge or the instruments to make it more than a phrase. Attempts to apply it have provided another example of the best being the enemy of the good.

That is why I favor a government policy of providing a stable fiscal and monetary framework for the economy, rather than of trying to engage in fine tuning.

A stable fiscal framework would involve setting tax rates and enacting expenditure programs in terms of long-run considerations, not of short-term stabilization objectives. Congress could and should concentrate on the issues it is qualified to judge—how large a fraction of their resources the citizens wish spent through government and on what projects. It should not let itself get mired in trying to forecast short-term changes in the economy.

In terms of these long-run considerations, taxes are already too high, not too low. We are now spending too large, not too small, a fraction of our resources through the Federal government—as judged by what we are getting (or not getting) for our money. We are being told that the proposed tax surcharge is a strictly temporary expedient. But past experience suggests that temporary taxes have a way of becoming permanent. Enacting higher taxes now will simply reinforce recent trends, validate past expenditures, and encourage still higher levels of spending later. That is why I oppose any increase in taxes. Far better to suffer temporarily high deficits, if that be the price, than permanently high taxes.

A stable monetary framework would involve a steady increase in the quantity of money at a rate calculated on the average to be consistent with stable prices. It would involve, too, a free market in foreign exchange—but that is another and even longer story.

Currently, such a monetary policy would require a sharp decrease in monetary growth—as already noted, from about 12.5 per cent a year to about 5 per cent per year. That would be a drastic change. However, postponing it will make the move to a stable monetary policy still more difficult, as inflationary expectations become ever more widespread and even more strongly imbedded in private arrangements. It is probably not too late to make such a drastic change without drastic consequences. Let the present rate of monetary growth continue much longer, and that will no longer be the case. The course of prudence will then involve reconciling ourselves to a long-continued inflation, with at best a gradual tapering off.

If the monetary authorities were at once to shift to a slower rate of monetary growth, the immediate effect would be to raise interest rates. But this effect would be temporary. After some three to six months, as the reduced rate of monetary growth started to restrain the growth of aggregate demand, the pressure for credit would slacken, and interest rates would start to decline. A monetary policy that will avoid inflation is also a policy—and the only policy—that can be counted on to stop the present trend toward ever higher interest rates.

Such a stable fiscal and monetary framework would enable the public to conduct their economic affairs without having to engage in a guessing game about what governmental authorities propose to do, in full confidence that governmental monetary and fiscal policy would provide a stable base for the private economy. It would enable Congress to go about its proper business without having to engage in a guessing game about what private individuals and enterprises propose to do. It would enable the monetary and fiscal authorities to concentrate their scarce resources on strengthening our basic financial and economic institutions rather than vainly trying to lean against next year's wind, which, in the process, they are themselves stirring up.

REPORT ON THE LINDSAY ADMINISTRATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the City Club of New York is an organization of responsible citizens of New York City who are concerned with the welfare and well-being of the city. On November 2, 1967, they issued a report entitled "Achievement and Nonachievement by the Lindsay Administration." The report is set forth at length at the conclusion of my remarks.

The report is both laudatory and critical of the Lindsay administration, and I bring it to the attention of my colleagues for its substance.

I believe that the quality of city government today is crucial to the well-being of the Nation. This report, in its fair criticism, can help other city managers who are interested in appraisals of programs in a sister city.

Frequently style passes for performance in public recognition, but in this report the City Club makes this important distinction. I recommend this analysis to all interested in the welfare of our cities:

ACHIEVEMENT AND NONACHIEVEMENT BY THE LINDSAY ADMINISTRATION

Because we admire Mayor John V. Lindsay's idealism, we hesitate to criticize his administration. Yet, we are afraid that if he fails to offer constructive counsel and he fails to heed it, the four-year record of the first reform administration in a generation could be one of non-achievement.

To Mayor Lindsay's great credit is the adoption of a progressive municipal tax program including an income tax for both residents and commuters, whereby fiscal responsibility was substituted for the irresponsibility of long term borrowing for current expenses. Our mayor also had the courage to bring from outside the city a new police commissioner who was in a position to reorganize the department. In selecting Thomas Hoving as his first Park Commissioner, Mayor Lindsay gave authority to a creative person whose innovations will very likely have a lasting favorable effect on the recreational scene. He has spoken out courageously on the Vietnam war and, in his opposition to the new State constitution, refused to capitulate to forces which would destroy the public school system. And he is perhaps unique among public officials in the United States in his ability to relate personally and sympathetically to the poor and neglected people of the cities.

On the other hand, inquiries made by the City Club reveal deficiencies in Mayor Lindsay's administration which are very deep-seated—through certainly correctable.

One of Mayor Lindsay's chief complaints is that he has not been able to put through his entire reorganization plan. One of his proudest boasts is that he has attracted the new breed of public administration specialist.

It will be recalled that the City Club was the only good government organization to withhold support for the reorganization plan.

We felt that it was a paper recipe sold to our mayor by men still devoted to what have long been discredited as mechanistic approaches to administration.

When we listened to the reorganization

scheme being presented to the City Council on behalf of Mayor Lindsay, we dreaded what we were hearing. It sounded as if our mayor were in the hands of people who know all about management—or its vocabulary—except how to get a job done. The essential purpose of organization, getting the work done, was ignored. No evidence was submitted that another level of staff would produce the work.

We saw in the program of building ever higher pyramids, or consolidating departments or bureaus under new and bigger staffs, a continuation of the process of making government ever more bureaucratic, unmanageable and unresponsive. We saw that most of the reorganization plans called for proliferation of supporting staffs at the expense of the operational line. Paths of communication would be so lengthened that by the time they reached the line, commands would become inaudible whispers.

The City Club was not the first to observe that while effective large business enterprises encourage the making of operating decisions at the lowest possible level, government tends to require all decisions to be made at the highest possible level. This means that if a new staff level is established, it becomes more isolated from operations while the functional departments below are rendered impotent.

Another principle is that the executive must pick good people and then let them do the work. No organization can work if the top executive must supervise every detail of administration. The right way to supervise in business is to let the lower echelons do their work and then modify it, if necessary, after action has been taken. Any other procedure leads to paralysis of the organization and the program.

HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

The Housing and Development Administration was the first to be formed by action of the City Council. In our testimony, questioning the reorganization, we asked, "Will it build one more house?" We then traced housing programs of New York, starting with the six-man organization under Robert Moses, the staff of less than 50 under Mario Procaccino and the 600-man staff under Milton Mollen, and said, "The proposed Housing and Development Administration is the latest attempt to get results in a field where there has been a consistent growth of staff with no improvement in results."

What happened? Has the Lindsay administration reached its housing goals? Here are the facts:

The Lindsay campaign white paper on housing proposed:

1. To create 50,000 new low-rent apartments in four years.
2. To boost middle-income apartment construction, to a rate of 15,000 annually.

Let us see if these goals have been reached.

1. In 1965, the last year of the Wagner administration, whose record in housing the City Club always considered unsatisfactory, building permits were issued for 3,363 low-rent public housing dwelling units.

In 1966, the first year of the Lindsay administration, permits were issued for 1,730 low-rent public housing units.

There has been a slight improvement in 1967 when in the first eight months permits were issued for 1,933 public housing units, a rate still well below the performance in 1965.

2. In 1965 permits were issued for 5,791 dwelling units under the City's middle-income program. In 1966, the number dropped to 3,483. In the first eight months of 1967, only 394 permits were issued!

If we add up all housing construction; private luxury, FHA, single family tracts, public housing and middle-income—Federal, State and local, we find that permits were issued for 25,715 in 1965 and 23,142 in 1966. In the first eight months of 1967, permits were issued for 16,443 dwelling units. Allowing for the seasonal drop-off, it seems likely that 1967 will be well below 1966.

The campaign white paper also said, "Tear down the 400,000 slum apartments which have infested the city since the turn of the century."

What happened? The City went on a rehabilitation kick. This was to be the new nostrum. Even though it should have been perfectly obvious to his staff that it would cost much more than new construction, Mayor Lindsay was induced to fall for the farce known as instant rehabilitation.

Jason Nathan, the administrator of Housing and Development, presided at the highly publicized ceremony marking the opening of the first instant rehab of an old law tenement. Later, when the Federal government publicly dismissed instant rehabilitation as worthless, Mr. Nathan was 3,000 miles away in Portland, Oregon, making a speech about how housing should be administered.

The one bright light in Mayor Lindsay's housing picture was Charles Moerdler, a compulsive achiever, a man for whom there was apparently no place in a consolidated set-up. Well, Moerdler is gone. And we have consolidation. But five months later we still did not have Uniforms on Building Inspectors, One Stop Plans Review, Consolidated Inspection Staffs, Cyclical Inspection, Objective Standards for Housing Inspection, or any of the solid reforms pushed by Moerdler.

HUMAN RESOURCES ADMINISTRATION

Re-reading the City Club testimony on consolidation of the Welfare Department into the new Human Resources Administration we noted the following: "Merely putting existing programs under an enlarged bureaucracy holds little promise of a solution. It would save money and accomplish no less to turn the whole program over to the Welfare Department, which seems to have in Commissioner Ginsberg a qualified executive."

In the language of the season, when Mayor Lindsay brought Mitchell Sviridoff to New York, he hailed him as a mighty ground gainer. Unfortunately, when Sviridoff became separated from the political organization and labor unions which had been running interference for him in New Haven, he faded as a scoring threat. He surrounded himself with many highly touted specialists in public administration and perhaps will take some of them with him when he joins the Ford Foundation, from where he will try to call the signals on poverty from a less exposed position.

The Sviridoff problem seems to have been that after the extreme build-up, miracles were unfairly expected of him. We suspect the program itself was not sound. There does not seem to be an adequate unifying theory behind the poverty program, national or local. Usually, the absence of a sound basic concept means a program is foredoomed to failure. Like the tendency to make all decisions at the highest possible level, one of the mysterious obliquities of governmental practice is that the bureaucrats never seem to hesitate to set up an elaborate organization before having a sound plan for what to do with it and what it should do. Government often acts as if the setting up of an organization were the rite which would solve the problem. The City very likely does not have the power to deal adequately with the deep-seated social problem of poverty. Mayor Lindsay should say so, or come up with a new theory and plan. He should not imply that it will somehow be solved by medicine men called "urbanists."

No doubt this little essay could cause Mayor Lindsay considerable annoyance. We hope it won't and that instead he will re-examine his administration to see where and how improvements can be made. As an eager intellectual who came late to the field of administration, our Mayor has been fascinated by its scientific aspects, and assumes that those who observe its complexities and talk its language are also able to produce the results which he wants. But the critic is

not the playwright, and the researcher not the manager. As businessmen know, administration is also a craft or field, with so many controlling variables that it defies exact theoretical prescriptions. Consider for a moment the miracle of human motivation which can compensate for almost any shortcoming in training or equipment. In Vietnam a powerfully motivated peasantry holds in stalemate the richest and strongest nation in the history of the world.

The vocabulary of public administration experts is full of phrases like "coordination of responsibility," "span of control," "sound alignment of functions," "delegation of responsibility." But one word is sometimes missing. It is "accountability," without which no administrative scheme is worth the paper it is written on. Unless the head of government demands full performance toward the established goal, and penalizes non-performance, talk about scientific management is meaningless. And unless his own staff is able to provide him with a regular accounting of work accomplished, he cannot manage for results. Fiorenzo LaGuardia was himself the best judge of the quality and quantity of work to be expected. Since this is apparently not yet John Lindsay's strong suit, he must have deputies on his own staff with the most sophisticated knowledge of capability upon whom he can rely.

Mayor Lindsay stands today amidst a total lack of achievement in housing and redevelopment. Failures also exist in other areas. What is to be learned? We have some suggestions:

Despite the laudatory recent articles in *The New Yorker* and the *New York Times Sunday Magazine*, Mayor Lindsay's inner circle does not seem to be adequate to enforce accountability for performance from the various departments and agencies.

We must have goals for every department and agency and our mayor should add to the City Hall leadership those who can give meaning to that most important of highest level management mandates—accountability.

There is a natural tendency of public officials not to stir up the quiet sectors. No one can really blame an elected official for coming to believe that the appearance of things is more important than their true condition. Yet we cannot help feel that now, when the first half of his four-year term is almost over, is the time for Mayor Lindsay to take stock. Non-achievers in high posts should be replaced with committed achievers. Even if such people stir things up a bit too much for City Hall comfort and may occasionally be hard to live with, they are the people we need if work is to be done and if problems are not merely to be covered with mimeograph paper.

We believe that Mayor Lindsay has the capacity to learn rapidly and that these first two years could be followed by two years of high and "hard" achievement.

VIETNAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, on his recent visit to Vietnam, described the war there by stating, and I quote:

This is our great adventure, and a wonderful one it is.

It should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that the Vice President of the United States was not speaking for the American people when he made his remarks. He was not speaking for the American

soldiers, he was not speaking for the South Vietnamese, he was not speaking for this Congress, or at least I doubt that he was doing so.

The question is, Who was he speaking for when he described the bloody and frustrating war there, just as Webster does in the dictionary, as "a stirring experience, of a romantic nature"?

The war in Vietnam is not a great adventure for our fighting men. It is a final adventure for far too many of them.

It is not romantic for the parents of the fighting men; it is heart rending and fearful.

It is not wonderful for the wives and children of those sacrificed there. It is a lonesome, anxious, terrible, and sometimes eternal vigil for those who live to suffer their losses of their loved ones.

Our business is to make history—

The Vice President went on to say.

It's wonderful to make it, make history in your own way and your own time—

He added.

The kindest thing I can say for our Vice President in this instance, Mr. Speaker, is that he was not talking for the parents, the soldiers, the wives and children of America, but for himself. And if this is true, I suggest that the President of the United States confine his Vice President to future travels within the continental limits of the United States.

If one of our national leaders feels war is an exhilarating, somewhat frivolous adventure, and says so in the presence of those we are trying to encourage to participate more fully in the war for freedom, he is doing a disservice to his country and his fellow Americans on the battlefield.

We have enough contention at home concerning our efforts in Vietnam, an effort I support now that our fighting men are committed to the battlefield. We do not need, nor should we tolerate, international joyriders touring foreign lands on our behalf, spreading gladdidings about the "great adventure" we are engaged in. It is a fight for freedom, and to quote the President of the United States, "a fight for survival." What is so funny about Vietnam, then, Mr. Speaker; what is so great and adventuresome? I repeat, the place for our gung-ho Vice President is not overseas, yapping about making history with someone else's sons. He belongs back in Washington, explaining what he meant and why he considers war such a great adventure.

HYDE PARK CO-OP A PATTERN FOR THE NATION

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the *Record* and include extraneous matter concerning the Hyde Park Co-op.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Hyde Park, in the district it is my privilege and my honor to represent, is Hyde Park. It is Hyde Park in a singular numerical sense, since though there are other communities by that name scat-

tered over this universe of ours, none has similarity in universality, depth in the art of being pleasantly articulate, and the knack of achievement in neighborly living together and blending the everyday chores of existence with the gainful pursuit of the arts and cultures, comparable to that of Hyde Park on Lake Michigan on the South Side of the city of Chicago.

Charles P. Schwartz, Jr., is president of the Hyde Park Cooperative Society, Inc., which has a membership of 10,334 families and in the current year has done a merchandizing business of \$6,117,499, has declared a 4-percent dividend on common stock, and distributed a 3-percent patronage refund on member patronage during the last fiscal year. The patronage refunds payable in cash totaled \$136,887. In brief, the Hyde Park Cooperative Society has been a huge success.

President Charles P. Schwartz, Jr., writes me:

I know you are familiar with the Co-op and its unique success in bringing together people to fill a common need. While such an organization may not succeed in every neighborhood, I think it is reassuring today to see that people of modest means can combine together for a mutual benefit. I am sure it would be welcomed by the Co-op members, and perhaps useful to others in various parts of the country, to have public mention of the Co-op's success.

Mr. Speaker, with this thought I am in full agreement. I am sure my colleagues throughout the Nation will find in the success story of the Hyde Park Co-op an inspiration for the commencement of similar undertakings in their respective districts. As Mr. Schwartz suggests such an organization may not succeed in every neighborhood, but with the same dedication and the industry of the founders of the Hyde Park Co-op I venture the prediction that a Co-op on the pattern of that in Hyde Park would succeed in most American neighborhoods.

By unanimous consent, and with the confident hope that it will provide a chart for other American communities throughout our Nation, I am extending my remarks to recite the success story of the Hyde Park Co-op as told in excerpts from the 1967 annual report of the society and from the articles in the mid-October 1967, issue of *Evergreen*, the society's publication. I quote from the president's annual report by Mr. Schwartz:

THE PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Last year combined progress with problems of operations, expansion and debate among the membership. While many of these conditions continue, each Co-op member should be proud of the way in which their Society and its staff have been meeting challenges such as—

Higher food prices and rising operating costs.

Sales volume that often pushes your store to capacity.

Operating difficulties and merchandise shortages created by record snow storms and truckers' strikes.

Starting the new FORM Scandinavian furniture store to offer quality furniture at reasonable prices.

Debates within the membership upon a variety of operating policies and the possible role of the Co-op outside of its previous activities.

Revision of the role of Co-op committees and creation of a practical method to submit controversial issues to a referendum vote of the entire membership.

Grocery store: This operation has continued its past success and we have adequate financial resources.

Our rate of profit last year was relatively good despite the factors listed above and efforts to maintain lower prices. . . .

Prices charged by the Co-op are regularly examined so that the store remains competitive on an overall basis, offering good value for "one stop" convenient shopping. Our weekly specials remain in effect for a full week and unlike competitors, do not compel shoppers to concentrate their buying on the weekend period. Shoppers receive a real bonus every shopping day through the "Everyday Low Prices" program which covers a number of high volume popular items. These prices are often below cost, so only a small proportion of our goods can be priced so low. There is also a general desire for the Store to carry a wide range of goods, and this assortment is bound to include higher, as well as lower priced items. However, through our unique, "price per ounce or unit" signs, shoppers are able to compare the values offered. Your store is apparently still the only one in the nation to offer this service.

The Society has previously considered opening a second grocery store but no site has been located that seems suitable in terms of consumer demand or the elements needed for success. . . .

Furniture store: FORM, your Scandinavian furniture store, opened soon after Labor Day and has met widespread praise. It will provide quality furniture at reasonable prices and thereby fill significant needs for our community and the general Chicago area. FORM is patterned after a successful operation by the Greenbelt (Washington, D.C.) Co-op which is providing us with valuable consulting services. . . .

Other Services: FORM is the Society's largest venture outside the grocery field. However, the Co-op has helped a number of other activities, although none are directly part of the Society. The list includes the Credit Union, Fuel Co-op, Chicago Memorial Association and Sitter's Swap. . . .

Community activities: The Society has always sought to participate in and support worthwhile community organizations and activities. Special functions such as the annual book sale for Worldwide Co-op Partners and the UNICEF card sale have raised significant sums for charitable contributions outside our own area. Last year contributions were made to help establish a co-op amongst California farm workers who were seeking improved living conditions; and to co-operative activities to help victims of the Italian floods.

The Society is supporting, for a second year, a joint project with the Cooperative League to provide educational and organizational assistance to neighbors in Hyde Park, Kenwood-Oakland and Woodlawn. This program, conducted by William Stewart, has sought to reach residents directly and to help them help themselves in areas such as ending overcharging on the sale of substandard merchandise in local stores. Consumer groups such as buying clubs have been organized which can reduce the cost of living. Information is also provided about activities such as credit unions.

GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT

Mr. Speaker, Gilbert Spencer is the efficient and popular general manager of the Hyde Park Co-op and Mrs. Linnea Anderson, the education director. Mrs. Anderson and her distinguished husband, Douglas Anderson, associated with Senator Paul Douglas for 18 years as his Chicago representative, have been moti-

vating forces of dynamic influence in the growth of the co-op since the days of its organization. The directors are President Schwartz, Vice President F. Raymond Marks, Jr., Secretary Colette Rasmussen—Mrs. Richard—Treasurer Frank T. Okita, David Badal, Florence Goldwasser—Mrs. Eugene—Jetta Jones—Mrs. James—Henry McGee, Dorothy Sandberg—Mrs. Glen H.—and alternates Dr. Andrew Thomas and Nathaniel Blackman, Jr., William J. Stevens, is the co-op's attorney.

I quote from the annual report of General Manager Gilbert Spencer:

Our Society completed another successful year on July 29, 1967. Your Board of Directors is recommending a 4% dividend on common stock and a 3% patronage refund on member patronage recorded for last fiscal year. 3% is the very maximum refund rate that earnings of \$228,000 for last year will permit. Earnings were down from the high peak of the prior year because expenses were higher in 1966-1967 and sales of \$6,117,000 increased only \$98,000 or 1.6%. Contractual wages were higher and productivity dropped slightly due to inefficiencies resulting from labor turnover and the fact that applicants with experience are generally unavailable. Also, legal expenses were abnormally high last year and we absorbed nearly \$20,000 of expenses incurred in the developing of our new Scandinavian furniture operation, FORM.

FORM, located on the north end of Harper Court, at 52nd Street and Harper Ave., opened for business on September 8th, nearly six weeks after the beginning of our current fiscal year. We projected average weekly sales of \$10,000 per week for the remainder of this fiscal year. Actual sales during the opening weeks were nearly double this figure and the enthusiastic comments of members and others visiting FORM indicate that sales may average above our estimates for this year. We were fortunate to have had the services of Bob Gowell, manager of Scan, and his design staff headed by Frits Moltke-Hoff in developing our furniture operation. They, with our manager, Barbara Goede, have created our unique and attractive Scandinavian furniture shop.

Although the Hyde Park Cooperative Society now has two operations, the supermarket and FORM, patronage refunds will be based on your total co-op purchases. . . .

Our Balance Sheet, Statement of Assets and Liabilities, indicates that our financial position is sound. Member investment and reserves account for a high proportion of total assets. Working capital was reduced appreciably last year due to investment of accumulated cash savings in our furniture store. Our total cash and savings deposits were \$400,000 as of the close of last fiscal year (July 29, 1967) but \$200,000, half of this, will be paid out in the next few months in patronage refunds, dividends on shares, deposits to employees' savings-sharing trust and in income taxes. This will leave our Co-op with adequate working capital but minimal savings for further growth.

ENTHUSIASTIC CONSUMER RESPONSE

Mrs. Mary Louise Stauffer, reporting on the enthusiastic consumer response to FORM, writes:

Our new furniture store in Harper Court, FORM, opened September 8th and has been bustling ever since. Both member and public response were enthusiastic beyond all our expectations. Co-op members, not only from the Southside, but from all parts of the city, have come to visit FORM and to make both small and large purchases. At this writing, re-orders have already been placed for several pieces of furniture.

We are pleased that our original objective of bringing a very fine line—and a most complete one, too—of Scandinavian furniture to Chicago, at very reasonable prices, is being met. Thus can we, as a cooperative, continue to find new ways of offering new and needed consumer services.

At the stockholder's annual meeting of the Harper Court Foundation, treasurer Bruce Sagan reported that FORM is one of the best things to happen to Harper Court. He pointed out that FORM, even at this early date, is a great traffic builder for the other merchants. FORM also has on display potted plants from Plants Alive, children's books from Acasa, a stereo from the Fret Shop, drapery panels from Wall and Window and bedspreads from Fabyar. FORM is also displaying children's books from its 53rd street neighbor, the Accent shop. In the future, FORM hopes to be able to work closely with other neighborhood merchants.

CREDIT UNION DAY

October 19 was International Credit Union Day, and in recognition of that day Evergreen comments:

In 1849, Friedrich Wilhelm Raiffeisen, mayor of the tiny German Village of Flammersfeld, founded the first credit union to save his villagers from usurers and loan sharks. Membership was limited to the inhabitants of Flammersfeld, who knew each other intimately. By pooling the village savings, a fund was created for making low-cost loans to responsible villagers, thus freeing them from exploitation.

The same principle guides our credit unions today—to the confusion of loan sharks and high-cost finance companies. In helping ourselves through our cooperative credit society, we are building a living, ever-growing monument to Friedrich Wilhelm Raiffeisen.

CO-OP A COMMUNITY INSTITUTION

Hyde Park Co-op, with over 10,000 member families, is a community institution interested in pretty much everything that happens in Hyde Park. Here is the program for the semiannual membership meeting on October 26, 1967:

AGENDA

At 6:30 p.m.: United Nations Buffet Dinner.

At 7:30 p.m.: Meeting called to order by Charles Schwartz, President.

Approval of Minutes of Semi-Annual Meeting of April 27, 1967.

Introduction of Parliamentarian: William J. Stevens, Attorney.

Report by the President: Charles Schwartz.

Report by the General Manager: Gilbert Spencer.

Distribution of Earnings by the Treasurer: Frank T. Okita.

Discussion of above reports.

Presentation of Resolutions:

(1) Alan and Lois Dobry: "Resolutions presented at meeting without previous notice" . . .

(2) Shirley Lens: "Peace and other neighborhood organizations be granted the right to have tables for petitions, etc., in store" . . .

(3) John Rossen: "An immediate end to American participation in the war in Vietnam and immediate withdrawal and return of all American military personnel" . . .

(4) Richard Murray: "Negotiate a loan for at least \$10,000 to East Garfield Park Co-operative Assn. for instigation of small grocery store" . . .

Discussion and vote on above Resolutions.

Movie: "This is a Cooperative."

New business and adjournment.

HYDE PARK IS ARTICULATE

Mr. Speaker, I close with this quotation from President Schwartz' report:

Many of these events reflect the maturity and success of the co-op. . . . Differences

of opinion are inevitable in all such efforts, especially in our articulate community.

Hyde Park is an articulate community. Perhaps that is the reason for its greatness and of the success of the Hyde Park Co-op.

FLOOD INSURANCE

Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYATT] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYATT, Mr. Speaker, in the last two decades the State of Oregon has had the unfortunate occasion to experience the wild ravages of the forces of nature several times. Most of these disasters were floods.

Just 3 years ago at Christmas a heavy snowfall followed by sudden warming created flood conditions so critical that certain parts of the State were named national disaster areas. This is why I have carefully studied possible areas of flood relief, and why I have introduced flood insurance legislation and have worked diligently for its passage.

Floods wreak terrible damage, and, although the toll in lives lost directly and through associated disease are bad, the damage to the property of uninsured individuals generally makes up far and away the greatest proportion of loss.

In flood-prone areas those persons who most need financial protection from the dangers of flooding are the least likely to have that protection. Either they are classified as absolutely uninsurable, or the rates are so exorbitant as to be prohibitive.

The National Flood Insurance Act of 1967, passed this past week by the House of Representatives, is a marked step toward providing some measure of financial security for those families finding themselves in flood-prone areas.

Admittedly, this measure is just a first step. But it is a long step and an important one on the way to providing flood-threatened individuals with the protection and security they should and must have.

Together with our rapid advancement in the field of flood control through strategically located dams and water reservoirs, the National Flood Insurance Act of 1967 should be looked upon as another great stride forward in protecting the people of this Nation, both physically and financially from the crippling effects of natural disasters.

HOSMER STATEMENT IN ABM HEARINGS

Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter and tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER, Mr. Speaker, following is the statement I am making today to the Subcommittee on Military Applications of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy which is holding hearings reviewing the anti-ballistic-missile system issue:

In 1966 the Pentagon estimated the USSR then had 340 ICBMs. Estimated additions to

TABLE I

Yearly additional rate	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973
200.....	540	740	940	1,140	1,340	1,540	1,740
300.....	640	940	1,240	1,540	1,840	-----	-----
400.....	740	1,140	1,540	1,940	-----	-----	-----

It makes little difference whether these additions are in ICBM configuration or take the form of orbiting weapons. In either event they will carry large hydrogen warheads and their purpose is the same.

The precise reason the Soviets maintain, improve and expand their strategic nuclear system is to be able to make a surprise attack which so severely damages us that our retaliatory forces are rendered incapable of hitting back with unacceptable destruction. The fact they continue to spend billions of rubles on this system makes it obvious they intend to use it when it can be employed successfully on its offensive mission.

The precise reason we maintain our strategic nuclear system is to deter such an attack. Deterrence is a defensive maneuver and its success depends on obviously being able to suffer such an attack and still have sufficient undamaged surviving weapons to impose unacceptable retaliatory destruction on the attacker's homeland.

Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara properly points out that the keystone of deterrence is a capability to "absorb any surprise nuclear attack and to retaliate with sufficient strength to destroy the attacking nation as a viable society." He believes this involves not so much the atomic punch of our warheads as it does laying them down with precision on their targets. He feels it depends not so much on the number of our missiles as it does their survivability. He contends survivability does not necessarily require ABMs to intercept enemy warheads, but that what is important is hardened ICBM sites capable of withstanding the explosions and functioning afterward.

He promises—and has convinced President Johnson—that enough of our strikeback strength will survive any conceivable attack to impose "assured destruction." As the Soviets come closer and closer to us in numerical parity, more and more of the validity of his promise turns whether they are using warheads sufficiently powerful to penetrate our hardened silos and destroy our ICBMs.

In announcing the Soviet orbital system last Friday Mr. McNamara again contended that Soviet yields are in the 1 to 3 megaton range—insufficient to penetrate our silos. He refuses to recognize the Soviet penchant for large yields in the 10 MT to 30 MT range, or the superior thrust of their rockets which enables them to carry the more powerful warheads—presumably capable of penetrating and destroying our ICBMs in their silos. Nor, have I ever heard him admit that even if he is right about Soviet yields at this moment, there is any guarantee that tomorrow their strategic nuclear system cannot or will not be retro-fitted with the larger warheads.

Secretary McNamara surely cannot speak about today's Soviet warheads with any more verity than his Joint Chiefs of Staff who apparently disagree with him on the issue. Nor can he speak with any more assurance about future Soviet warheads than

this arsenal range from 200 to 400 per year. The US has 1000 silo-based Minuteman missiles and 54 Titan II's—1054 landbased missiles. Roughly 400 of its 656 Polaris missiles can be assumed to be on station at any one time. Thus the total of available US strategic missiles is 1454 and this figure remains steady. Depending on Soviet rate of additions, the Table I indicates when the Soviets will achieve numerical parity and thereafter superiority:

even members of this Joint Committee and others privy to the same intelligence estimates that he is.

As the trend toward parity continues it becomes increasingly important to determine—as best we can—whether or not, utilizing the proper yield warheads, a Soviet surprise attack at numerical parity actually will leave us an undamaged "assured destruction" capability. For the purpose we must assume continued improvements in their guidance will bring accuracy to within around 2000 feet and it is reasonable to assume their force has been programmed against our 1054 landbased ICBMs, locations of which are known.

Under these circumstances the Rand Corporation's "Bomb Damage Effect Computer" calculates a 92% destruction probability—destruction of 970 of our 1054 land-based ICBMs, leaving 84 undamaged to retaliate.

It can be assumed our 25 Polaris submarines actually at sea with about 400 Polaris missiles will be subject to some attrition from a fairly large number of Soviet submarines and other attackers. To round out calculations generously we can assume 79%—316 Polaris missiles—will actually get away on retaliatory missions.

Our total retaliatory force will thus be 400 missiles with what generally are assumed to be 1 megaton warheads. If the Soviet ABM defense system is only 50% effective, 200 will get through to their targets.

Will that 200 impose "assured destruction"?

The answer does not require revelation of national secrets. It can be done with substantial confidence using the laws of probability. We can assume that all 1454 of our missiles are targeted for destruction of the Soviet Union, because any lesser assumption simply decreases the retaliatory damage calculation about to be made. It also is logical to assume the 100% destruction mission will be divided proportionately between land-based and Polaris missiles according to their respective ratios in the stockpile, 72% and 28%, and that they will be destructive in the same relationship as the number reaching target is to the total available the moment before surprise attack—7.9% for landbased missiles and 39.5% for Polaris. Damage calculations are shown on table II.

TABLE II

[In percent]

	Planned damage	Missiles on target	Actual damage
Land based.....	72	7.9	5.7
Polaris.....	28	39.5	11.1
Total.....	100	-----	16.8

Prior to World War II the USSR lost 10% to 15% of its population during the purges. During WWII it lost over 13% of its popu-

lation. From the Soviet viewpoint it is questionable whether a 16.8% population loss from retaliation would be unacceptable and therefore constitute "assured destruction." In WWII the USSR suffered a total loss of 40% of its industrial capacity. By comparison it might regard a 16.8% loss to be a bargain-basement price for world domination.

I anticipate a quarrel with my figures by claims that our arsenal has a large "over-kill" capability and several missiles may be assigned to the same target, thus "assuring" destruction. It will be said there are about 150 city-industrial complexes in the USSR worth hitting, so that starts us with about 10 bombs in stockpile for each—and if 200 get through, that still allows 1½ per complex to assure destruction.

My answer is straightforward. In assuming that 200 missiles penetrated Soviet defenses, I assumed that all were assigned to the city-industrial complexes. Actually not less than 25% would likely be assigned to purely military targets. That leaves 150—one per complex. Further, it is unreasonable to assume that ICBMs are perfect and there would be no malfunctioning. It is more realistic to assume 5% loss for rocket power failures, another 5% for guidance system troubles, another 5% for warhead defects, then allow 5% more for post-attack human judgment degradation at our retaliatory command and control centers, and another 5% loss to account for Soviet civil defense. This totals another 25% and leaves only 100 missiles, ⅔ of a missile per complex. Since complexes actually should need about 4 warheads to accomplish the 100% destruction we assumed, that means the remaining warheads will account for but 25 complexes—whether by 25% destruction of 100 complexes, 100% destruction of 25 complexes, or some combination in between. Thus, since 25 complexes is 16.8% of the 150 complexes started with—destruction amounts only to .2% difference from the 16.8% figure arrived at by another route and the refutation of my calculations does not stand up.

I also anticipate an effort to attack my calculations by asserting they neglect MIRV. This is a "Multiple Individual Re-entry Vehicle" package attaching more than one warhead to a missile. But since the Russians are as smart technically as we are there is no validity to a contention that they are not also going to MIRV and thereby cancelling out whatever advantage we might otherwise anticipate. And, since they are blessed with rockets capable of carrying larger payloads than ours, there is no assurance they just might pack more warheads per delivery vehicle than us and gain an advantage.

My conclusion is that we should (1) be adding to our numbers of ICBMs; (2) we should be putting in an ABM system against the Soviets, not just the Chinese; (3) we should not phase out the B-52s and B-58s, which I did not include in this discussion and which may well be the balance of power on our side at this moment making deterrence work; and, (4) we should be analyzing whether a second mission for the orbiting weapon is to knock out any antiballistic missile system we put in, and thereby clear the way for a rain of Soviet ICBMs to follow.

It is interesting to note that decisions affecting nuclear deterrence which a President makes on the advice of his Defense Secretary and others probably will not affect the strategic power of the nation during his term of office. But they may largely determine the degree of strategic superiority—or inferiority—available to his successor.

This is an ironic fact of life in the nuclear age. The decisions made by President Eisenhower gave President Kennedy the opportunity to build superior weapons systems. The decisions President Kennedy and President Johnson have made may determine whether their successors have the opportunity to build superior strategic systems to defend the nation. If they have made mis-

takes, their administrations will not suffer for it, but in the future the nation may be hard pressed to cope with nuclear blackmail or even a disastrous surprise attack.

WHAT SECRETARY McNAMARA FAILED TO TELL ABOUT THE SOVIET ORBITING WEAPON

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, over 5 months ago many more details about the Soviet orbiting weapon were revealed than Secretary McNamara disclosed in his Friday press conference. These were contained in the May 29, 1967, issue of the American Security Council's Washington Report. The article was written by the exceptionally well-informed Dr. Steffan T. Possony, of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University. For the information of the Congress and of the public I have obtained unanimous consent for the republication of Possony's statement below.

It is to be noted that McNamara inexplicably designates the weapon as FOBS—fractional orbital missile system—while the Soviet call it by the code name Scrag, a word which the dictionary defines as meaning "to wring the neck of; also to garotte."

A most vital disclosure by Possony is that the Scrag warhead in orbital configuration would have a 30-megaton warhead, presumably sufficient to penetrate our hardened ICBM silos, ruin our ICBM missiles and thus destroy our retaliatory capacity. Despite Soviet capabilities with this size warhead and larger, and the ability of their rocket motors to hoist them, McNamara continues to insist that Scrag warhead yields are only in the 1- to 3-megaton range. I believe he does so less with assured knowledge of the yield than he does wishfully, to support his continued claims that we do not need an IBM system for protection because our missile silos are so strong they cannot be penetrated.

During McNamara's Friday press conference a hint was tossed out that, if anything, Scrag was designed to suppress our manned bombers by catching them on the ground with only a 3-minute attack warning. A more pertinent speculation might be that Scrag would be put not only to that mission but two more in the following sequence: First, to destroy the acquisition radar of any antiballistic-missile system we might install, that is, function as an anti-ABM weapon; and, second, to destroy our retaliatory ICBM's in their silos.

That Secretary McNamara has chosen not only to rename Scrag as FOBS and then depreciate its possible adverse effect on American security, while at one and the same time enunciate a legal brief for Soviet development of such a weapon is amazing and regrettable. Had we developed such a system and the

Soviet Secretary of Defense announced it similarly he would have been put up against a wall and shot instantly.

Full details about Scrag disclosed by Possony and which Secretary McNamara withheld are as followed:

SCRAG: THE WEAPON OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION

For several years now, American strategists have been debating the question of whether it would be useful to develop or deploy nuclear space weapons. Space weapons, notably bombs or radiation weapons, could be built but need not be orbited before the onset of a crisis; or they could be deployed in orbit to win cold or hot conflicts through space mastery, just as during the 19th century Britain was able to prevail through its dominion of the high seas.

The dominant Washington attitude has been that space weapons offer no advantages over conventional ICBM's. Some scientists have even argued that a space weapon is a "stupid weapon" because it is more expensive, less accurate, and less usable than the weapon which, according to their uncritical assumption, it replaces, namely the long-range missile. (This was the classical argument of the gun against the airplane and of the airplane against the missile. Incidentally, new weapons usually do not "replace" old weapons, but the new and the old arms join in novel combinations of mutually-supporting systems.)

As usual, when the American strategic community indulges in flights of fancy and tries to prove that a plausible weapon is neither feasible nor advisable, or in any event is too expensive, the Soviets just move forward and produce the weapon which our conformist chorus denigrates.

In the present instance, the Soviets did something which no one expected: they came up with a weapon which can be used as a normal ICBM or as a space bomb or, for good measure, as a fractional orbital weapon. This three-stage triple-in-one Soviet weapon code-named "Scrag" was announced by Brezhnev on July 4, 1965 and first exhibited on November 7, 1965.

By the end of 1966, some characteristics of this remarkable instrument had become known. According to the best presently available information, Scrag, used as an ICBM, could carry a 50 MT warhead; in its orbital configuration, the warhead would have a yield of 30 MT. The yield of the sub-orbital assembly is unknown, but it may be estimated at about 40 MT. It is probable that with some reduction of overall yield, all Scrag configurations, including the orbital assembly, can be fitted for the delivery of multiple warheads. (The Soviets may not have full test-validated data on space configurations for the Scrag, hence, there could be some "bugs" yet in the weapon.)

In terms of firepower, one orbital Scrag is the equivalent of 20-30 of our Minutemen Missiles. One ICBM-Scrag equals more than five Titan II or 50 Minutemen. A major technological surprise, therefore, has been achieved by the Soviets, contrary to the often-voiced Pentagon conviction that significant surprises no longer are likely.

The information about this new threat became known at the very time when the United States was signing a treaty outlawing space weapons. The information was soft-pedaled, lest it disturb our greatest venture in space diplomacy. The widely acclaimed and rarely analyzed treaty was sent to the Senate. Ratification was achieved by unanimous vote. Yet, the treaty provides no defense whatever against Scrag or other space weapons. On the contrary, it inhibits the U.S. from protecting itself against space attack.

The American press did not pick up this sensational counterpoint story. Hence, the American public never heard of Scrag and if

asked, might well confuse it with a new beach resort in Hawaii. It is even more disturbing that the present civilian "high command" of the Pentagon does not think Scrag is very important and needs to be neutralized by an ABM system adjusted to handle both orbital and missile warheads.

What are the additional capabilities which Scrag gives to the Soviet Union?

1. Though it is not too difficult to extend the range of missiles, each ICBM is essentially targeted against a few locations. By contrast, Scrag provides the Soviets with a genuine capability to hit every spot on earth, at very short notice.

2. In terms of target selection, missiles do not have the operational flexibility of a combined orbital, sub-orbital or ballistic system.

3. The presumed capability of Scrag to be fitted with single and multiple warheads renders this weapon effective against a whole spectrum of targets, ranging from strongly hardened pinpoint targets like missile and nuclear storage sites, to soft large targets like metropolitan clusters, and to numerous smaller and semi-hardened targets within a large area like industrial installations and airfields.

4. Soviet military thinking has been impressed by the idea that a major offensive should be run in three successive "waves" or blows. If the three different configurations of Scrag are fired simultaneously, the ICBM would hit after half-an-hour and the sub-orbital version after one-hour-and-a-half. The orbital bombs could be used for subsequent salvo, serial or individual attacks, at the discretion of the Soviet high command.

5. The orbital bombs also would be available as a strategic reserve, for days, weeks or months. Thus, they would provide the Soviets with an option to fight a short or a long nuclear war. If the U.S. has no defenses against the space threat and if it does not pursue an effective counter-force strategy, Scrag would be invulnerable while on the ground, in space, and on its target run. If so, the orbital bombs would be available after the so-called nuclear exchange in which the U.S. would have expended its nuclear weapons. In this case, these bombs would embody a war-winning nuclear monopoly.

6. The orbital weapons could be directed at targets that escaped destruction during the initial blow or at targets that were spared for the ultimate phase of the conflict. The weapons could be used to compel surrender, or else to punish the resister by destroying one city after the other. After surrender the space weapons would facilitate occupation, allowing the Communists to takeover, control or devastate the vanquished country.

7. Through simultaneous launch, the missiles and the sub-orbital configurations could be used to destroy American strategic power, whereas the orbital bombs would terminate and win the war. In a staggered-firing series, the Soviets could launch the orbital Scrag hours or days before the rest of their force is released. Whenever the Soviets estimate that a credible and overwhelming nuclear threat is enough to force us to our knees, they may be satisfied just to orbit the space bombs and rely on purely psychological effectiveness. But if a physical nuclear attack should become necessary, pre-launched Scrag could be used to negate existing warning systems and to execute very rapid pre-emptive counter-force strikes against the United States.

8. The sub-orbital and orbital Scrag provide the Soviets with a significant capability of detonating high-yield explosions at very high altitudes and through a drawn-out firing series to keep U.S. electronics and communications inoperable. With such a capability, they would be able to "pin down" our strike forces. Under certain circumstances and given certain assumptions, Scrag could be used for sustaining high-altitude X-ray screens, thus delaying or pre-

cluding retaliation. (High-altitude explosions could blind many millions of people. High-yield bombs launched from space would allow genocidal strategies.)

9. The new Scrag capability, notably the sub-orbital version, allows the Soviets to intervene with increasing effectiveness into local crises and to threaten any country that may take an anti-communist position. Further, the information on Scrag is still another item in our current intelligence regarding Soviet weapons that indicates the strategic balance is changing. This change—in the Soviets' favor—is one reason why the U.S.S.R. has not hesitated to intensify the Cold War.

10. Except perhaps for SLM systems, Scrag represents the first genuine global weapon in history. Once the U.S. has been neutralized or destroyed and provided a sufficient number of orbital warheads is left over, Scrag could force each heretofore free country to establish a Communist government and would ensure that this government remains obedient to Moscow. Scrag, therefore, is the optimal weapon for the completion of the world revolution and for the preservation of Communist world rule.

11. If the U.S.S.R. elects to orbit Scrag space bombs without a concomitant missile strike, the U.S., depending upon the magnitude of the unexpected Soviet space deployment, might suddenly find itself in a posture of accentuated military inferiority. (For example, 50 Scrag's may position 250 to 500 additional warheads.) Given present U.S. capabilities, the Scrag's could not be shot down; if we intercepted some of them, the Soviets might elect to regard such action as U.S. aggression. If upon a sudden Soviet space deployment, we attack the U.S.S.R. forthwith, regardless of whether we still have the strength to win, we could invite our own physical destruction. If we did not attack, the Soviets could destroy us politically. Thereupon, the orbital bombs could blackmail one country after the other. Ultimately, and entirely in accordance with the Kremlin's preference, the world revolution would be completed by "peaceful means."

Thus, Scrag will increase the effectiveness of nuclear psychological warfare, enhance the effectiveness of Soviet physical nuclear strategy; possibly deter or prevent counter-strikes and retaliation; conceivably maneuver the U.S. into self-destruction or surrender, as well as facilitate and perhaps bring about world conquest.

The Soviets are deploying Scrag simultaneously with their ABM weapons. The resulting strategic imbalance is dangerously aggravated by these other gaps in our own capabilities: Our erstwhile numerical superiority may be giving way to quantitative inferiority. Our Minutemen missiles allow only a very narrow target selection and are not capable of taking out strongly hardened or large area targets. We do not have up-to-date weapon systems for multiple or serial strikes, nor can we preserve portions of our main strikes forces as a strategic reserve. We are not prepared to fight a long war; once our bombers are completely obsolete, attrited, de-activated or destroyed in battle, we will lack a strategic system suited for winning the terminal phases of war. We also lack offensive and defensive space weapons. And we refuse to build defenses against missiles, and to protect three-quarters of our population against the hazards of nuclear war.

In summary: The United States is confronted by an entirely new and dramatically augmented threat. The ominous development of Scrag was not predicted by U.S. intelligence nor by U.S. computers, let alone by Messrs. McNamara and Brown. Since our country continues to see no evil and hear no evil, time is beginning to run very short. It just may be that we are too gullible too bemused, and too disinterested to survive.

STEFAN T. POSSONY,

Strategy and Military Affairs, Editor.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, during part of this afternoon I was in attendance at the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy's hearings on ABM defenses. These hearings were held in the New Senate Office Building, and it was impossible to interrupt my attendance at the hearings for all the frequently called votes in the House.

THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DENNEY] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill, the purpose of which is to provide the necessary machinery to prevent the needless destruction of one of our Nation's basic industries, the textile industry.

The impact of excessive cheap foreign imports has especially been felt by our domestic wool industry. This industry has experienced a severe depression since July of 1966 which continues unabated resulting in shorter work hours and adding to unemployment. There are over 300,000 woolgrowers in the United States and thousands of people in connected-service industries who are dependent upon them.

Mr. Speaker, the need for immediate action is apparent. For instance, imports of woven wool cloth, chief product of the wool textile industry in 1966 were 64 percent over those in 1961. In 1966 alone, cloth imports displaced about 20 million manhours of work in U.S. mills. Even my colleagues who would generally support the administration's viewpoint, must agree that this is not in keeping with the President's plea to create new jobs for our disadvantaged.

The source of imports of wool manufacturers has shifted rapidly to Japan and other oriental countries with low wage scales. For instance in 1966, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan accounted for about two-thirds of the imports of woven wool cloth. I find this fact especially disturbing in the case of Japan. As my colleagues know, this country has expended great amounts of money and effort in placing that country on its feet after World War II. However, now that Japan has recovered, although it seems willing to sell goods to this country, it has high protective barriers directed against American imports. Not only does it restrict imports, but economic policies are such that it denies substantial American equity investment in their domestic industries.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know,

we are still facing an increasing balance-of-payments problem. Excessive foreign imports contribute substantially to this deficit. In wool textiles and apparel alone, in 1961 imports exceeded exports by \$144 million. In 1966 this deficit soared to \$310 million. The figures become even greater when other segments of the textile industry are added.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of our Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], has already introduced similar legislation. It would be my hope that this entire problem could be explored in depth with the benefit of early hearings on the subject.

A copy of my bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles

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 "Textile Trade Act of 1967".

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that the program for orderly trade in textile articles instituted by the President in 1961 has not been fully implemented. Imports of textile articles have grown two and one-half times since that year, with particular concentration and disruption in certain areas. Such imports contribute to reduced employment opportunities for United States workers in the domestic textile industry. International agreements already exist for orderly trade in cotton textiles and numerous agreements between countries other than the United States exist for trade in textile articles of other fibers as well as cotton.

It is, therefore, declared to be the policy of Congress that access to the United States market for foreign produced textile articles should be on an equitable and orderly basis consistent with the maintenance of a strong and expanding United States textile industry and designed to avoid the disruption of United States markets and the unemployment of United States textile workers.

SEC. 3. The President is authorized and directed to undertake negotiations with other Governments for the purpose of consummating agreements to provide orderly trade in textile articles, including the quantitative limitation of imports of all such articles into the United States. Such agreements and the authority contained in section 4 shall limit the annual importation of each category of textile articles to the share of the United States consumption of such category supplied by imported textile articles during a representative historical period of not less than one calendar year prior to the year 1967, as determined by the President. Such representative historical period shall be the same for all countries and all categories of textile articles. The President shall have full authority to determine the share of total imports of any category of textile articles which may be supplied by any country to the United States on the basis of historical patterns of such imports, the interests of developing countries, and such other factors affecting trade in such categories as he deems appropriate.

SEC. 4. To effectuate the purposes of section 3, when agreements exist which cover a significant portion of the United States imports of textile articles, the President shall by proclamation limit the quantity of such articles designated by categories which may be imported from any country or countries not parties to such agreements.

SEC. 5. After one hundred and eighty days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the total quantity of imports of each category of textile articles not subject to an agreement or agreements negotiated pursuant to section

3 or to proclamations issued under section 4 shall be limited during any calendar year to the average annual quantity of such articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the six calendar years 1961-1966. The total quantities of any textile article which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the balance of the calendar year in which this section becomes effective shall be equal to that proportionate share of the average annual imports of such article for the years 1961-1966 which the number of days remaining in the calendar year bears to three hundred and sixty-five. Beginning with the calendar year following the year in which this section becomes effective the total quantity of any category of textile articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption in that year and each succeeding calendar year shall be increased or decreased by an amount corresponding to the increase or decrease (if more than 5 per centum) in the United States consumption of such category during the preceding calendar year compared with the year previous thereto, except that the amount of such increase in any category of textile article which may be entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during any calendar years shall not exceed 10 per centum of the amount of such increase in United States consumption of such category.

SEC. 6. Nothing contained in this Act shall affect in any way quantitative import limitations established pursuant to international agreements, either multilateral or bilateral, which were in effect on July 1, 1967, so long as such agreements remain in force and effect and are enforced by the United States in a manner which controls imports to the minimum amounts permitted under such agreements.

SEC. 7. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "textile articles" includes top, yarn, fabric, apparel, man-made staple fiber, filaments, and filament yarns, and all other textile manufactures, whether spun, woven, knit, felted, bonded, or otherwise manufactured of cotton, wool, or man-made fiber, or any combination or blend thereof or in combination with other fibers.

(b) The term "category" means a type or class of textile articles such as staple, yarn, fabric, apparel, made up goods, or other article, whether based on count, construction, style, weight, value, or other characteristics.

(c) The term "textile industry" includes all establishments engaged in the production of textile articles.

SEC. 8. The President may issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

FARMERS COME TO DEMONSTRATE

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ZWACH] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, quite recently there was a peace demonstration here in Washington by—what the Defense Department estimated to be—35,000 people. When the demonstration was over some 400 demonstrators had been jailed and the taxpayers had a million dollar bill to pay for extra police and cleanup operations.

By contrast, on August 16, 35,400 farm folk gathered at Des Moines, Iowa, under the auspices of the National Farmers Organization. It was a moving demonstra-

tion, a demonstration very different from other demonstrations which have occurred in the United States during recent years.

Mr. Speaker, in order to share with my colleagues the contrast between this farm demonstration and other demonstrations held in our country, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point an article by Msgr. Edward W. O'Rourke, which appeared in the St. Cloud Visitor of November 3, 1967:

NFO MEETS: 35,400 FARMERS COME TO DEMONSTRATE

(By Msgr. Edward W. O'Rourke)

On Aug. 16, 35,400 farm folk gathered at Des Moines under the auspices of the National Farmers Organization. This was the largest meeting of farmers which has ever taken place. But, it was more—it was a moving demonstration, a demonstration very different from other demonstrations which have occurred in the United States during recent years.

Most demonstrations are organized as protests—against the war in Vietnam, against racial discrimination, unfair labor practices, etc. Those who gathered at Des Moines on Aug. 16 came to protest unfair farm prices. But they had a more positive purpose, too. They came to pledge cooperation in a nationwide effort to bargain for better prices.

Many demonstrations are unruly and loud. 35,400 farm folk came and went from Des Moines in perfect order, without a single unpleasant incident.

Many demonstrators are unkempt, unclean and freakish in their appearance and conduct. The men and women who came to Des Moines on August 16 were clean-shaven, neatly dressed and well-mannered.

Most demonstrations are noisy and brief shows by a very small group. The NFO demonstration in Des Moines was a massive meeting which lasted 6 hours. Many of the participants had ridden buses for 10 to 14 hours en route to Des Moines; they sat in a sweltering auditorium for 6 hours and then boarded their buses for the long ride home.

The 35,400 farm folk who came to Des Moines on Aug. 16 had something to say. Everything about them and their meeting indicates that they deserve a hearing.

This is what I heard these folks say on Aug. 16: We consider farming a way of life and intend to preserve the family farm system. We want prices which will pay the cost of production and a fair profit. We are convinced that the Government cannot or will not give us such prices; we intend to bargain together to obtain them. If necessary, we shall resort to a massive holding action of all major farm commodities as a means to bargain for fair prices.

I am convinced that these 35,400 persons deserve a hearing. First and foremost, the farmers of our nation should listen to them. Either they should join in the bargaining effort planned or come forward immediately with a better plan. To procrastinate or to do nothing is completely unreasonable.

All members of the NFO should listen. A massive holding action will succeed only if a very large number of farmers hold their products. Members of the NFO must either convince their neighbors to join the NFO or in some legitimate way to support the proposed bargaining effort.

Leaders of other farm organizations should listen. It must be apparent to all openminded observers that a rapidly growing and very large number of farmers want to bargain for fair prices. Any farm organization which fails to meet this need will probably lose members.

Officials in Washington should listen. They have done little to serve the needs of the folk

who met in Des Moines on Aug. 16. These are hard-working, loyal U.S. citizens. They deserve more understanding and better service from their government.

American consumers should listen. Farmers deserve better prices. Consumers must be willing to pay accordingly.

I pray that the great demonstration in Des Moines on Aug. 16 will lead to an accomplishment of the just cause which 35,400 good people proposed that day.

SALUTE TO THE GRANGE

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ZWACH] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the fact that the oldest farm organization in the United States—the National Grange—celebrates its 100th anniversary this year.

This centennial event will be celebrated during their weeklong national convention at Syracuse, N.Y., November 13 to 22.

Oliver Hudson Kelley, the father of the Grange, settled on a homestead near Elk River, Minn. Mr. Kelley helped to organize the first State Grange in Minnesota in 1869.

As we pay tribute to the oldest farm organization in America, a short recap of its 100 years finds its history starred with national and local accomplishments in behalf of rural America. A partial listing shows the Grange was active in the educational and legislative process of securing passage of the Farmers Home Administration; the rural electrification program; Public Law 83-480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act; the parcel post system and rural free delivery; the Interstate Highway System; and many other long-lasting programs of benefit to society.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that this organization, which has served our Nation so well, had its roots in the Sixth Congressional District of Minnesota. My sincere congratulations to the National Grange on the occasion of attaining 100 years of age, and best wishes for continued service to mankind in the next century of growth.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON CRITICIZES PROPOSAL TO SHIFT CERTAIN FUNCTIONS OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION TO THE COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that it is a serious mistake to scatter Federal services for small businesses among several agencies. In

1953 Congress created an independent agency to deal exclusively with the problems of small business. I only wish that every act we passed produced results as constructive as those which have flowed from the creation of the Small Business Administration.

Surely one of the reasons the economy has done so well through the last 7 years lies in the impressive gains small business made. It is clear from the record that SBA has been a strong factor in these gains.

In just the last 4 years, SBA has made nearly 43,000 general business loans, contributing some \$1.7 billion in new investment to the economy. These loans have opened hundreds of thousands of new jobs, directly and indirectly.

The small business population has climbed sharply, to a total that now exceeds 5 million firms. Four years ago, it was roughly 4.7 million. Thus, the small business community is growing by a net gain of 70,000 to 100,000 new firms a year.

Now we find that in section 406 of title IV of the poverty bill, provision is made to transfer vital SBA functions to the Department of Commerce. If these provisions are not removed or amended by the House, they certainly would go a long way toward undoing much good which has been accomplished during the past 14 years by SBA, operating as a one-stop shop center for small business.

The program we are on the verge of giving to Commerce and the Office of Economic Opportunity could surely be better handled by SBA, which already has the basic responsibility in this area and has a wealth of experience that Commerce and OEO simply do not share. These changes will merely lead to duplication and confusion.

In order to carry out the provisions now embodied in section 406 of title IV, it would be necessary to establish another miniature Small Business Administration within the Department of Commerce. Has anyone stopped to consider the cost of such an endeavor? How much time and money would it take to effectively change the orientation of the Department of Commerce so that it might meet the needs of small business?

Perhaps the seriousness of the situation can best be described by showing what could happen to SBA's vital procurement function if section 406 remains as is. The proposal would create duplicating and overlapping programs in the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Commerce Department's Economic Development Administration.

The SBA—within the limits of its budget—is doing just the sort of work some observers want to see turned over to OEO and Commerce. SBA already has an Office of Procurement Assistance and administers a number of programs specifically designed to funnel business into distressed locales. Both OEO and EDA, under the proposed ground rules, will have the authority and money with which to outbid each other for furtherance of their own pet projects. SBA has no authority to offer financial "rewards" to firms that cooperate with it.

In short, section 406 undercuts the

work now being performed by SBA and allows OEO and EDA to "bribe" prime and subcontractors away from programs SBA has developed out of 15 years of experience.

Legislation already on the books in the Small Business Act could be used to do the very things that are called for in the proposed legislation—instead of that, the proposal would nullify efforts of SBA which currently is giving priority to programs aimed at assisting ghetto areas.

At the time SBA was established by Congress, section 12 of the enabling act provided that all the functions, duties, and powers of any then existing Government departments bearing on small business should be transferred to SBA—including records, property, and necessary personnel. The proposals now before the House Education and Labor Committee would reverse this precedent. The new groups are quite apt to be working at cross purposes with the existing agency which has proven its competence over the past 14 years.

In the name of helping small business, let us not take steps that may easily turn out to injure it. Let us amend section 406 so as to substitute "Small Business Administrator" for "Secretary of Commerce" wherever the latter appears in that section.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to say that I am joined in my opposition to this provision of the poverty bill by all of my colleagues on the Small Business Committee and by the distinguished chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, Hon. CARL PERKINS. Chairman PERKINS wrote to me and the other members of the Small Business Committee who had earlier written to him expressing our concern for this provision. He assured all of us that he joins us in feeling that the term "Small Business Administrator" should be substituted for "Secretary of Commerce" wherever it appears in section 406 of title IV of the poverty bill.

I am hopeful that the House will act to preserve the integrity of this vital Federal agency.

HUNT-WESSON CANCELS SOVIET OIL IMPORTS

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Hunt-Wesson Co., of Fullerton, Calif., has canceled purchases of Soviet vegetable oil and has informed me that a 20-million-pound shipment originally expected to dock last weekend at New Orleans is no longer en route to U.S. port. The announcement was good news for American farmers, especially those with sons in Vietnam.

While I am gratified at the company's belated decision, I am determined, nonetheless, to make sure that none of the

13 million pounds of Soviet oil the firm has already accepted in this country is fed to U.S. servicemen in Vietnam.

It would be a gargantuan irony if U.S. soldiers in Vietnam wounded by Soviet weapons, were fed Soviet vegetable oil purchased, in effect, by U.S. taxpayers. Hunt-Wesson is one of the largest suppliers of vegetable oil to U.S. forces in Vietnam and has declared that none of the supplies are from the Soviet Union. The Defense Department has assured me an investigation. I have demanded first-hand verification that none of the Soviet oil is commingled in preparation of orders for Vietnam.

Text of telegram received November 4:

Hon. PAUL FINDLEY: No Soviet oil has been used by Hunt-Wesson in fulfilling Department of Defense contracts. Ship Prometheus no longer enroute to U.S. port. Shipment of cottonseed oil on Prometheus was rejected October 26 on receipt of laboratory test results showing oil failed to meet standards required by purchase contract. We have no plans for making additional Soviet oil purchases.

R. B. GABLER,
Vice President.

McNAMARA'S "THIN" ABM COULD TRIGGER NATO COLLAPSE

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican Committee on Western Alliances today warned that the McNamara "thin" ABM system could rupture NATO.

The committee's conclusions and recommendations are contained in a statement published today. Here is the text:

McNAMARA'S "THIN" ABM COULD TRIGGER NATO COLLAPSE

The Administration's decision last month to begin the deployment of a "thin" antiballistic missile (ABM) defense carries with it the stark possibility of fatally rupturing our North Atlantic military alliance.

Secretary McNamara strove to justify the decision claiming the ABM system would act as a deterrent to Red Chinese nuclear blackmail sometime in the 1970's, but he was forced to admit the system would have value in protecting our launch sites from a Soviet ICBM attack. It is significant that over the past year Congressional pressures and the recommendations of our chief military advisors were to deploy an ABM mainly in response to the Soviet Union's ABM system. Initial European reaction has been to view our ABM deployment as more Cold War competition. Secretary McNamara himself has repeatedly pointed out that a "thin" system would provide the momentum for expansion that could trigger a new arms race.

Just as the development of purely national nuclear ballistic missiles in the late fifties created divisive policy problems within NATO, so will the development of purely defensive nuclear weapons heighten these differences. In addition, the deployment of ABM systems by the United States and the Soviet Union will radically widen the gap between the two super powers and the rest of the nations of the world.

Unless timely policies are undertaken at once to forestall it, our European allies will ultimately be driven to positions of defensive neutrality, and a long-standing goal of Soviet foreign policy will have been realized: the break-up of NATO into a fragmented set of middle-sized states, each of which would be highly vulnerable to Soviet power squeezes.

To prevent this calamity, the United States must—without further delay—explore fully with her NATO allies the possibilities of developing a NATO ABM system. As the nation possessing the preponderance of nuclear technology in the alliance, the U.S. should seek to share with its allies the development of an ABM defense serving the entire community on the basis of cooperative funding and construction. Of direct benefit to the defense United States would be advance warning from European-sited radars of a Soviet launch that would enable us to attempt offshore interceptions.

Although the NATO Nuclear Planning Council is reported to have discussed the need for ABM defense of western Europe, there is no evidence that the basic concept has been considered by the North Atlantic Council. If it has been so considered and rejected, surely the U.S. decision to "go-it-alone" was of sufficient importance to warrant announcement by President Johnson—with suitable reference to the attitude of our allies.

It is already apparent that the manner of Secretary of Defense McNamara's ABM announcement last month resulted in a gaffe comparable to his imperious scrapping of U.S. participation in the Skybolt Project back in 1962 that rocked the MacMillan government.

Prominent foreign policy analysts have reported that our allies grumbled that they were merely "informed"—not "consulted" about the ABM decision—with but advance copies of the Secretary's speech, exactly the same as sent to the Russians.

The decision to proceed with an ABM system—which has been unfolding in Congress and in the press this past year—was certainly momentous enough to have warranted full coordination with our allies and use of the full prestige of the President's office to explain it to the American public and our NATO allies.

Relegating the task to Secretary McNamara as the subject of a speech before a press services gathering of editors and publishers in San Francisco revealed anew the major foreign policy flaw of the Johnson Administration: the cavalier subordination of Western solidarity to the pursuit of detente with the Communist world. The Secretary's speech was drafted as one long assurance to the Soviet Union that we intend it no harm, and a continuation of his plea for a non-proliferation treaty unpopular with many of our European allies.

Since about five years will be required to deploy a "thin" ABM system within the United States, it is not too late to begin genuine consultative discussions with our allies towards the possibility of a community defense system. From studies already made there are several modes for deploying an ABM in Europe, all of which should be explored with our alliance partners.

We should not approach such a conference with a pre-announced "American package," such as the ill-fated multilateral force proposal, which Secretary McNamara tried to impose on NATO several years ago, but rather be prepared to listen as well as talk.

In the long run we must share more responsibilities so that western unity in international politics may be strengthened. It is neither necessary nor desirable that the U.S. counter the Soviet missile threat alone. Our unwillingness to share nuclear responsibility with our allies in the past has led to the present rift in NATO. We should not seal

NATO's demise by rushing into the development of an ABM system alone.

Anti-missile defenses can either be a stumbling stone or a stepping stone toward western solidarity. The first step upward is one that the U.S. alone may take.

IS NATO CLOSING RANKS?

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the eminent foreign correspondent and columnist, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, recently congratulated the nations of NATO for closing ranks. I hope the congratulations are not premature. Certainly forward steps to stitch together this most essential of our free-world alliances is long overdue and the alliance must be more than restored to its former position of solidarity in military defensive matters. In order to survive the critical 1969 milestone it must take on useful new form, reaching into political, economic, and monetary matters as well as military. It must also be a focal point at which external policy decisions can be hammered out.

Here is Mr. Mowrer's perceptive and hopeful comment:

NATO CLOSING RANKS—BENEFITS COULD EXTEND TO MANY FIELDS

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Better late than never!

At long last, but still in good time, representatives of 14 of the 15 NATO countries have decided to close ranks, formulate common policies on crises in all parts of the world and compel potential adversaries everywhere to deal with what can be the strongest political and military unit in the world.

Provided of course that the NATO powers agree to place such responsibility in a fortified executive council.

What a relief to those of us who have, since NATO's foundation, urged the U.S. Administration to take the lead in making it a center of political, military, scientific and economic power able to cow and deter any conceivable adversary.

Yet we should go easy. The new plan is still only a proposal and will be put in final form by a special policy making group (the American member is Under Secretary of State Eugene V. Rostow) at the end of this month. It will still have to be accepted by the fourteen countries, with or without the participation of France.

Moreover, this draft does not go nearly far enough. The individual governments are asked to "coordinate traffic in science and technology" rather than to pool their research and finding in these fields.

ARMS CONTROL ONE OBJECTIVE

It binds them to seek common effective methods of "arms control" instead of military preponderance.

It recommends economic aid to developing (meaning underdeveloped) countries on a multilateral basis but apparently contains no mention of a common trade and economic policy toward common enemies.

Like the United States since the advent of the Kennedys, the drafters of the new blue print do not admit that they have enemies.

They talk of improving relations with the communist countries of Eastern Europe in-

stead of making friendship with these countries dependent upon their dissolution of communist schools for subversion and upon the cessation of "little wars of liberation" and of communist promotion of third-party aggression such as the Arabs' recent attack on Israel.

Nonetheless, the announcement of the fourteen-power proposal could be the best news in a month of Sundays.

For once accepted in embryo, any united West seems bound to extend its activities into all necessary fields. Not even the United States will be able to proceed with bi-lateral agreements with a non-member such as the Soviet Union.

NONPROLIFERATION TREATY OPPOSED

This should hold good of the potentially disastrous non-proliferation treaty whose signature would permanently divide nations into two classes—those with nuclears and those without.

Britain and some smaller NATO countries may favor that treaty. Germany and Italy do not. On October fifth of this year, the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, the acknowledged organ of the German Christian Democrats, stated flatly that the Bonn government "is not going to sign the non-proliferation treaty come what may." (Nor, in my judgment, will Japan, Sweden or India.)

As members of the newtoughtened NATO organization, Germany and Italy may properly argue that any such treaty would be a violation of the common policy agreement.

In the eyes of Russians as well as of Chinese communists, the Cold War is today's overweening fact which it is the purpose of peaceful coexistence pattern to obscure. As co-policy makers with the United States, even the peaceniks among our NATO allies will be compelled to face this situation.

Furthermore, they will, I dare hope, see that the primary role of a reinforced NATO is to make clear to the Russians the futility of further expansionist efforts. Thereby, for the first time since Moscow produced an A-bomb, the prospect of real peace will appear.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF BOL-SHEVİK SEIZURE OF POWER IN RUSSIA

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, November 7 will mark the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik seizure of power in Russia. It appropriately can be identified as a day for mourning and this is precisely what is recommended by more than 70 American national organizations and over 100 prominent individuals including several prominent and respected Members of Congress.

Here is the text of the proclamation formulated by this association:

DAY OF MOURNING FOR THE VICTIMS OF COMMUNISM PROCLAMATION

November 7th will mark the 50th anniversary of one of the greatest disasters in history—the Bolshevik seizure of power in Russia. From that country the communist blight has spread until it torments a billion human beings.

We free Americans record:

That during the last half-century, communism has been responsible for the exter-

mination of at least 85 million people through civil war, man-made famine, purges, genocidal deportations and executions, in torture chambers and in concentration camps;

That communism has systematically destroyed moral and spiritual values; imposed incalculable sufferings on nation and people; has persecuted all religions and placed myriad minds in the chains of thought control;

That communism set the pattern for Fascism, Nazism and other varieties of totalitarianism, and that its relentless drive for world domination has kept nearly a hundred million people of East-Central Europe in bondage and the world in a state of turmoil;

That since 1917 not one of the nations conquered by force or seized by subterfuge has been permitted a free election, nor has any free people ever voted to adopt communism in preference to democracy;

That during these 50 years, communist dictatorships have preached "liberation" while practicing unlimited oppression to consolidate their rule based on terror;

Therefore, believing it to be the solemn duty of those who cherish freedom and conscience to speak for the silenced and to honor the martyred dead,

We, free American individuals and organizations, do proclaim November 7th a day of mourning for the victims of communism.

We call on free men everywhere to observe that day and that week by commemorations and prayers; and

We call on every community to rededicate itself in its own way to restoring the freedoms already destroyed for a billion human beings and threatened by communism for the rest of mankind.

THE POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Education and Labor has completed dramatic markup sessions and has reported to the House its proposal to extend the present poverty program.

Republicans on the committee proposed an expanded attack on poverty through a revised and improved "economic opportunity crusade" designed to reach more of those people who need help, and at a reduced cost to the taxpayer. Regrettably, it was rejected.

The bill as reported is likely to be torn apart on the floor of the House, with many of the changes damaging and destructive. As a result, the future of the poverty program is in doubt.

Poverty is a problem of individual human beings.

It is a child in a ghetto school whose IQ drops from 90.6 percent in the third grade, to 85.3 percent in the sixth grade.

It is an unemployed father forced to leave his family so the family can receive welfare.

It is 56 percent of the pupils who enter high schools in Central Harlem and drop out before they receive a high school diploma.

The sorrowful statistics of want have been recounted many times. My purpose is not to recount statistics, but to question what is being done to change them.

Between 1947 and 1960, the percentage of Americans whose income was less than \$3,000 decreased from 33.9 percent to 22 percent. This was significant progress. In recent years, the progress has been less marked. It is economic growth, and economic involvement of all citizens, that makes up our American tradition. Our remarkable record of advancement makes us insist that today's poverty can be treated; that to a large extent poverty can be remedied.

The poverty bill is scheduled for debate today, November 6. The congressional discussion on poverty which we have listened to in the past few months is hardly an appropriate background for a public discussion of this pressing problem.

I am deeply concerned over the prospect that any poverty bill may be defeated. I say this as one who for the past 2 years has supported the Republican alternative and opposed the Economic Opportunity Act as passed. I have done so because I felt the measures, as passed, were not addressed to the real needs of the poor as were the alternative approaches available in the minority substitute. Too often the debate has been on quantity rather than quality. Interestingly, critical comments have been voiced recently by many supporters of the present war on poverty. For example, Congressman HUGH L. CAREY, Democrat, of New York, made this observation:

If I wanted to sack this program I could fill the record with the excess and the waste and the mismanagement, if you will, the nepotism that has been practiced in some of these agencies.

I am also concerned about these shortcomings, and I am equally concerned that the program falls far short of its announced purpose. However, I would hope to be able to vote for some poverty program and to retain the Office of Economic Opportunity. My reason is that, despite its faulty performance, it is important to maintain at least one credible national symbol and program which demonstrates our Government's commitment to the poor.

If the Democrats fail to realize the jeopardy in which they have placed the OEO, and should the OEO not be retained, a serious psychological harm could be done to the country, with a widening of the gap between the urban poor and society. Even more discouragement and alienation on the part of the poor is a risk this country should not take.

Although the image of OEO has become increasingly blurred over the past 3 years, it is, sadly, the only symbol that this administration has for the poor. For example, recent years have seen the passage of several civil rights bills, but they have gone largely unenforced by this administration. Unique proposals such as the Human Investment Act, the Home Ownership Plan, and the Economic Opportunity Corporation have been derided by the administration, or worse, ignored.

To abolish the one Federal symbol would make it appear to the poor that the Nation is breaking its commitment. I would like to vote to retain OEO. But, in retaining it, it must be improved and strengthened by changes in unsuccessful

programs and by the addition of new proposals. I believe strongly that by grafting on fresh ideas, OEO will be able to better accomplish its stated purpose.

I am dismayed and disheartened at the obstinacy of the Democratic leadership. It is approaching the upcoming floor debate on the poverty bill seemingly blind to the pleas of constituent groups. Leadership actions are risking full destruction of the flagship of the administration's programs.

There is much discontent in this body over the performance of the poverty program. With important modifications, the House could be persuaded, I believe, to preserve OEO. But it will not be easy. To accomplish this, the Democrats will have to develop some compromise with the Republican leadership. They must decide whether it is more important to maintain their traditional party power coalition between the Northern and Southern wings of the Democratic Party, or to consider the people who have staked their hopes on the exaggerated and unfulfilled programs' promises.

If the OEO bill remains unimproved and unchanged it will face almost certain extinction. There are three alternatives open to the Democratic leadership. First, they can remain unmoved by the rising chorus of public appeals to make changes or concessions. In that case, the bill and its hollow promises will be defeated. The Democrats may feel as a party that little would be lost by having the poverty bill defeated. They would be trading a program for a campaign issue. But the poor would bear the loss of such a pyrrhic victory.

A second alternative is for the Democratic leadership to make concessions to the Southern wing of their party. That could maintain the poverty program in name only. The desires of many of the latter group to gag and bind community action, and other self-help programs, could so emasculate the war on poverty that it would be without substance.

I recall similar sacrifices made by the administration. In 1965 the demise of Adam Yarmolinsky was the price of the Southern Democrats. In education it was Commissioner Howe's authority. In agriculture it was the cotton subsidy-food stamp deal. The price this time appears to be, at the minimum, the poor and community action. The price of passage has skyrocketed even in terms of the present inflation.

This approach worked well for the Democrats in the 89th Congress, when they outnumbered Republicans by almost 2 to 1. The Democrats did not have to listen or yield in the 89th; they rammed their programs through without so much as a nod to their Republican colleagues. The OEO and other poverty programs were launched by the Democrats with no hint of compromise.

The role of a responsible minority is to interact with the majority to modify and perfect legislative proposals. The minority can only propose. They cannot initiate proposals with any prospect of successful adoption. The minority cannot schedule hearings, or the witnesses to testify, on important legislative matters. The minority cannot control the flow of

the legislation from the committees to the floor of the House. But, the minority should be heard when it offers constructive suggestions for the improvement and refinement of legislation with which it can basically agree in purpose. The majority is blind, indeed, if it believes that its approach is flawless. Clearly, the Democratic Party has no monopoly on humanitarianism or concern for the people of this Nation. This is especially true in the case of the present Democratic majority which is, for the most part, a combination of the liberal, the conservative, and the big city machine blocks, and little middle ground. That is an alliance, not a political party. It is designed not to govern but to maintain power. And that is the tragedy of the present Congress of the Democratic Party, and, indeed, that party's increasingly obvious weakness.

The third alternative for the Democratic leadership is to earnestly seek a bipartisan agreement with the Republicans. Most Republicans are committed to finding solutions to big city problems. Legislation requires compromise. Each side must make concessions in order to save that poverty effort and to move the program forward. The question is—are the Democrats willing to compromise? It appears not.

In seeking and urging a compromise to save OEO, I am pleading not for myself or for other Republicans. The scandals and failures in the OEO programs have made the War on Poverty an unpopular issue in most Republican districts all across the Nation. And, as Daniel P. Moynihan, former Assistant Secretary of Labor, warned in his oft-quoted speech to the Americans for Democratic Action in September:

We have been too long prisoners of the rhetoric that Republicans don't know anything about the social problems of the nation, or in any event don't really care.

Or, as the Washington Evening Star put it in response to Moynihan's warnings:

This is a time of choice for the liberals of this nation. It is a time of division between those hopelessly enmeshed in the politics of opposition and change, and those who are truly liberal enough in their thinking to realize that the nation is indeed in a major crisis at home and abroad. It is a time when the only sane reaction is to stabilize the ship and to start bailing, not to drill more holes in the hull.

My plea expresses the same desire as a number of national organizations who share my hope for a compromise to save OEO. I recommend that the Democratic leadership heed the urgings of the Citizens Crusade Against Poverty, the National Association for Community Development, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the League of Women Voters, to mention just a few of the concerned organizations.

We will soon know the decision of the House Democratic leadership.

And, most important, the poor will know.

The responsibility is with the Democratic Party which controls the executive branch and both Houses of the Congress. The choice is theirs.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I insert the following articles:

First, "The Liberal Dilemma," editorial by the Washington Evening Star, September 26, 1967.

Second, "Private Agency Helps Poor in NW Suburbs," editorial by Paddock Publications, October 20, 1967.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Sept. 26, 1967]

THE LIBERAL DILEMMA

Daniel Patrick Moynihan is a man dedicated to the proposition that the truth should be heard, regardless of whose sacred cow is scarred in the process. And this fact alone sets him apart from the majority of those whose function it is to think aloud in public today.

Two years ago, Moynihan—then assistant secretary of labor—was asked to study the root causes of the Negro problem. His report, arguing that the basis of the trouble was the instability of the Negro family structure, resulted in his being labeled a racist by the people who make a practice of basing their conclusions on emotion rather than facts.

Now, he's done it again.

Moynihan, who is now director of the Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Affairs, undertook to tell the executive board of the Americans for Democratic Action what the proper role of the liberal should be today. As a result, there are bound to be demands that his credentials as a liberal be canceled.

The core of Moynihan's argument is that the major international and domestic crises that face the nation today cannot merely be the targets of liberal political wrath. The liberals, he said, should face up to their responsibility by seeking solutions to the problems, and should stop preaching against what is happening, because "it is they who have been in office . . . and in large measure presided over the onset of both the war in Vietnam and the violence in American cities."

It is time, he said, to recognize that "getting out of Vietnam is a matter not just of summoning the will, but also of finding a way."

It is time for liberals to approach the domestic crisis with an understanding "that their essential interest is in the stability of the social order" and to form "much more effective alliances with political conservatives."

Liberals should "divest themselves of the notion that the nation . . . can be run from agencies in Washington" and should work toward a decentralization of government power.

And finally "liberals must somehow overcome the curious condescension which takes the form of sticking up for and explaining away anything, however outrageous, which Negroes, individually or collectively, might do."

Pat Moynihan does not have all the answers. But here is a man who thinks, who cares, and who has the courage to speak his mind. And he has put his finger on an essential truth.

This is a time of choice for the liberals of this nation. It is a time of division between those hopelessly enmeshed in the politics of opposition and change, and those who are truly liberal enough in their thinking to realize that the nation is indeed in a major crisis at home and abroad. It is a time when the only sane reaction is to stabilize the ship and to start bailing, not to drill more holes in the hull.

[From Paddock Publications, Inc., Oct. 20, 1967]

PRIVATE AGENCY HELPS POOR IN NW SUBURBS

Some big city and southern congressmen are teaming up in an effort to prune the

federal government's right to channel anti-poverty funds to private community action groups; they intend to exact that price for supporting new Office of Economic Opportunity appropriations.

Local community action groups have operated some of the War on Poverty's most imaginative programs, but they also have posed an annoyance and threat to some big city political machines.

What concerns us, however, is the effect cutting off funds to non-official agencies would have on the anti-poverty effort in the northwest suburbs.

Some school districts—notably Elk Grove District 59, Wheeling District 21 and High School District 214—have been creative in their use of federal War on Poverty funds. But most other suburban taxing bodies have taken no interest in anti-poverty programs.

Local governments have understandable reasons for not jumping into the War on Poverty. Most of them are struggling with a multiplicity of problems directly affecting their own residents. The poor generally live in unincorporated areas, and they are scattered, uneducated, and unlikely to call government attention to their needs. Couple with that the difficulty inherent in getting several municipalities to cooperate in solving all but the most pressing problems, and it seems unrealistic to expect suburban municipalities to become involved.

It is a local community action agency, the Northwest Cook Opportunity Council (Norwesco), that has initiated most of the programs available in this area for low income families. Their most notable effort has also been a national success, Head Start. An Opportunity Center designed to centralize scattered services for poverty-level families is just getting under way. The council has encouraged improvement of area medical services for the poor and looked into low-cost housing, so far with little success.

Norwesco is performing a needed service to the area's poor, a service that would be lacking if anti-poverty administration was limited to public agencies.

A TRUE PERSPECTIVE

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, during this period of celebration commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Soviet October revolution, one might be tempted to fall for some of the propaganda disseminated by the U.S.S.R. concerning the great progress made since 1917.

Of course, no mention is made, for example, of the barbaric treatment accorded religious liberty during the last half century. How many churches, mosques, synagogues, and seminaries have been eliminated since Lenin assumed power will not be a matter of discussion in Soviet circles during this period of celebration. The importance of religious liberty, a right which contributed so much to the founding of our Nation, seems to be almost unimportant in evaluating the "progress" made by the Soviets.

A Reuters dispatch from Geneva, Switzerland, dated October 29, tells of a charge of religious persecution against

members of the Evangelical Christian Baptist Church in the U.S.S.R. It might be well to review during this 50th anniversary season the unparalleled brutality visited upon those of religious beliefs by the godless leaders of the Kremlin. Perhaps then the 50th anniversary of the Soviet October revolution will be put in proper perspective.

I insert the article, "Baptists in Soviet Jailed, One Tortured to Death, Thant Told," which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer of October 29, in the RECORD at this point:

BAPTISTS IN SOVIET JAILED, ONE TORTURED TO DEATH, THANT TOLD

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, October 29 (Reuters).—More than 200 dissident Soviet Baptists are in jail or awaiting trial for violating strict Russian religious laws, a document made public here Saturday alleged.

It said one person died after torture and that children were questioned for hours about their parents' religious activities.

DESCRIBED AS APPEAL

The document was described as an appeal by relatives of Baptists who ran afoul of the law, and was addressed to United Nations Secretary-General U Thant.

It was disclosed Saturday by Russian Orthodox Archbishop Anton of Geneva.

There was no means of checking the authenticity of the 17-page document and only copies in Russian and French were shown to reporters.

CAREFULLY DOCUMENTED

The Russian-language copy was carefully documented and gave considerable circumstantial detail. Attached to it was a list of 202 names of persons said to be in jail or under investigation, including a number already mentioned in the Soviet press.

Beside each name was listed the town where the trial took place, showing that the dissidents were spread over most of European Russia and the Ukraine, and extending to the North Caucasus, Central Asia, and Irkutsk in Siberia.

ILLEGAL MEETINGS

The document said they were charged with organizing illegal meetings, distributing slanderous literature or involving under-age children in religious practices.

The carefully hand-printed last page was dated Aug. 15, 1967, and the signatures of five women, who said they represented the "council of relatives of prisoners—members of the Evangelical Christian Baptist Church in the U.S.S.R."

The 202 were all members of the large group among an estimated 500,000 Soviet Baptists who refused to recognize the authority of the state-registered Baptist Church.

ARCHIE MOORE: HELPING OTHERS EARN LIFE, LIBERTY, AND HAPPINESS

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, almost every American, and sports fans without fail, know the name of Archie Moore, former light-heavyweight boxing champion of the world. The story of his title fights and the climb from the slums of St. Louis to the glory of world recogni-

tion as champion for a decade is the story of a man who demanded only a chance to work hard toward success.

The true measure of Archie Moore, however, cannot yet be taken even though he no longer actively participates as a contender for world boxing titles. When most men would be content to retire after one successful and lucrative career, Archie Moore has started another and the final judgment of his total success in life must include his latest venture: "ABC—Any Boy Can." The final judgment of this fine American will not concern whether he has succeeded but only how much. And at this stage in life the degree appears to be ever increasing.

When asked, "Any boy can, what?" Archie Moore replies: "Any boy can improve himself if he wants to." The program is designed to help them do it. The boys are the first concern.

ABC started some 5 years ago in Vallejo, Calif. It is an after-school project for the boys and for "Instructor Moore," as the boys call Archie, it is a program with this goal:

We only have one objective in ABC . . . and that is to teach the young boys to want something better, to give them the desire to grow into good and decent human beings, to show them that they, too, can be police chiefs, school principals, teachers, doctors, lawyers or anything else. We teach just what we call it, "Any Boy Can."

It began for Archie Moore when, as he says:

I started thinking, I got weary with thinking about boys and how to help . . . then it came to me that we could help if we could show them they don't have to act "big" in bad ways, they can be "big" in good ways.

ABC is backed not by the Federal Government but by money from the city, civic agencies, and private industry, and from Archie himself.

In Archie Moore's ABC program, "his boys" learn self-respect; self-assurance; sports, including football, softball, and boxing—for defense only; they also learn the 10 Commandments by heart and the rules which an ABC boy is expected to live by. These include "A boy shall not steal, A boy shall not drink, A boy shall not lie, steal, or show disrespect."

As Archie says:

We start out by getting their interest . . . maybe we do this with a free feed, or a party, or just taking time to talk with them, not at them, and then we emphasize that they must teach as they learn. It isn't enough that the boys, who are from 8 to 15 years old, learn our code and rules . . . They must feel they are teaching them too.

Of course, the most important thing about ABC is that it works. It takes boys who are either juvenile delinquents or headed in that direction, and the underprivileged boys, and helps them find a life of responsibility and respect—and shows that they have a future, if they want it.

Congratulations from the recreation district in which the Vallejo project operates were emphatic. In a resolution of commendation and congratulations, recreation members stated that the ABC program had developed "a basics program, providing opportunities for physical, mental, and moral improvement to

youngsters" with results which are "obvious, immediate, and conclusively successful in the judgment of this community."

Archie Moore would be the last to say the injustice stemming from racial conflict does not exist. He knows it does. But he is also quick to state that these injustices can be mediated, and admits that while he "despised the whites who cheated me, I used that feeling to make me push on."

Archie's philosophy, and the sentiments he tries to instill in "his boys," was recently published by the San Diego Union. This excellent article was reprinted across the Nation and is also to be used by the U.S. Information Agency for distribution to foreign nations. I believe his statement shows wisdom and the love he has for his country.

His statement, he wrote it himself and submitted it to the sports editor, is not only a statement of purpose, it is a call to law and order and to plain, old-fashioned work. I submit it at this point:

GUIDE OR MISGUIDE—ARCHIE MOORE POINTS WAY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Archie Moore, internationally known San Diegan and retired light heavyweight boxing champion of the world, told friends yesterday he feels that "everybody must take a stand in this time of internal crisis. A man who stands neutral stands for nothing." He then wrote the following statement and submitted it to The San Diego Union, which is printing it verbatim.)

(By Archie Moore)

The devil is at work in America, and it is up to us to drive him out. Snipers and looters, white or black, deserve no mercy. Those who would profit from their brother's misfortunes deserve no mercy, and those who would set fellow Americans upon each other deserve no mercy.

I'll fight the man who calls me an "Uncle Tom." I have broken bread with heads of state, chatted with presidents and traveled all over the world. I was born in a ghetto, but I refused to stay there. I am a Negro, and proud to be one. I am also an American, and I'm proud of that.

The young people of today think they have a hard lot. They should have been around in the '30s when I was coming up in St. Louis. We had no way to go, but a lot of us made it. I became light heavyweight champion of the world. A neighbor kid down the block, Clark Terry, became one of the most famous jazz musicians in the world. There were doctors, lawyers and chiefs who came out of that ghetto. One of the top policemen in St. Louis came from our neighborhood.

We made it because we had a goal, and we were willing to work for it. Don't talk to me of your "guaranteed national income." Any fool knows that this is insanity. Do we bring those who worked to get ahead down to the level of those who never gave a damn? The world owes NOBODY—black or white—a living. God helps the man who helps himself!

Now then, don't get the idea that I didn't grow up hating the injustices of this world. I am a staunch advocate of the Negro revolution for the good of mankind. I've seen almost unbelievable progress made in the last handful of years. Do we want to become wild beasts bent only on revenge, looting and killing and laying America bare? Hate is bait, bait for the simple-minded.

Sure, I despised the whites who cheated me, but I used that feeling to make me push on. If you listen to the professional rascals, adherers to this idea of giving up everything you've gained in order to revenge

yourself for the wrongs that were done to you in the past—then you'd better watch your neighbor, because he'll be looting your house next. Law and order is the only edge we have. No man is an island.

Granted, the Negro still has a long way to go to gain a fair shake with the white man in this country. But believe this: if we resort to lawlessness, the only thing we can hope for is civil war, untold bloodshed, and the end of our dreams.

We have to have a meeting of qualified men of both races. Mind you, I said qualified men, not some punk kid, ranting the catch phrases put in his mouth by some paid hate-monger. There are forces in the world today, forces bent upon the destruction of America, your America and mine. And while we're on the subject, do you doubt for a minute that communism, world communism, isn't waiting with bated breath for the black and white Americans to turn on each other full force? Do you want a chance for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness in the land of your birth, or do you want no chance at all under the Red heel?

AFRICA'S A GREAT PLACE TO VISIT

There are members of the black community who call for a separate nation within America. Well, I do not intend to give up one square inch of America. I'm not going to be told I must live in a restricted area. Isn't that what we've all been fighting to overcome? And then there is the element that calls for a return to Africa.

For my part, Africa is a great place to visit, but I wouldn't want to live there. If the Irishmen want to go back to the Emerald Isle, let them. If the Slavs want to return to the Iron Curtain area, OK by me. But I'm not going to go to any part of Africa to live. I'm proud of ancestry, and of the country that spawned my forefathers, but I'm not giving up my country. I fought all my life to give my children what I'm able to give them today; a chance for development as citizens in the greatest country in the world.

I do not for a moment think that any truly responsible Negro wants anarchy. I don't think you'll find intelligent—no, let's rephrase that—mature Negroes running wild in the streets or sniping at total strangers. God made the white man as well as the black. True, we haven't acted as brothers in the past, but we are brothers. If we're to be so many Cains and Abels, that's our choice. We can't blame God for it.

TEACH THAT "ANY BOY CAN"

Something must be done to reach the Negroes and the whites in the ghettos of this country, and I propose to do something.

As a matter of plain fact, I have been doing something for the past several years. I have been running a program which I call the ABC—Any Boy Can. By teaching our youth, black, white, yellow and red, what dignity is, what self respect is, what honor is, I have been able to obliterate juvenile delinquency in several areas.

I would now expand my program, change scope. If any boy can, surely any man can. I want to take teams of qualified people, top men in their fields, to the troubled areas of our cities. I know that the people who participated in the recent riots, who are participating and who will participate, are misguided rather than mad.

If some bigot can misguide, then I can guide. I've spent too much time of my life building what I've got to put it to torch just to satisfy some ancient hatred of a man who beat my grandfather. Those men are long dead. Do we have to choke what could be a beautiful garden with weeds of hate? I say NO! And I stand ready to start "Operation Gardener." I invite the respected Negro leaders of our country to join me.

Mr. Speaker, Archie Moore is a voice in the wilderness. There are too many

Negro leaders saying, "we want," "we should get," "give us." I believe that one of the greatest problems facing the Negro comes from leaders who counsel their followers to demand things rather than to work for them.

Examples of the "we want" leadership are, of course, Martin Luther King and his righthand man, Ralph Abernathy. During the late months of summer King wound up a tour of northern cities. While in Washington, D.C., Abernathy stated:

We don't want any tea and cookies. Tell the nation (he is speaking to a group of 2,000) and the world we want filet mignon. We're sick and tired of neck bones and back bones.

Within 2 weeks after this statement the president of the National Council of Negro Women said of the Civil Rights Act of 1964:

It told them they would get so much and then gave them nothing. So they go into the streets and fight society.

More recently, King called for \$20 billion—for guarantee programs including guaranteed annual wage and guaranteed jobs; threatened a massive "camp-in" in Washington, and the need for "escalating nonviolence to the level of civil disobedience." King proposed stopping all functioning of the Nation's Capital. Civil rights pressure, he said, should be put on Congress so it can "no longer elude our demands."

It is tragic to think of the barriers which the rantings of a Martin Luther King place in the path of a sincere, dedicated Archie Moore.

The value of Archie Moore working with his boys cannot be overstated, and the merit of his philosophy should not be missed. He calls for hard work, not charity and handouts; he counsels self respect and respect of others, not civil disobedience. He recommends understanding instead of hate; and he speaks of long-term faith rather than rioting and killing.

Archie Moore submitted his statement to the San Diego Union, not because some one had asked him to write for them, but because he doubtless felt he had something to say, something that needed saying. The editor who received it saw a question Archie had written: "What do you think of this?"

The amazing response by millions of Americans has given the answer.

HOW SOUND IS YOUR DOLLAR?

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, one of the fine newspapers which serves our middle western region—and serves the Nation—is the Chicago Tribune. It has just completed a series of editorials entitled "How Sound Is Your Dollar?" This has been a thoughtful analysis of our economy and our place in the world.

I submit these editorials for inclusion in the RECORD:

HOW SOUND IS YOUR DOLLAR?

Lenin, the evil genius of the Russian revolution, contended that the United States could be forced to spend itself into a revolutionary crisis. "The best way to destroy the capitalist system," he wrote, "is to debauch the currency."

What is happening to our currency? How valid is the familiar standard of comparison, "sound as a dollar?" Is it still, in Washington Irving's words, "the almighty dollar, that great object of universal devotion?" If so, why have foreigners converted more than 10 billion of their surplus dollars into gold since 1952 and reduced the United States gold reserve to 13 billion dollars?

Responsible bankers and economists tell us that inflation is not simply a possible danger—something we may have to worry about in the future—but is hurting us now. Officials of the Johnson administration say the deficit in this fiscal year may reach 29 billion dollars unless Congress votes a tax increase. Others believe the deficit may be much larger. Unless this deficit is financed by printing new money, which would greatly increase the rate of inflation, the government will have to pay record-high interest rates to sell its bonds, in competition with private borrowers, in a money market that is already squeezed. Clearly we are facing a money crisis.

Because this problem vitally concerns the welfare of all the people, the editor has decided to devote this entire space normally reserved for editorials of *The Tribune* for seven days, beginning today, to a special report on the money crisis.

We are moved by a sense of public responsibility to do this. It is not a pleasant undertaking. The "pursuit of happiness" is an American ideal, and the vision of an "affluent society" is for more agreeable than the specter of ruinous inflation. Moreover, those who are not absorbed in the pursuit of happiness have other things besides the value of the dollar to worry about, such as the manifestations of moral decay and disintegration which some of our social philosophers ascribe to the affluent society.

What we are attempting to do is not easy, either. If readers believe we are exaggerating the menace they will doubt our credibility. If we are too restrained they may wonder whether there is anything to be concerned about.

People don't worry much about the purchasing power of the dollar so long as they have enough dollars to spend. It is comforting to be told that the "gross national product of goods and services" [GNP] increased 15 billion dollars in the third quarter of 1967 to an annual rate, seasonally adjusted, of 790 billion dollars—an average of \$3,950 a year for 200,000,000 Americans. But inflation accounted for more than half of this increase in the GNP, which is simply the sum total of all spending. The GNP would be doubled overnight if the dollar were devalued by 50 per cent. The GNP per capita in 1966 was \$3,757, but compared with 1940 dollars it was only \$1,619. Even in constant prices, however, the per capita GNP was more than twice as high in 1966 as the average of \$761 in 1940.

There are various measures of the rate of inflation, but the consumer price index, published by the bureau of labor statistics, is the most meaningful for most citizens. It is based on the average cost of a long list of representative items purchased in American cities. In August, the dollar was worth 41.5 cents, compared with its purchasing power in January, 1940. The consumer price index rose only 1.3 per cent a year from 1959 thru 1965, but in 1966 it climbed nearly 3 per cent and since May of this year the annual rate of increase has been 4.5 per cent. The rate may go much higher next year, es-

pecially if the federal deficit is financed mainly by pumping out fresh supplies of money. When inflation reaches a rate of 4 or 5 per cent a year it begins to feed on itself. The people rush to buy things they want before the price becomes prohibitive.

The classic definition of inflation is "too much money chasing too few goods." This is called "demand-pull" inflation. Another kind is called "cost-push" inflation. Powerful labor unions push wages up faster than productivity increases and big corporations pass their increased costs along to the consumers. The United States has had both kinds, but the trouble since 1965 has been "cost-push" inflation. Industry has been operating at 10- to 20-per cent below capacity, so there is no general shortage of goods. Settlements in the railroad and Ford Motor Co. strikes have established a pattern for labor cost increases of 6 per cent a year.

The great danger is that deficit financing will add "demand-pull" to "cost-push" inflation. Then it could run away with most of the nation's dollar assets unless totalitarian controls were adopted to suppress it. We could lose our economic freedom that way.

Inflation eats up savings and all fixed-dollar assets, such as life insurance reserves, pension and retirement funds, mortgages, government and corporation bonds, and bank deposits. Hundreds of billions of dollars of such assets already have been wiped out by the 58.5 per cent decline of the dollar since 1939.

Inflation hurts everybody, but pensioners and others with fixed incomes, as well as salaried white-collar workers, are the first to suffer. Wage increases obtained by the labor unions may keep pace with living costs for a time, but in a runaway inflation the social order is disrupted and almost all of the people are impoverished. That is what happened in Germany from 1920 to 1923, when prices increased a trillion-fold. Women standing in line in food stores watched a constantly changing price table and the cost of their purchases often doubled or tripled before they could reach the cashier.

There are no safe income-producing hedges against inflation. In the earlier stages of the German inflation common stocks advanced more rapidly than the depreciation of the paper mark, but in later stages wholesale and retail prices rose more rapidly than stocks.

Economists disagree about the effect of deficit financing on the business cycle. Some believe the boom is over and that we face a severe slump. Others believe a slump can be avoided by a vast expansion of the money supply and bank credit to finance the deficit. This might be more disastrous than a slump. We have no crystal ball and we make no predictions. We have consulted monetary authorities and other officials, economists, and bankers in Washington, New York, Chicago and Zurich, Switzerland, however, and there is general agreement that the present rate of deficit spending is extremely dangerous. We report the facts of this frightening situation to alert the people. They can stop this reckless deficit spending if they want to. The way to stop it is to cease clamoring for more and more federal spending programs and to put pressure on Congress to stop voting for them.

HOW SOUND IS YOUR DOLLAR?

THE MONEY CRISIS

The shepherd boy of folklore had warned so many times that the wolf was coming that nobody believed him when the wolf finally came. So it is with those who have been warning for years that deficit spending would produce a financial crisis in this country. When they use the word "crisis" their credibility is doubted. But the crisis is here, now. The wolf of inflation is no longer creeping at a stealthy rate of 2 to 3 per cent

a year; he is boldly striding at an annual rate of 4½ per cent and threatening to become voracious enough to eat up most of the nation's dollar assets.

Responsible officials in Washington frankly acknowledge that monetary policy in this country is no longer controlled by the federal reserve system, which was established by law to maintain an "elastic" but sound currency. Monetary policy is controlled by fiscal policy [spending], which in turn is controlled by the politicians. The politicians are committed to a policy of "guns and butter," of a "war on poverty" concurrently with the war in Viet Nam, of constantly expanding government and continuously rising deficits. Officials of the Johnson administration warn that the deficit in fiscal year 1968, ending next June 30, may reach 29 billion dollars without a proposed 7.4 billion dollar tax program, which has been rejected by the House ways and means committee.

Others believe the deficit may be considerably larger. European bankers told American representatives at the recent annual meeting of the World Bank and International Monetary fund in Rio de Janeiro that they expect the United States deficit in fiscal year 1968 to reach 35 or 40 billion dollars. For the first time at one of these annual meetings European bankers, in private conversations, said they no longer believe budget estimates announced by the United States government.

The credibility of official budget estimates has been impaired by this country's chronic deficits, both in its domestic and in its international accounts. As Dr. Robert V. Roosa, former undersecretary of the treasury, said in a recent lecture, "a country whose external accounts are seriously and continually out of balance often has something going seriously awry within its own economy." The accumulated deficit in the United States balance of payments position from 1950 thru 1966 was 33.3 billion dollars, and it is continuing at an annual rate of more than 2 billion dollars.

As a result of this persistent deficit, the United States gold reserve decreased from 23.252 billion dollars at the end of 1952 to 13.075 billion at the end of August, 1967, when United States liabilities to foreigners—payable in gold—exceeded 29 billion dollars. The depletion of our gold reserve, which now is considerably less than half of the total of foreign claims against it, is psychologically inflationary; it weakens confidence in the dollar. The main cause of inflation, however, is deficit spending. The government finances its deficits by selling bonds and other instruments of indebtedness, which become the basis for a vast expansion of paper currency and bank credit.

The federal debt on Oct. 12 was 339,752 billion dollars. The interest alone on this colossal debt was estimated, in the President's budget submitted to Congress last January, at 14,050 billion dollars in this fiscal year, but it is likely to be close to 15 billion because of rising interest rates and much heavier spending than the President predicted.

The growth of the federal debt has been attended by a steady erosion of the purchasing power of the dollar. As reported by the labor department's bureau of labor statistics, the consumer price index, representing average costs of all items purchased in United States cities, was 116.9 [1957-59 equals 100] in August. On the same 1957-59 base, the index for January, 1940, is 48.5. Thus in August of this year the dollar was worth 41½ cents compared with January, 1940.

Lelf H. Olsen, senior vice president and economist of New York's First National City bank, told the National Industrial Conference board on Oct. 3 that "we have been experiencing an unacceptable rate of inflation for two years now." He said the consumer price index rose only 1.3 per cent a year from 1959 thru 1965 but climbed nearly

3 per cent last year. Despite a near-recession, inflation in the first half of this year eased off only slightly, to a 2.5 per cent annual rate. Since May 1, Mr. Olsen noted, "the rise in consumer prices has spurred to a 4½ per cent annual rate." He warned that both inflation and high interest rates are "already with us" and are "likely to move higher" as the "federal reserve pumps out new money to finance the federal deficit."

Mr. Olsen also warned that the money supply, broadly defined to include time deposits as well as currency and demand deposits, has been growing at a record annual rate. On Aug. 30 the total was 357.2 billion dollars, consisting of 39.6 billion in currency, 139.5 billion in demand deposits, and 178.1 billion in time deposits, all seasonally adjusted.

"From December last year thru August of this year the annual rate of increase was more than 12 per cent, over half again the average rate of increase from 1961 thru April of 1966," Mr. Olsen said. "Total commercial bank credit, that is loans and investments, increased in the first eight months of this year by 16 billion dollars. Seasonally adjusted, this amounted to an annual rate of increase of 41 billion dollars, or 13 per cent; the previous record gain in growth of bank credit was 25 billion dollars in 1965."

A federal deficit of 25 or 30 billion dollars would require a far more inflationary expansion of the money supply unless the Fed should decide to raise interest rates much higher. The easy money politicians would resist higher interest rates. Moreover, it is doubtful that the Fed could finance such an enormous deficit, even with higher interest rates, without a vast expansion of the money supply.

As Dr. Roy L. Reiersen, senior vice president and economist of the Bankers Trust company, told the National Industrial Conference board, chronic deficit spending "gives rise to . . . persistent and spiraling inflation, tight credit, and high interest rates, repeated crises and unsettlements in the credit markets, abandonment of any hope for the balance of payments, and the real possibility of a major dollar crisis."

No responsible economist or banker believes there is imminent danger of hyperinflation in this country, such as occurred in Germany after World War I and China after World War II. In the German inflation of 1920-23, prices increased a trillion-fold. In such a cataclysmic inflation whole classes are impoverished and the social order is destroyed. Altho there is no imminent or unavoidable danger of such a terrible catastrophe in the United States, the peril is clear, present, and great. Even creeping inflation, at a rate of 3 per cent a year compounded, doubles prices in 23 years. Once the rate increases to 4 or 5 per cent and the people become convinced that continued, rising inflation is inevitable, they accelerate it by trying to evade it or hedge against it. They spend their savings and even go into debt, bidding up prices for stocks, real estate, commodities, new cars, and other costly things.

A tax increase would reduce the deficit and thus would have some effect on the rate of inflation. But taxes themselves are inflationary because they increase production costs, consumer prices, and demands for higher wages. The Johnson administration has argued that its proposed surtax of 10 per cent on the income tax liability of corporations and individuals would not affect married couples with two children, earning \$5,000 a year or less, or single persons earning \$1,900 or less because of personal exemptions. This argument is as false as it is demagogic. Taxes are paid by all the people, regardless of their income, when they buy bread and the other necessities of life.

Colin Clark, of Oxford university, one of

the world's most distinguished economists, contends that "25 per cent of the national income is about the limit for taxation in any nontotalitarian community in times of peace." The rate in the United States in 1966 was 36.9 per cent. The national income was 616.7 billion dollars, receipts of the federal government were 143.2 billion, and receipts of the state and local governments were 84.7 billion. The nation's imperative need in the present crisis is not higher taxes but a reduction of spending. Rep. Wilbur D. Mills (D., Ark.), chairman of the ways and means committee, wisely justifies the refusal of the House to vote new taxes on the ground that "we want to pause in this headlong rush to ever bigger government." The objective, he says, is not simply to cut federal spending this year and next year, desirable as that may be, but to establish control over the amount and character of federal spending in the future. He emphasizes that basic changes in federal programs are necessary, and demands responsible leadership by the executive branch in the formulation of such changes.

HOW SOUND IS YOUR DOLLAR?

PRINTING PRESS MONEY?

While officials of the Johnson administration have been calling for a tax increase to restrain inflationary pressures, the federal reserve system has been pumping out fresh supplies of money at an unprecedented rate to expand the already overheated economy.

Leif H. Olsen, senior vice president and economist of New York's First National City bank, calls this curious spectacle "the great economic paradox of 1967." It is significant, he says, that the two leading schools of economic theory now agree that the economy is being overstimulated. One school consists of the so-called "new" economists—Keynesians and neo-Keynesians—who advocate deficit spending to stimulate economic expansion, full employment, and prosperity. The other school, headed by Prof. Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago, advocates a continuous but limited expansion of the money supply—3 to 5 per cent a year—to maintain orderly economic growth. From December, 1966, thru August of this year the money supply, broadly defined to include time deposits as well as currency and demand deposits, increased at a record annual rate of 12 per cent.

The federal reserve board's easy money policy in the face of a federal deficit that may exceed 30 billion dollars in this fiscal year is viewed with increasing concern by bankers and businessmen. Even William McChesney Martin Jr., esteemed chairman of the Fed's board of governors, is accused of going along with a reckless policy of financing the deficit by printing new money.

For many years Mr. Martin has been regarded as the personification of sound money—a mighty bulwark against the deluge of inflation—and has been as immune from attack as J. Edgar Hoover, heroic defender of the nation from communist infiltration and subversion. But Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly charged in its issue of Oct. 9 that the nation's money managers, under Mr. Martin's leadership, "have pursued an almost fanatical easy credit policy, a reckless course that has ceaselessly worked to lower the purchasing power of the currency at home and debase its standing abroad."

Some leading bankers agree with this judgment of the Fed but tend to excuse Mr. Martin. They point out that he has only one of seven votes in the board of governors of the federal reserve system and one of 12 in the federal open market committee, both of which are dominated by easy money proponents. At a meeting of the open market committee on May 23, the chairman went along with the "liberals," voting for a "policy to foster money and credit conditions, including bank credit growth, conducive to renewed economic expansion." Darryl R. Francis, president of the St. Louis Federal Reserve bank

and a member of the open market committee, voted against this policy directive on the ground that both monetary and fiscal policies had been highly stimulative and that some firming in the money market was needed to guard against inflationary pressures later in the year.

The Fed adopted a restrictive money policy in 1966, which resulted in an excessive accumulation of inventories and depressed the market. Altho the money managers switched to an expansive policy in December, the lag effect of the earlier tight money policy caused a near-recession in the first half of this year. Just as the full effect of the restrictive policy last year was not felt until this year, the full effect of the inflationary policy this year will not be known until next year. In spite of this danger, the money managers, with Chairman Martin's acquiescence, persist in their policy of expansion.

Actually the monetary authorities have no real choice. Control of monetary policy has passed into the hands of the politicians, and that is the most frightening aspect of the financial problem. If the President demands and Congress votes appropriations which will result in expenditures of 25 to 30 billion dollars in excess of revenues, government obligations must be sold to finance the deficit. If they cannot be sold to individuals and nonbanking institutions, they must be sold to the banks. When serious inflation is present or threatened, investors are reluctant to buy fixed-income, longer-maturity securities, such as mortgages, municipal bonds, and treasury issues. To make government securities attractive to individuals and nonbanking institutions, the Fed would have to push interest rates up to intolerable heights. The tug-of-war between government and private borrowers would be intensified. There would be no mortgage money for housing.

The only alternative to a restrictive, high-interest-rate policy is to pump reserves into the banking system and force it to buy the government's bonds. In effect, this amounts to printing new money.

In a statement to the House ways and means committee, Chairman Martin strongly supported the President's proposal for tax increases. He said we already have "clear and compelling evidence of a resurgence in inflationary pressures which, if unchecked, would curtail domestic expansion, aggravate an already serious balance-of-payments problem, and bring severe strains in the markets for credit." Instead of a reduction in government spending, however, he argued for a tax increase.

Mr. Olsen told the National Industrial Conference board that increasing taxes while continuing an expansive monetary policy would be similar to applying the brakes on a speeding automobile while keeping the accelerator on the floor. "A tax increase may well help to slow things down," he said, "but the real help will come when monetary policy is permitted to become somewhat less stimulative by having less federal debt to finance."

This would require a reduction of spending. The cost of the war in Viet Nam has reached an annual rate of 27 billion dollars [2¼ billion a month] and is likely to go higher unless the administration eventually decides to end it by winning it. All wars are wasteful, but there is no realistic hope for substantial savings in Viet Nam if we give our fighting men the support they deserve.

There are opportunities, however, for reductions of billions of dollars in civilian spending. The budget submitted to Congress last January estimated expenditures on civilian programs at 59.5 billion dollars. Henry H. Fowler, secretary of the treasury, told the ways and means committee that the January estimates may be exceeded by 2.5 billion dollars. Others believe the Johnson administration will ask Congress to vote huge new appropriations for spending programs in the cities next year, an election

year, because of threats of black power demagogues to incite insurrections that will make last summer's violence in Newark, Detroit, and other cities look like mere tryouts.

Fowler said total expenditures in fiscal 1968 may be 8.5 billion dollars higher than the estimate of 135 billion in the President's administrative budget, submitted to Congress last January. Revenue estimates have been revised downward by 7 billion. Without a tax increase, Fowler said, the deficit could rise to 29 billion dollars.

There is a highly significant item called "transfer payments" in the government's national income account, which is reported in the commerce department's Survey of Current Business. These are called transfer payments because the money is transferred from the pockets of one group of citizens to those of another—from the productive to the nonproductive. They include social security and other pensions, as well as welfare payments, but the pensions have to be paid out of current income, because there are no reserves for them. The total of all transfer payments, including 1.8 billion dollars in state unemployment insurance benefits, was 43.9 billion dollars in 1966. In 1967 the seasonally adjusted annual rate was 50.8 billion dollars in the first quarter and 51.4 billion in the second quarter. This is one measure of the rate at which the United States is becoming a socialist welfare state. Another measure is the tax rate—total federal, state, and local tax collections as a percentage of national income—which in 1966 was 36.9 per cent. Still another is the rate of inflation. In August of this year the dollar was worth 41½ cents compared with its purchasing power in January, 1940, and in recent months consumer prices have been rising at the annual rate of 4½ per cent.

These are trends that disturb Rep. Wilbur D. Mills [D., Ark.], chairman of the ways and means committee, who says there must be "basic changes in federal programs, not merely appropriation cuts this year," before Congress increases taxes. They are trends that should disturb all Americans.

HOW SOUND IS YOUR DOLLAR?

AS GOOD AS GOLD?

There are two deficits, closely related and mutually aggravating, which debase the domestic purchasing power and discredit the international standing of the United States dollar. One is the deficit in the federal budget and the other is the deficit in the international accounts of the United States.

We have a substantial tho declining surplus in foreign trade, but because of foreign aid, military expenditures overseas, tourist spending, foreign investments, and other dollar outflows, there is a chronic deficit in our total international transactions. Beginning in 1950, the United States has had a balance of payments deficit every year except 1957, and the accumulated net total at the end of 1966 was 33.339 billion dollars. The deficit, seasonally adjusted, was 536 million dollars in the first quarter and 513 million in the second quarter of 1967; so the total this year may exceed 2 billion dollars.

The balance of payments deficits have been financed in part by the payment of gold to foreigners and in part by the increase of our indebtedness to foreigners. The United States gold stock declined from 24.6 billion dollars at the end of 1949 to 13.04 billion on Aug. 30, 1967. Meanwhile, United States liquid liabilities to foreigners increased to 29.596 billion dollars in June. Altho only 14.069 billion of this was held by foreign official institutions and therefore immediately convertible into gold, the dollar holdings of private banks and other foreigners can readily be transferred to their central banks for conversion into gold.

Thus foreigners could draw out the entire gold reserve of the United States at their

discretion or else discredit the dollar by forcing this country to suspend gold payments. They have not done this because such a raid on the dollar would adversely affect their own currencies and economies. The dollar is an international currency. More than half of all international transactions are denominated in dollars. So long as the United States is willing and able to buy or sell gold at 35 dollars to the fine ounce troy, the dollar is as good as gold.

Many foreign bankers are convinced, however, that the United States, in spite of official protestations to the contrary, eventually will be compelled to suspend gold payments or devalue the dollar by increasing the price of gold. If this opinion gains credence, the foreigners may start a run on the United States gold stock, just as a run on a bank is started when the word gets around that its condition is shaky. If the price of gold were doubled, the dollar holdings of foreigners in the United States would lose half their value.

West European countries which enjoy surpluses in their international transactions and have accumulated large gold and dollar reserves are increasingly insistent that the United States must put its house in order. Their attitude was reflected in the 1965 annual report of the Bank for International Settlements, which declared that, "after an extended series of external deficits, the reserve position of the United States needs to be strengthened to restore full confidence in the dollar." If the United States does not solve its balance of payments problem, confidence in the dollar will be further impaired and there will be great danger of a run on our gold stock, as well as forced devaluation of the dollar.

The balance of payments deficit increases inflation in the United States by draining off gold and eroding confidence in the dollar. In addition to this, foreign holdings in the United States resulting from the balance of payments deficit include more than 15 billion dollars in bank deposits, which are part of the inflationary money supply.

Inflation in turn has a major effect upon the balance of payments deficit. High production costs are pricing the United States out of the markets of the world and our trade surplus is rapidly declining. The surplus will decline further and may be wiped out if the rate of inflation increases, for imports always go up with inflation. From 6.7 billion dollars in 1964, the trade surplus declined to 4.8 billion in 1965 and to 3.7 billion in 1966. The surplus was up to an annual rate of 4.2 billion in the first half of 1967, but this rate may not continue because of declining exports to Britain and Germany, which have had recessions.

Actually it is doubtful that the commercial exports of the United States balance its imports. If exports that are subsidized under the foreign aid program and military equipment sales by the government were deducted from the so-called surplus, it probably would disappear. Foreign aid of all kinds, economic and military, now exceeds 6 billion dollars a year. The administration argues that 87 per cent of all foreign aid expenditures are for American goods and services and that the effect on the balance of payments is negligible. It is obvious, however, that nations receiving this aid can use the foreign exchange it saves them for the purchase of goods and services from other countries. Otherwise this foreign exchange might come to the United States.

Instead of reducing foreign aid to balance our international accounts, the government has resorted to the shortsighted expedient of restricting profitable private business with foreigners. There is a so-called interest equalization tax on purchases of foreign securities. Under a so-called voluntary restraint program, the federal reserve board limits bank loans to foreigners and the commerce department limits direct foreign investments by American companies. As a result of this

program, the total outflow of private capital declined from 6.5 billion dollars in 1964 to 3.7 billion in 1965 and rose only slightly to 4.1 billion in 1966. The annual rate so far this year has been about the same as in 1966.

This policy is self-defeating, for the repatriation of United States earnings from direct investments abroad has exceeded the investment outlay from the United States every year since 1945. In 1964, the last year for which the figures are at hand, the inflow to the United States was 4.5 billion dollars and the outflow was 2.4 billion. In 1960 United States corporations invested 4 billion dollars in fixed assets abroad, but 56 per cent of this came from retained earnings and borrowings abroad. In 1966 the investment total was 9 billion dollars, but 70 per cent of it came from retained earnings and borrowing abroad.

Americans spend about 2 billion dollars a year more on foreign travel than foreign tourists spend in the United States. This is a substantial item in the adverse payments balance, but any limitation on the freedom of Americans to travel and spend their money abroad would be widely resented. Duty-free imports of tourist purchases already are limited to \$100.

From 1960 thru 1966 about 70 per cent of the direct cost to the United States government of maintaining its troops in Germany was offset by the sale of military equipment to Germany. This year Germany agreed to purchase \$500,000,000 of long-term United States bonds and the total offset, including military purchases, is expected to be 100 per cent. The German purchases offset expenditures by the United States government, but there is still a big dollar loss thru spending by the troops, who exchange some of their dollars for marks in Germany and for other European currencies when they go on leave.

This dollar loss could be stopped only by bringing the troops home, and this would be prudent, both strategically and economically. The prosperous western European countries, which rely mainly upon the United States nuclear deterrent for their defense against communist aggression, certainly could replace the American ground forces with troops of their own. Moreover, the Germans are fully capable of developing their own nuclear deterrent as the French are doing, and it makes no sense to restrain them from acquiring weapons which the enemy already has.

The dollar loss in Viet Nam from all sources is estimated at 2 billion dollars a year. The troops are paid in military payment certificates [scrip], which is the only currency accepted in United States installations, but they exchange some of their scrip for piasters to spend in Saigon and other cities. The United States buys these piasters with dollars, which the government of Viet Nam is supposed to use to pay for imports from the United States. Undoubtedly, however, there is a big leakage, just as there is a big dollar leakage in foreign aid to Viet Nam, in spite of all efforts to prevent it. Some of these dollars find their way into the hands of French businessmen and end up in Paris. Moreover, the troops in Viet Nam are given dollars to spend when they go on "R and R" [rest and recreation] in Bangkok, Singapore, Hong Kong, Manila, or Taipei.

There is not much more that can be done to plug the dollar leaks. The only way the United States can solve its balance of payments deficit is to put its house in order by ending deficit spending—on foreign aid, among other things—which is the cause of inflation, of the loss of foreign markets, and of the steadily worsening dollar crisis.

HOW SOUND IS YOUR DOLLAR?

THE GLOBAL GIVEAWAY

Foreign aid is a major reason why your dollar is losing its purchasing power and the debt-burdened, deficit-ridden United

States is in the throes of a money crisis. Foreign aid, including interest on the money we have borrowed to give away, now costs the American people more than 10 billion dollars a year.

A table submitted by the government to a House appropriations subcommittee shows that foreign aid of all kinds, economic and military, grants and loans, from 1946 thru 1966 [fiscal years], totaled 122 billion, 365 million dollars. The net total, after all interest and principal payments on loans, was 108 billion, 867 million dollars. Rep. Otto E. Passman [D., La.], chairman of the subcommittee, has since been advised that the net total thru fiscal year 1967 is 114 billion, 694 million dollars.

Rep. Passman calculates the total cost of foreign aid since 1946, including interest the government has paid on money borrowed to give away, as 152 billion, 533 million dollars. The net total of 114 billion, 694 million—not counting the interest already paid on it—is more than one-third of the present federal debt of 340 billion dollars. Hence more than a third, or almost 5 billion dollars, of the interest cost of the federal debt—officially estimated at more than 14 billion dollars this fiscal year—must be attributed to foreign aid. New grants and loans to foreign countries now exceed 6 billion dollars a year, and the net total, after all interest and principal payments, is well over 5 billion. Thus the total cost of foreign aid, including interest on the debt, is more than 10 billion dollars a year.

The total public debt of all the other noncommunist countries of the world, according to the latest figures Rep. Passman could get from the executive agencies of the government, is 248 billion dollars, 92 billion less than that of the United States. Yet the United States this year, 22 years after foreign aid began as a post-war emergency relief program, is dissipating its national resources and loading unborn generations with debt by extending assistance of some kind to 100 countries and five territories.

When this unexampled giveaway madness began in 1945 the dollar was still worth 77.3 cents, compared with its purchasing power in January, 1949, in spite of war time inflation, but by August, 1967, it had declined to 41.48 cents. Meanwhile the United States had accumulated a net deficit of 33.3 billion dollars in its international balance of payments position by the end of 1966; its gold stock had declined from 24.6 billion dollars at the end of 1949 to 13 billion in August, 1967, and its liquid liabilities to foreigners, payable in gold, had increased to 29.5 billion dollars. Now the United States is facing a federal deficit that may exceed 30 billion dollars in this fiscal year, accelerated inflation, and a money crisis that could induce foreigners to start a run on our remaining gold stock.

Rep. Passman charges that the foreign aid program has been "fragmentized" to confuse the people. He says the aid flows from 16 different "spigots," and that each year Congress is asked in more than a dozen items of proposed legislation to increase the spending or lending authority of the dispensing agencies.

What the public hears most about is the President's annual request for authorizations and appropriations under the foreign assistance act. This year the President requested 3.226 billion dollars in new funds, and Congress may reduce this by almost a billion dollars, but it will make little difference. There are too many other programs, such as food for peace, the Export-Import bank, military assistance, and aid thru international agencies, and too many billions of dollars of unexpended balances available to the aid bureaucracy. Yet irresponsible Washington reporters write about the annual "foreign aid" bill of 3 billion dollars or

less as if it were the sum total of foreign aid, and this phony figure sticks in the minds of the people. The table submitted to the House subcommittee shows that economic and military assistance of all kinds, including loans and grants, totaled 6.376 billion dollars in fiscal 1962, 6.738 billion in fiscal 1963, 6.134 billion in fiscal 1964, 6.140 billion in fiscal 1965, and 6.751 billion in fiscal 1966.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk told the House subcommittee that foreign aid "transfers United States skills and commodities—not United States dollars—to the less developed countries" and has no significant effect on the chronic balance of payments deficit. This argument, of course, takes no account of what economists call the "substitution effect" of aid and is false. Countries receiving American goods and services under the aid program can use the foreign exchange this saves them—including their dollar earnings from exports to the United States—for the purchase of goods and services from other countries.

Moreover, foreign aid is a major cause of federal deficit financing, which increases inflation and the cost of production and thus adversely affects the competitive trade position of the United States. Our trade surplus, which declined from 6.7 billion dollars in 1964 to 4.8 billion in 1965 and 3.7 billion in 1966, falls far short of offsetting the deficit in our other international transactions.

Testifying before a joint congressional subcommittee on economic policy, Dr. N. R. Danielian, president of the International Economic Policy association, said: "The stark fact is that United States commercial exports are hardly enough to pay for our commodity imports. If you deduct the foreign-aid-induced exports and the military hardware sales from export figures, it is doubtful that purely civilian exports and imports are in balance."

Secretary Rusk also told the House subcommittee that foreign aid requests of all kinds for fiscal year 1968 were less than 0.7 per cent of our GNP [gross national product of goods and services], which was swollen by inflation to an annual rate, seasonally adjusted, of 790 billion dollars in the third quarter of 1967.

Without foreign aid, Rusk, said we'd be living in a "less stable and more threatening world." Yet when Congressman Passman reminded him that foreign aid, with interest, had cost 152.5 billion dollars, Rusk said this country, since 1946, "has put more than 900 billion dollars into defense, almost a trillion dollars." When we have to spend that much on defense, it is hard to believe that foreign aid has brought us a more stable or less threatening world.

Another administration argument is that American exports to Europe have increased enormously since the end of the Marshall plan and that exports to Japan have multiplied as a result of our aid. But our imports have increased more than our exports. We still have a favorable balance with Europe—exports of 10.011 billion and imports of 7.863 billion in 1966—but not with Japan, for which the figures in 1966 were 2.964 billion of exports to 2.365 billion of imports from the United States. If the grant aid of 12.928 billion dollars extended by the United States under the Marshall plan from 1949 thru 1952 and 8.724 billion under the mutual security act from 1953 thru 1957 had consisted of interest-bearing loans, the prosperous countries of Europe, as well as Japan, would be repaying us now, with interest, and there would be no balance of payments problem. Instead, these countries are accumulating huge gold and dollar reserves and exporting manufactured products at prices with which the United States cannot compete.

Altho the United States is technologically the most advanced nation in the world, its

industrial production costs are so high that it has become primarily an exporter of agricultural products and other raw materials, chemicals, semi-finished products, and machinery [an exception to the general trend] and an importer of finished products which require a substantial employment of labor in their manufacture. In 1966 we imported manufactured goods valued at 6.353 billion dollars and machinery and transport equipment valued at 4.827 billion, compared with exports of manufactured goods valued at 3.434 billion and machinery and transport equipment valued at 11.164 billion.

The western European countries agreed to general tariff reductions averaging about 31 per cent in the recent "Kennedy round" of negotiations, but they have erected all kinds of so-called nontariff barriers against American products, such as quotas and internal taxes. As a result of these restrictive trade practices, there is strong support in Congress for a proposed system of quotas to restrict imports of textiles, footwear, steel, electronics, and other manufactured products. This would provide some protection for American industry and labor, but it would increase prices to consumers, provoke reprisals against American exports, and further aggravate the balance of payments problem.

HOW SOUND IS YOUR DOLLAR?

GOLD AND FOOL'S GOLD

Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, the financial wizard of Hitler's Third Reich, probably would feel vindicated by the artful expedients and quackeries that have been proposed by some of the frenzied financiers in this country to prevent a day of reckoning for the United States dollar.

These clever schemes are intended to make it appear that the dollar is as good as gold, altho the gold we have left is less than half of the outstanding foreign claims against it. They are intended to conceal the vulnerability of the dollar and the cause of its distress—deficit spending.

Charles Dickens stated the problem as Micawber's law: "Annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure nineteen nineteen six, result, happiness; annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure twenty pounds ought and six, result misery."

Micawber's law was repealed by the Roosevelt administration in the 1930s and the Keynes law was substituted. In her book, "The Roosevelt I Knew," Frances Perkins thus stated the Keynes law: "With one dollar paid out for relief or public works or anything else, you have created four dollars' worth of national income."

John Maynard [Lord] Keynes, English economist and a major deity in the international lavender set, was "liberally consulted" by "government people" in Washington, according to Miss Perkins, and was convinced that the United States would prove the validity of his prosperity-thru-spending doctrine to the whole world.

Keynes also dreamed of a world central bank, with the power to create new money, an international currency which would replace gold in the settlement of accounts between nations. A long step in that direction was taken by the members of the International Monetary fund at its recent annual meeting in Rio de Janeiro. This scheme provides for the use of S. D. R.s [special drawing rights], called "paper gold," by nations with chronic balance of payments deficits, such as the United States and Gamal Abdel Nasser's United Arab Republic. The S. D. R.s also have been called fool's gold, a term suggesting that they would have about as much value as the iron pyrites which so many deluded prospectors have mistaken for real gold.

If the new scheme is ratified by the I. M. F. member governments, each member will be authorized a certain quota of S. D. R.s. Then if President de Gaulle of France, for example,

should continue to demand gold for his country's surplus dollar holdings, the United States—at least, in theory—could pay him off in S. D. R.s. If de Gaulle accepted the S. D. R.s, he could use them to settle France's accounts with any other country that would accept them.

If a nation should overdraw its quota of S. D. R.s, it would be obliged, in due time, to purchase acceptable foreign exchange with its own currency and redeem the overdrafts. The idea is that the S. D. R.s would rest upon the joint and several obligations of all the I. M. F. members and would be "gold-guaranteed," altho just how has not been determined.

Bankers we have consulted say this scheme is nothing to be alarmed about because it will never be used extensively. The nations with balance of payments surpluses do not need it and they are not likely to accept "fool's gold" from countries with persistent deficits. Even if the S. D. R.s were acceptable, the United States could not draw too heavily upon them, because that would be a sign of weakness and it might start a run on our remaining gold stock.

Dr. Robert V. Roosa, former undersecretary of the treasury and now a partner in Brown Brothers, Harriman & Co., New York, was one of the original proponents of the international currency scheme. He proposed the use of C. R. U.s [convertible reserve units], which were called "Roosa cruasas." Supporters of this proposal were called Roosacrualians, which sounds more like a potty religious sect than a group of responsible monetary authorities.

The international currency proponents have been derided gently by Prof. Milton Friedman, of the University of Chicago, as "able men who spend endless hours trying to devise ingenious means whereby everybody can borrow from everybody else without anybody being committed to lend to anyone." Dr. Roosa, however, seemed the soundest of sound money men in a recent debate with Prof. Friedman, in which he strongly defended the present system of fixed exchange rates, based upon \$35 as the price of gold.

Prof. Friedman, who was described by Dr. Roosa as "one of the world's most distinguished exponents of market economics," said the balance of payments problem "is simply another example of the far-reaching effects of government price fixing." He proposed a system of floating exchange rates, in which the market would determine the parity of the dollar and of all other currencies, and there would be no balance of payments deficit because exporters and importers and other private traders would settle their own accounts. Official foreign exchange reserves are not needed, he said, because private dealers will provide them, just as they do in the free commodity markets.

If the exchange value of the dollar should decline under the floating rate system, American exports would rise, in spite of high production costs, because more dollars could be purchased with English pounds, German marks, French francs, etc. Dr. Roosa argued, however, that such a system would "make for progressive inflation and successive waves of exchange rate depreciation from one country to the next." In a country experiencing rapid inflation, he said, the most likely reaction would "be toward accentuation, not containment, of the exchange rate decline, for the domestic prices of exports could then increase beyond the screen of lower exchange costs to foreigners, import costs would rise, wages would no doubt be raised even further, and a new wage floor would have, in effect, been built under the inflation already realized."

Many foreign bankers are convinced that the United States will be compelled eventually to increase the price of gold, because the dollar already has lost more than half of

the commodity purchasing power it had before World War II and the cost of producing gold, like everything else, has gone up proportionally. This belief is an incentive to foreigners to speculate on a gold price increase, or insure against devaluation of the dollar, and it makes our remaining 13 billion dollar gold reserve highly vulnerable.

William F. Butler and John V. Deaver, vice presidents and economists of the Chase Manhattan bank, have proposed an ingenious plan to protect the gold we have left without devaluing the dollar. In the October issue of *Foreign Affairs*, they suggest an official declaration that the United States will never support a price higher than 35 dollars an ounce and that this country's response to an assault on its remaining gold stock would be suspension of the privilege foreigners now have of buying our gold with their dollars. Future sales and purchases would be made only at the discretion of the United States, and then only at the fixed price of 35 dollars an ounce.

Butler and Deaver acknowledge that the United States in such circumstances would lose control over the price of gold and over the foreign exchange value of the dollar. But they argue that foreigners would either have to support the dollar at the present rate, which would be the same as going on a full dollar standard, or else at a devalued rate, which would put European exporters at a competitive disadvantage. Moreover, Europeans would take a huge loss on their dollar holdings if the exchange rate were devalued.

Butler and Deaver are persuasive, but they concede that the United States, despite its great economic power, "can no longer call the tune." Certainly it will be increasingly difficult for the United States to call the tune on gold, because the world supply is so small and the demand is so great. Gold sells for the equivalent of 70 to 75 dollars an ounce on the Bombay market. The total reserves of all the non-communist countries in December, 1966, were estimated at 43.225 billion dollars. World production outside of the communist countries totaled 1.445 billion dollars in 1966. The major producers are the Soviet Union and South Africa [1.080 billion dollars in 1966], followed by Canada [114.6 million dollars] and the United States [63.1 million dollars]. New production is barely sufficient to supply the increasing needs of industry. The United States may have to subsidize domestic production of gold for industrial use, for some of the mines cannot operate profitably at the government's fixed price.

HOW SOUND IS YOUR DOLLAR?

WHAT CAN WE DO?

There is not much an individual can do to stop inflation—unless he happens to be President of the United States. If enough people are sufficiently concerned, however, they can stop federal deficit spending—the main cause of inflation—by sending a torrent of letters and telegrams to their senators and representatives in Congress, demanding an end of the reckless practice of voting appropriations that vastly exceed any reasonable expectation of revenues. A list of senators and representatives from five midwest states will be found on page 2.

We have asked leading Chicago bankers what can and should be done to halt inflation, which has reduced the value of the dollar by 58.5 per cent since January, 1940, and is rapidly getting worse as the federal reserve system pumps out fresh supplies of printing press money to finance a deficit that may exceed 30 billion dollars this fiscal year.

Here are their answers:

Beryl W. Sprinkel, vice president and economist, Harris Trust and Savings bank: "The source of the current serious inflation is clearly overexpansive governmental economic policies in the monetary and fiscal areas. Economic policies are now the most expan-

sive since World War II, despite the fact that the economy is fully employed and prices are rising rapidly. Hence, the prospect is for substantially greater increases in total spending in the coming year than in the production of real goods and services. Therefore, price pressures will be sizable.

"What can now be done to bring the inflation under control? Clearly the leadership for this action must emanate from government. So far this year the money supply has been rising at about a 7 per cent annual rate, at least twice too much for price stability. At the same time, the budget deficit has continued to increase as both defense and nondefense spending has risen.

"Strict control of federal spending, accompanied by a possible tax increase, is a desirable ingredient in slowing the inflationary push. Of equal or greater importance is a reduced rate of monetary growth emanating from a less expansive monetary policy. Undoubtedly, monetary policy has been this expansive primarily because of concern about rising interest rates and the problems created both for the housing industry and the financing of the federal deficit.

"Unfortunately, when rapid monetary increases occur at full employment and inflation develops, an easy money policy causes high rates of interest after the money begins to be spent. On the other hand, the beginning of the less expansive money policy in an effort to slow the inflation would, in the short run, mean even higher interest rates.

"There is little that the individual can do to slow the inflationary surge other than to urge his elected representatives to pursue less expansive monetary-fiscal policies in this day of full employment and rising prices."

Tilden Cummings, president, Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust Company of Chicago: "Inflation has once again become one of our most serious economic problems. Efforts to curb the rapid advance in prices have been half-hearted at best and will continue to be ineffective unless the administration, Congress, labor, and management combine to bring the dangerous trend to an early halt.

"The current inflationary trend must be attributed to monetary and fiscal policies inappropriate for a war economy. Clearly, the need now is for a sharp reduction in the huge and unsettling budget deficit thru cuts in such nondefense expenditures as harbor and river development, road construction, dams, aero-space, agriculture, and termination of the numerous programs that have outlived their usefulness. Where cuts are not immediately feasible, deferment of projects must be considered. It is entirely possible that cuts could be made in defense expenditure also, without impairing military effectiveness. In addition to budgetary cuts and deferments, a tax increase is needed in order to return some semblance of proportion and balance to our fiscal and monetary position.

"Firm fiscal action will free the monetary authorities from the need to finance the administration's unwieldy deficit thru massive injections of bank credit by the federal reserve. Undoubtedly the resulting sharp rise in the nation's money supply has materially contributed to the inflationary trend. Reduction in the money supply's growth might even go hand-in-hand with a general lowering of interest rates once the administration's borrowing needs have been brought back to normal proportions.

"The urgency of a successful anti-inflationary program requires a clear statement by the administration of its specific policy objectives, supported by immediate action on the part of Congress. In addition, strong appeals must be made to both labor and management to exercise maximum restraint in their wage and price demands."

Homer J. Livingston, chairman of the board, First National Bank of Chicago: "The

threat of an acceleration in the upward movement of prices is one of the most serious economic problems facing the nation today. Such a development always lowers the purchasing power of those on fixed incomes, mainly the senior citizens who are growing in number and who have come to constitute a significant market for the nation's output of goods and services. Equally troublesome is the effect of inflation on the nation's balance of international payments. Exports would decline as United States-made products are priced out of world markets, while imports would rise as they become less costly than domestically-produced goods.

"Finally, inflation wears away the incentive to save, and savings are essential to investment and capital formation, the source of job creation. It is for these reasons that the deficit of the federal government must be narrowed by reducing expenditures and by increasing taxes. Failure to do so will lead to higher prices for all.

"It is unconscionable that a nation as affluent as the United States should resort to massive deficit financing at a time when employment and incomes are virtually at unprecedented highs, as they are today."

In a significant speech at Grinnell college last Sunday, George Champion, chairman of the board of the Chase Manhattan bank and a distinguished native son of Illinois, warned that "massive transfusions of federal money" will not solve the problems of our cities. He noted that the cities which were hardest hit in riots last summer had received above-average shares of the billions dispensed each year by the federal government. He said the whole welfare state, including the farm program, is based upon the assumption that depression is a normal condition, tho this concept is hopelessly obsolete.

Many of the federal programs have exactly the opposite effect from what was intended, Mr. Champion said. Housing projects become permanent slums. Welfare payments to fatherless families encourage fathers to leave home, resulting in patterns of idleness and community-sponsored illegitimacy. The "sprawling welfare empire and the layers of local and state relief operations" are regarded as the "enemy" by welfare recipients, who are organizing unions to press for their "rights" in demonstrations against the system.

What is needed, Mr. Champion said, is "incentive welfare," involving motivation, training, and job opportunities. Business and industry, he said, can provide the basic education and training needed by the unemployed to qualify them for jobs now going begging. Across the nation, there are more than 1,000,000 job openings and almost 3,000,000 unemployed.

"Even as prosperous a nation as ours cannot do everything at once," Mr. Champion asserted. "We must inevitably make choices."

If we make the wrong choices, relying upon an ever-expanding central government and ever-mounting federal deficits to "do everything at once," a prophecy made 110 years ago by Lord Macaulay may be the melancholy fate of this Republic. In a letter to H. S. Randall, an American friend, Macaulay predicted that industrialization and urbanization eventually would produce "a distressed and discontented majority" in this country, which would listen to the rantings of demagogues and could not be restrained by the government.

"There is nothing to stop you," he wrote. "Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. . . . When a society has entered on this downward progress either civilization or liberty must perish. Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the 20th century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth; with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals

who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and that your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."

TRUTH-IN-PRICING LEGISLATION

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, many times in the press of legislative work and in the rush to judge serious issues the work of some of our distinguished colleagues is overlooked.

One of my freshman colleagues, the Honorable ROBERT V. DENNEY, of Nebraska, has introduced, in my opinion, one of the most interesting and important measures in this session.

"The Denney bill," as this legislation has come to be known, would require that every public bill or resolution submitted to the House of Representatives contain an estimate of its cost to the Government for the next 2 fiscal years. Cumulative totals would be published twice a month.

H.R. 9966 will require the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to submit to both bodies, on or before the 15th day of each month, an adjusted estimate of anticipated revenues and expenditures of the Federal Government for the balance of the fiscal year. We all know that the budgets presented to us in January are based on a number of assumptions, which later are often proven to be inaccurate. In this measure the members of both bodies would be presented with an up-to-date financial picture as to the current financial status of the budget.

In conjunction with the above measure, Congressman DENNEY has introduced House Resolution 476 which would amend the rules of the House to provide that each bill or resolution introduced in the House must contain an estimate of the cost to the Federal Government, for the then fiscal year and for the next succeeding fiscal year. The resolution also provides that the Clerk of the House shall have the duty to publish in the RECORD on the first and 15th days of each month cumulative totals showing the total cumulative costs per fiscal year of all bills or resolutions introduced during the present Congress, and as well, the total cumulative costs per fiscal year of all legislation passed during the present Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that BOB DENNEY is asking us to use good business judgment and commonsense in this approach to the fiscal responsibilities of Congress. The National Federation of Independent Business put this idea to a vote of its 240,946 members, and 82 percent registered approval of this approach, 12 percent were opposed, and 6 percent undecided. In my own State of Oklahoma, 87 percent registered approval.

With all of the discussion of truth in packaging, and truth in lending as being valid national objectives, I believe that

we in Congress would be remiss if we did not as well believe truth-in-pricing legislation is both desirable and absolutely necessary.

I congratulate my distinguished colleague, BOB DENNEY of Nebraska for his outstanding approach, and I for one intend to join with him in his fight for fiscal responsibility by cosponsoring this measure today.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM—ACTION NOW

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly obvious that the academic community, the American people, and the press are well aware of the source of failure to take action on congressional reform.

The Senate passed S. 355, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967, by a vote of 75 to 9, clearly demonstrating wholehearted bipartisan support for improving Congress so far as the Senate is concerned.

The Republican policy committee of the House of Representatives has twice formally endorsed congressional reorganization and urged action through publicly released statements of position on October 10, 1966, and May 10, 1967. The entire conference, composed of all Republican Members of the House, formally adopted a resolution urging action on congressional reform at its last meeting on October 11, 1967. The text of this resolution was included in the RECORD by my colleague from Michigan Mr. RIEGLE, on page 31016 of the RECORD of November 2, 1967. From time to time, I and other Members have inserted editorials urging action on congressional reform. These editorials come from all parts of the country.

An editorial in the Spokane, Wash., *Spokesman-Review* of October 11, 1967, entitled "House Demos Stall Congress Reform," was recently brought to my attention. I include the text of that editorial at this point in my remarks:

HOUSE DEMOS STALL CONGRESS REFORM

Well over seven months ago the United States Senate passed a bill to provide for a comprehensive reorganization of the machinery of Congress.

This measure, and comparable legislation that had been introduced in the House of Representatives, has been stalled in the lower house, where hearings have been suspended and the rules committee has blocked desirable action.

Legislative reform should be a vital issue now because this measure—among other things—is intended to establish new procedures in the handling of appropriation bills, and in equipping the Congress with improved means of checking into the budget requests of the executive agencies.

The proposed reorganization would also give better direction and leadership to congressional committees, improve their profes-

sional staffs and revise the regulation of lobbyists.

The Democrats who control the House and the House Rules Committee apparently fear the effects of legislative reorganization.

Members of Congress who see the need for strengthening the legislative branch of the federal government—and the need for restoring popular respect for representative government—have a ripe opportunity now to show their faith and their works. Their first job is to knock out the Democratic leaders' blockade and get the reorganization bill passed at this session.

THE POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, during November, this body has reflected the concern and the temper of the people, and has voted to allow the States to exercise more control in matters of common interest. I supported the rights of the States in the areas of meat inspection and air pollution.

Now that we are discussing one of the most controversial of the proposals offered by this administration, I must remain consistent in my voting and must continue to reflect the wishes of the voters in the First District of Wisconsin.

I am firmly convinced that the best answer to the so-called poverty program in this Nation—which, I believe, at best should be an adjunct of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—rests with the several States.

Each State is best prepared to cope with the poverty problems which confront it. Each State is best prepared to minister to the needs of its citizenry, just as each community is best able to handle its own United Givers' drive.

The Federal Establishment has little business dictating to the States when it comes to methods and means of attempting to deal with poverty as such in these United States. Member after Member of the House and the Senate has spoken at length about the abuses and mishandling which are increments of the poverty program as it is administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity. I have been appalled by illustrations of waste, inefficiency, and lack of judgment found in the OEO and almost totally ignored by its Director, Sargent Shriver.

Mr. Shriver is accustomed to the "good life," and apparently expects his OEO to operate at the same level. He and the administration ask us each year to pay Cadillac prices for a compact car. It is time that the taxpayers get somewhere near a dollar's value for each 100 cents they are forced to invest in the OEO via payment of their Federal income tax.

It would be more reasonable to direct action against poverty in the Nation if each State controlled the funds for its individual program. Through this method, more money could be spent on

the training and rehabilitation of individuals, as the bureaucratic level of fat would be stripped from designated funds. States have organizations of varying degrees of efficiency already in existence, and while some of them may not prove to be much better than the bureaucratic control exercised by Washington, D.C., I feel confident that the lowest proficiency found among the States would surpass the efforts of the present administrators at the OEO.

In my own district in the State of Wisconsin, there are some dedicated and competent men and women who seem to have to spend much of their time wrestling with the forms and applications which the Federal Government requires as a prerequisite to the granting of funds already collected in Wisconsin for use in combating poverty. Several local officials have told me, in all candor, that they have been told that the most professionally prepared applications have the best chance of approval and ultimate funding. This is ridiculous. The communities with the greatest need do not necessarily have silk-writing public relations men available to prepare their applications. Quite the contrary. Yet the Washington bureaucrats apparently have no other basis on which to judge the merits of the requests they receive. The State's assumption of control of the program would eliminate such nonsense. The deserving would receive their share of funds regardless of their competence in verbiage and verbosity in the submission of their applications.

I would urge that any antipoverty fight be financed through the withholding of Federal taxes collected by the States in an amount proportionate to the population and number of low-income families found therein. By keeping the money at the State level, the 10 to 20 percent of funds wasted on administration in Washington, D.C., but now programmed for use throughout the Nation would be eliminated. The topheavy pay scale enjoyed by the large yet select group of sociologists and economists nuzzling against the Federal bosom would be eliminated and the money would have a better chance of finding its way to worthy recipients.

The needs of the people can best be met when those who administer a program are totally conversant with the area and populace involved. Even in the four counties which I represent the needs differ sharply from the western edge of the district to the eastern. Wisconsinites know this and could cope with such a problem much more capably than bureaucrats attending high level conferences some thousand miles away.

My idea is not new. Many efforts have been made during this and preceding Congresses to keep local taxes back home for local use. I am certain that many more bills will be introduced which will ask for greater local control over the largesse accumulated in Washington yearly to finance programs which can best be administered at the local level. I will support those bills which meet such a test. And believe me, Mr. Speaker, I am certain that more and more Members will adopt such an attitude if they pay close attention to their mail. The voters are

sick and tired of pumping money into Washington, D.C., to be used in select areas for a select few.

It is high time that the United Givers' principle be adopted when it comes to the grappling with poverty pockets in the States. The United Givers' drives in the United States would never succeed if the entire amount of money collected throughout the United States were sent to the all-knowing bureaucracy in Washington where the sage of Timberlawn, Sargent Shriver and his subordinates would skim off the cream, before they dispensed the loot after due consideration was given to political benefit to be accumulated in certain areas.

If I must vote against final passage of this bill, and I presently believe that vote against it I must, I shall certainly not oppose other bills which may bring out one or two of the more successful sections administered by OEO if they are placed under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

LET'S KEEP OUR STAKE IN TOMORROW

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, one of the most responsible groups in these United States which has accomplished much in preparing for the world's population explosion is the American Feed Manufacturers Association.

This group has not only given the United States a lead on everyone else when it comes to the solution of nutritional problems, but has made enormous progress in the development of techniques and programs which will be in the forefront when the day comes that the population has expanded to its maximum and agricultural potential has diminished to its minimum.

Dr. Robert Spitzer, of Burlington, Wis., is the president of the AFM this year. He is an acknowledged expert in the nutritional field, and is one of the leading exponents of early planning for the needs of the world in the future. On October 11, Dr. Spitzer delivered an address at the Texas Nutrition Conference which is worthy of note. I include it in the RECORD for the benefit of all:

LET'S KEEP OUR STAKE IN TOMORROW

(By Robert R. Spitzer, Ph. D., president, Murphy Products Co., Inc., Burlington, Wis.)

The day I received Dr. Couch's kind invitation to speak here, I doubted whether I should accept. I knew it would be a long summer as we've been adding new management people and gearing ourselves to meet the obligations we announced earlier this spring. Perhaps you read about them last Spring in Feedstuffs, Feedbag Magazine and other of the fine trade press papers.

Perhaps, there wouldn't be the time to do justice preparing myself for so demanding a subject. But thanks to many wonderful people and the good Lord too, things are

going very well up there in Burlington, and we've had time to give this subject real consideration. Much thanks is acknowledged to our experiment station friends and the American Feed Manufacturers' Association Board of Directors.

And, after all, wasn't the question Dr. Couch proposed rhetorical for a guy who puts bread on the table before his wife and three kids by running that feed concentrate group up in Yankee Country?

"Should we be eating the soybean meal or feed it to animals and then eat the meat and eggs?"

That was his query.

Of course we should be feeding soybean to the animals—combined with a good ration of the commercial feeds you and I make.

Or, should we?

That night at the dinner table I told Marie I would be talking in Texas come October.

I guess that bread on our table had much to do with my decision.

It was diet-bread. That afternoon at the office I had a bottle of Diet Pepsi. At the morning coffee break I'd grabbed a low calorie candy bar and Marie was making sure we were having a colorful dessert called "Whip and Chill", guaranteed only 24 calories.

Robert White-Stevens of American Cyanamid summarized my thinking so well when he said in a paper earlier this year:

"Certainly we have come full cycle when we find ourselves paying a premium for sugar-free candies, cookies and cakes, saltless vegetables, low-calorie energy foods and indigestible bulk diets, where minus nutrition costs more than plus nutrition. There is apparently a significant psychological difference between lack of food and a minus-nutrition diet, and certainly it must be in the Marie Antoinette spirit of luxury when our dietary can be so munificent as to lead more to concern over the low calories of the cake than the bread it was proposed to replace."

Had I grown fat in spirit as well as slightly overweight in body? After 21 years in school had I abandoned the scholars' credo of questioning? Had I become so insular, living in a land of plenty, that I could not think in terms of those living in nations of want?

I determined to begin asking questions again.

I am thankful that I did.

For I found the answer to be "Yes" and "No"—and where "Yes", it is unquestionably a qualified "Yes".

Can the animals compete with the humans for concentrates?

In North America, Europe, Australia, New Zealand, Soviet Russia, of course they can. And should.

In parts of Africa, Asia, South America they can also compete, if, at the same time qualified world forces are at work helping upgrade agricultural science, marketing procedures, fiscal and governmental policy and all the other parts of that nation's economy.

And in other parts of those same continents—these nations in the birth pangs of development—there is little desire and no need for an animal agricultural economy. Too many human beings need too much more soybeans, rice, and wheat, than they are receiving today.

But we of the food and feed industry have an obligation to all; to the five-year-old boy in Pakistan dying of Kwashiorkor; to the Peruvian father who may have meat today, but hunger tomorrow and to the Dallas housewife with two chickens in the Sunday pot and saccharine in her coffee.

Our obligation, whether we be scholar, scientist, businessman, or politician—is to be making a meaningful contribution to the world food supply issue.

Only if we are doing so, in my opinion, can we contest the animal with the person for the protein both need to survive and flourish.

Let me say at this outset, I have neither the wisdom nor the clairvoyance to be speaking for the 21st Century and beyond. I read of a possible world 100 years from now I cannot comprehend. A world of 50 billion persons, or 10,000 per square mile—including the land areas of deserts, ice caps, and jungles. That would give our entire world land area the same population density as Manhattan Island today.

Which only means you won't be able to catch a cab anywhere in the world at 4:30 P.M.

That world is of another demography, another society, than what I can comprehend. But I can comprehend 6 or 7 billion people in 2000, about 330 million of them in this nation. And, it is to that era I address myself today.

We count 3.2 billion human beings in today's world, fast heading toward 5 billion by 1985 and probably near 7 billion by 2000 at a rate of 7000 births over deaths per hour.

For, while I have been speaking five minutes, the world's population has grown by nearly 600 persons.

And, four fifths of them have been added to nations that can accommodate them least—the under developed, or developing, countries.

Almost entirely in these nations 10,000 children are dying every day of hunger and malnutrition. It is this fact and the real fear of world wide famine after 1975 that led to this conclusion by the President's Science Advisory committee:

"The world food problem is not a future threat. It is here now and it must be solved within the next two decades. If it is solved during this time, it will be manageable for the years there after."

Recently I finished William and Paul Paddock's frightening book—"Famine 1975!" Their theme, carefully documented, is that Thomas Malthus was right in the early 19th century when he cited the imbalance between the world's arithmetically increasing food supplies and the geometrically increasing population. The book published this year, calls the next 10 years our "decade of disaster" and predicts famines to sweep through Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Assuming, as we must, that the world population will double by 2000—and that population of many developing nations will double before 1975—we see the arable land worldwide increasing by only five per cent in this century. But, the world food supply must be trebled by the year 2000 if people are to have enough of the right kinds of food to eat.

But in Asia there is virtually no available new cropland and in Latin America and Africa not nearly enough to meet demands.

The Paddocks debunk the "something will turn up" attitude with which we often look at these scare messages. They consider all known, practical methods of limiting family size and conclude none will be effective.

I have read supporting sources who say that optimistic estimates of the effect of family planning in the next 20 years will only reduce projected food needs by 20 percent.

This is not to discount the continuing efforts for world wide population control. Obviously, the effects of successful family planning will become more apparent in the years after 1985 if they are initiated now.

President Johnson in his 1967 State of the Union message rightly stated:

"Next to the pursuit of peace, the really greatest challenge to the human family is the race between food supply and population increase. The race is being lost. Every member in the world community now bears a direct responsibility to help bring our most basic human account into balance."

The fleets of ships with holds laden with \$21 billion in food and over another \$100 billion of other aid over the last 10 years has not

helped "bring our most basic human account into balance." We have, indeed, saved millions of lives in India during the two year drought since 1965. But now that the monsoon rains have again returned, India is generally not any more ready to increase the rice yields or the mills' production than two years ago.

As the Chinese say, "If you give a man a fish he has food for a day. If you teach him to fish he has food from then on."

In fact, like the sea gulls at St. Augustine, Florida, the people in some developing nations have been hurt by "Food for Peace" shipments. You remember how the gulls followed the shrimp boats out of St. Augustine every day growing sleek and fat on the scraps the fishermen threw to them. Then the shrimp beds played out and the boats no longer set out to sea each morning from St. Augustine.

And the sea gulls died. Thousands were washed ashore within a few months, dead of starvation. The gulls, in living off hand-outs from the fishermen for generations, had lost the ability to fish for themselves.

So it can be in some nations where it may be easier to get free wheat from the United States, Canada, and Australia than to work to improve the yield at home. Once the gifts give out the nation may have lost the ability to work for its own improved crop. And the bearer of gifts Uncle Sam becomes a villain... marches, protests, and our embassies sacked.

That is exactly what is happening today: the free wheat is giving out. In the U.S. we just don't have the reserves of only a few years ago to feed the world.

For example—in 1961 there were 115 million metric tons of grain stored here. In 1965 the reserve was reduced to 61 million ton and dropping.

In 1961, 59 million ton of wheat was stored in major exporting countries.

By 1966 there were 30 million ton, and it was dropping fast.

With half of the world's population rice consuming people, 1955 say 1.8 million ton of rice in storage.

By 1965 this has been reduced to less than 300,000 ton.

India, China and Soviet Russia—representing 40 percent of the world's people—are wheat importers today.

And South Vietnam, Japan, Indonesia and the Philippines—all self sufficient or exporting rice before—are now importing.

So, with our surpluses depleted it is a myth to even consider that the United States can permanently feed the world. It has been figured that if we were to reduce our animal population by one-half (and can you imagine this nation deliberately butchering its herds and flocks?) we could release 100 million tons of cereal grains. While this would constitute a large part of the diet of 200 million people it could make but little impact on the world's 1985 need. I am told that under the most favorable circumstances the U. S. could provide only one tenth of under developed countries requirements during the 1980's and little more by the year 2000.

We must, then, look to other ways to help alleviate world hunger. For, as the great historian, Toynbee has said:

"If there is a history of this time, the era will be noted not for its horrifying crimes or the astonishing inventions, but because it is the first generation since the dawn of history in which mankind dared to believe it is practical to make the benefits of civilization available to the whole human race."

For all of us with ability, knowledge, resources must "dare to believe" and do something about it.

The big city industrialist, the suburban housewife, the downtown politico—they must all be concerned with the scandal of our cities the long, hot summer just past. It is indeed a time of caring and involvement by

all who live there—lest man in the megalopolis ultimately destroy his own habitat.

Witness my own 76 year old father living in Milwaukee, 30 minutes from my serene little city of Burlington. In July he armed himself with a loaded 12 gauge shot gun and was ready to station himself on the front porch to protect his home and my 72 year old mother.

Witness my friend from boyhood days on the farm, who told me when we met at a family wedding last week that for a week in July he walked by an armed 50 caliber machine gun to get into the front door of his Milwaukee factory.

Remember Teddy Roosevelt's answer to the small businessman in the midwest who asked him what he could do to help the nation's ills? Do what you can with what you have, where you are, but do it.

The soldier, the statesman—his battle ground is in the jungles and rice paddies of Vietnam.

Metropolitan man, his wife, the politician—their battle ground is in the ferment of our cities.

The agri-businessman, the scientist, teacher, farmer—their battleground lies wherever people are hungry.

To each his own, we are a nation of specialists. We do what we can where we can do it best. Our best lies in preparing the land, growing the grain, breeding and feeding the animals, marketing the products that will feed hungry people.

Recently, someone on meeting me back in Wisconsin said, "Oh I know you, you're the Bob Spitzer in the feed business".

So, I've come to talk with you today more as a businessman and citizen in the life saving business than as a scientist discussing whether or not we can continue to feed our world's grain to the world's animals.

Several of you know me best—as I know you—as a scientist. We worked beside each other as grad students in nutrition. We have taught nutrition together. I worked with you on committees and at conferences when I served as Chairman of the Nutrition Council of the American Feed Manufacturers Association.

We know together nutritional and agricultural facts that need little elaboration here:

We know that one calorie of animal product requires seven calories from a vegetable source.

But, we are also aware that today 60 per cent of the by-product feeds used in animal production are essentially unusable for human food. So, the animal is not nearly the parasite upon our world food supply that it might seem.

We know that 75 to 80 per cent of all feed for beef animals comes from grasses and legumes and that the U.S. has a billion arable acres suitable only for grazing.

We know that animal protein has a higher biological value than vegetable protein in the pattern of amino acids included and unique nutrients such as B-12.

But, we are also aware of great strides in new crops and synthetic foods such as opaque-2 maize, a high-protein strain rich in critical amino acids.

We know that the unimproved milking cow of India produces about 38 kg. of milk protein annually, compared with about 350 kg. of protein for the improved dairy cow in Europe or North America. But, in the U.S. milk production has been increasing at a rate of 150 kg. to 200 kg. per cow per year and is expected to continue. In fact, similar production and protein efficiency increases can be expected in all the ruminants.

We know that the non-ruminants, pigs and poultry, require highly concentrated rations—high in cereal grains and high protein, oil seed meals. They are in direct competition with man for these ingredients, and therefore will not show the continued

production growth we have witnessed in the past decade.

We could talk together all day, even argue, about the potentials of animal farming vs. grain farming both here and abroad: Our subjects could include the prospects of urea feeding, vast fertilizer use increases abroad, intensified farming fostered by known scientific means, and several other areas as they relate to the conflict of man and beast for the world's grains.

But, history has proven that man anywhere given the chance will decide his dietary in the market place. He aspires to meat, but will settle for vegetable protein when cultural or religious mores demand or economics dictate otherwise.

For example, Japan in its ascending economy rose in red meat and poultry consumption between 1952-1962 from 6.6 lbs. per capita in the same 10 year period.

But, conversely, 50 per cent of the world population consumes its protein almost entirely from cereals and other indigenous crops with little or no animal proteins.

I am well aware that many eminent scholars and world planners are advocating a planned return to vegetable agriculture to match the world's multiplying protein need.

But, I am concerned, as is Dr. Ray Kottman, agricultural college dean at Ohio State University, that "the issue is too great and the stakes too high to become side-tracked in a squabble of animal vs. vegetable protein. I am very seriously concerned." Dr. Kottman continues, "That in our present pre-occupation about the specter of world-wide famine in decades of 1980's we might go on a national binge in holding back our research and development effort in livestock and livestock products."

Let us not forget that of the three billion livestock in the world and the equal number of domesticated fowl, that 60 per cent of these animals are in the developing countries. Yet, these nations produce only 20 to 30 per cent of the world's meat, milk and eggs. This low productivity is due largely to a failure to utilize scientific principles of disease control and animal husbandry in production processes, according to the President's Science Advisory Committee report on "The World Food Problem". And I'd add to this the lack of incentive for producer and processor.

Isn't it then a time to increase research and development efforts for livestock and livestock products in these developing nations rather than hold back?

Isn't it also time for the botanists, agronomists, chemists and all our research powers to look at the soybean, at the grains, rice, and the myriad of crops indigenous to the tropics and sub-tropics. Because it is true that the great body of agricultural science has been built up in temperate climates, while today's food problem is concentrated in the tropics. "Profound changes are needed," as Don Paarlberg of Purdue University has written, "conceptually, geographically, institutionally and financially to re-orient agricultural research toward the area of greatest human need."

The time is now (for some struggling nations it may already be too late) for the United States to lead the free world in history's greatest life saving mission.

If we do not, I assure you the Communist World will try. We can oppose the ideology of Communism. There is no better proof of its failure than agriculture. I have studied and I have viewed first hand the agricultural economy in Russia. Communism is not the answer for food production in the developing nations: It won't work.

Lack of incentive for the individual has led to failure and near-failure of Russia's agricultural development. That nation is incapable of merchandising abroad the incentive that is so vital an ingredient of any agricultural rehabilitation program.

I see that look on many of your faces. It says, "Of course, we agree. But where can the food industry—from farm to supermarket—find the funds to finance a massive research program. And haven't we already done a fair country job already improving both animal and grain production in this nation?"

The answer to your second query is unquestionably "Yes".

Edward Higbee writing in *Farms and Farmers in an Urban Life* says that, "The improved efficiency of modern American agriculture is as fabulous as the conquest of outer space, and it is far more significant for human welfare."

Look at some examples of that efficiency:

In 1939—2.3 billion bu. corn grown on 78 million acres.

In 1966—75 per cent more corn grown on 21 million less acres.

In 1939—740 million bu. wheat on 52.7 million acres.

In 1966—1.3 billion bu. on 50 million acres (a 71% increase).

In 1939—81 million head livestock.

In 1966—108 million head on the same range.

Today, 70% more farm commodities on 10% fewer acres than 1939.

While this crop and livestock efficiency has been increasing, manpower on the farm has been rapidly dropping.

In 1939—6.4 million farm units.

In 1966—3.3 million farm units.

In 1980—(projected) less than 1 million farm units.

Which means that where each farmer fed 16 others 30 years ago, today he produces food for 33 or more non-farm people. By contrast, the Russian farmer feeds four others. And, through this improvement of crops and livestock the food industry has continually lowered the percentage of total income that the consumer earned, while today only 18.2 per cent of the U.S. consumers disposable income is spent for food.

Or, to express it another way in a more current perspective. Since the 1947-49 period:

Wages have increased 100 per cent.

Medical care costs have increased 78 per cent.

Transportation costs have increased 51 per cent.

Housing costs have increased 39 per cent.

Food prices have increased 25 per cent.

Summarizing the total agricultural economic picture today, U.S. agriculture has already produced a production miracle to meet our own population explosion.

It has released 90 per cent of our people from labor on the farm, taking only 20 per cent of their take home pay for food, and left 80 cents of every dollar for goods and services other than food.

For a nation and industry that has done so well to meet one peoples need, doesn't it then, deserve a chance to meet the world's food needs. What other major U.S. industry has so streamlined its production efficiency?

Doesn't the animal industry deserve more research funds to further upgrade itself, to improve the animal efficiency in production of protein both here and in the more tropical nations where that animal can prosper?

The American housewife pickets the supermarket, charging that food costs are too high.

In my opinion she should be picketing, complaining that the food she buys is costing too little rather than too much. Because we in this industry are today doing too little to improve the product she buys. The fact is, after a century of progress, today we cannot offer to do more. Today too little profit margin exists to supply the research and development funds needed for new products, new machinery, new programs and the much needed help to new nations.

This is a nation investing three per cent

of the gross national product in research and development. But in agriculture we are investing only six tenths of one per cent—including both private and public investment.

President Johnson, you say the greatest challenge next to the pursuit of peace is the race between food supply and population increase?

President Johnson, I then suggest an administration farm policy oriented not to control the U.S. consumer alone, but a policy oriented to both consumer and producer.

President Johnson, let's return to the free enterprise policy that worked so well the century past. Let's let it begin working again so that we in agri-industry can get the prices we need to do the job you want done.

We have seen the specter of a crowded, hungry world where shipping Food for Peace from breadbasket nations in treatment without cure. We have seen urgent shortages of animal protein foods in some nations, vegetable protein needs in others and both in still others.

Statesmen, politicians, scientists and all of us here agree that the developed nations must help the developing improve their own technology in animal agriculture.

How, then, is the best way to do so?

Speaking in our own language, I believe we need a crossbreed, a crossbreed of government's Food for Peace program with our own People to People plan.

Call it a Food for Freedom Corp, or call it Self Help, Inc. if you will.

It begins with you . . . with me.

Its mission, the greatest life-saving adventure the world has known.

Its method—a massive research and development program at home supporting full force field teams abroad.

For instance: Imagine a team in a Pakistan province. It consists of dairy and beef cattle nutritionists, agronomists, irrigationists, implement people, University research people, veterinarians, feed manufacturers and some very practical farmers and cowboys too.

What could they do in a couple years to refine agricultural input and improve output?

Nothing, of course, unless both the political and economic climate was receptive.

Everything—or at least a 20% production improvement with that climate.

Don Paarlberg in his writings cites a few such scattered teams abroad today "drawing on the vast body of animal science, running it through the transformers and adopting it to local needs. The results have fun from failure to the spectacular," he observes.

But, Dr. Ivan L. Bennett, Deputy Director Office of Science and Technology cautions: "Any program to meet the world food problem must encompass the entire foreign assistance program of the U.S., other developed countries and international bodies."

"Obviously, government's role lies in improving farm to market transportation, improving sources of farm power, stimulating price systems, stabilizing prices and assuming the incentives necessary to motivate enterprise and, of course, attempting to bring reading and writing to the masses," Dr. Bennett concludes.

Ladies and Gentlemen . . . I am personally going to continue to enjoy steak, milk, and ham and eggs too. I intend to work for the good of agriculture and our industry. But I also accept another big responsibility.

I ask you to do likewise.

Although I am the current chairman of the Nation's largest manufacturing industry serving agriculture, I cannot at this time commit its 6,000 plant managements to join with me. But I have discussed the Self Help, Inc. proposal with a number of industry leaders and vitally interested people are discussing it in Washington later this month. I hope key people will be listening.

We agreed, the time is now for the agribusinessman who has thought more of his company and his country club than his

country or his fellow man world wide to become involved.

At our little company in Burlington, Wisconsin, we want to become involved. We will pay our share; we will send a specialist in the feed manufacturing business wherever he is needed.

I know at least 10 top people in various other agricultural industries or schools who will join me in sending experts or going themselves.

One of these people recently toured Asia and saw the need for just such a team effort as I envision. He saw the ravages of beri-beri in some of the polished rice eating developing countries. As, for centuries before, these people were deficient in Vitamin B-1. It was being lost in the rice outer hulls they would not eat. Nothing is ever going to convince them to eat rice hulls.

But, chickens grow fat on rice polishings, and the people of the orient are eager for more chicken meat in their diet; if only they could afford it.

What a place for an agri-industry team to start a broiler industry?

Again, I see your skepticism and questioning. "Nice ideas, but in an industry that can't finance its development program, how can we possibly afford sending key people and equipment abroad on life saving missions?"

Let me answer that with a brief personal and Murphy Products picture today.

I have spent 8 years since high school getting three degrees and the knowledge they represent; then 20 more years helping bring this little company along.

Five years ago a group of us in management bought a fairly large piece of the business. We had been with the firm for 15-25 years working hard. But with new opportunity our group went all out! These men worked literally night and day; we mortgaged our homes. After five years excellent progress is apparent. But what is the reward for work excellence and enterprise? This year we had a fine annual statement.

We are proud of it.

But, before we could spend \$1.00 for research facilities and capital investment, the government takes 52% for taxes. Add this to the volumes of reports and staggering demands for more regulatory branches of the government than I can mention here. Just how much burden can they put on our backs?

And, what would these tax dollars buy on the world's life saving market? It would buy a whole broiler industry team for Vietnam or a dairy team for Pakistan or a wheat team in the Middle East.

I venture that a few dedicated people from my company—your company, your schools, your ranches—could do more with that money than the millions spent on ill conceived, politically oriented, inadequately executed government agricultural programs.

This is not meant to be an attack on many of the dedicated career people in government agriculture. Or, on all their programs abroad. No team going to the developing nations could be without state and agricultural department technicians. I personally salute the career employee, dedicated in extension, U.S.D.A., Food and Drug, etc.

But, in many cases we have been sending a tackle or a freshman quarterback when a whole team was needed. That team needs some feed manufacturers from my industry, and representatives of your businesses and schools.

What could our tax dollars and energies do for world's hunger through a complete team effort? Give us tax credits for our overseas programs. Give us outright tax deductions for the high priced skilled technicians and management people we loan to hungry nations for a year or two. Let us send the man power and equipment and pay for it directly rather than filter our tax monies through the many federal layers.

To this administration I say we want to help in this war the President has declared on hunger. We have proven our genius and efficiency in the startling advances made over a century in U.S. agriculture.

Give us the chance, then, to work with government and do the same for the developing nations abroad.

Let me conclude with the final statements by the Paddocks in their book, *Famine 1975!*

"Now it is the turn of the American people to stand trial before the tribunal of history."

The next ten years may set the course which eventually can determine how the United States will be judged.

For in this period the American people must deliberately take on a role of leadership that will inspire and guide the stricken world through the complex Time of Famines. The United States must not lose the future by default. . .

Today we are a dynamic nation. It is well within our capabilities to work out policies which will alleviate the hunger and which will offer to some of our fellow nations, if not all, time to create their "better" world when the famines have subsided. . .

Let history's tribunal record that, although the United States could not prevent the Time of Famines, it nevertheless accepted this period as a challenge to its ingenuity and power. Let history record that because the American people met this challenge, the Time of Famines was something more than a crisis in man's development, that out of the experience of the Time of Famines came the foundation on which man built an era of greatness, an era of greatness not for the United States alone but also for the hungry nations."

With my own words, I add that we must rediscover in our own nation the power of freedom of individual action and of individual action and of individual incentive as compared to an agriculture hampered with political domination and controls.

Unshackle our power here and accept our opportunity overseas and we'll solve one of history's greatest problems—hunger. And there will be steak in our tomorrow.

SENATOR BENNETT CLARIFIES VIETNAM ISSUES

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. LLOYD] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, on October 23, Utah's senior Senator, WALLACE F. BENNETT, presented a major Senate address on Vietnam policy which is still being praised in the national press as one of the most lucid and clear discussions of the complex issue to emerge from the 90th Congress.

The address has been reprinted in its entirety by the U.S. News & World Report, which has a circulation of 1.6 million. It has also been the subject of columns by two nationally syndicated columnists, Mr. David Lawrence and Mr. Walter Trohan.

Senator BENNETT noted in his address that we are already involved in world war III—Communist style, and that we have been fighting it for more than 20 years. He said:

To me, the war in South Vietnam is a part of world war III, Communist style; another in the series of little wars the Communists thought they would win easily, by which

they hoped eventually to extinguish all political, economic and personal freedom in all the world.

Senator BENNETT stated further that he did not believe we can disengage from the conflict until we can assure South Vietnam freedom "from internal terror and external force."

The Senator said:

To withdraw sooner would not only reward Communist aggression, and confirm the effectiveness of their so-called wars of liberation, but would inevitably encourage further Communist military adventures elsewhere, just at a time when, in fact, their essential weaknesses are beginning to show and they are going downhill.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend Senator BENNETT's speech as must reading for all Members of Congress. It is a great and responsible contribution to clarification of the basic world objectives of the United States. It reaffirms loudly and clearly what the Vietnam conflict is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Salt Lake Tribune, October 25, 1967, commending Senator BENNETT for his address:

SENATOR BENNETT CLARIFIES VIETNAM ISSUES

In joining the debate on Vietnam this week, Senator Wallace F. Bennett of Utah did not offer a specific solution or call for new action. Instead, he analyzed the war in its historic context, emphasizing that "our presence in Vietnam is in keeping with our long-time foreign policies," and declaring that negotiations should not be started "until we can be sure that at the end . . . South Vietnam will still be free and independent."

President Johnson, Secretary of State Dean Rusk and other administration spokesmen have said much the same thing. But they were justifying a policy now under attack by members of both major political parties. Senator Bennett, a Republican, was offering a realistic appraisal of a policy buffeted by the winds of contradictory opinions.

The present battle of South Vietnam, said the senator, "may turn out to be as decisive in the third world war as the Battle of the Bulge and the Battle of Midway were in World War II." For "the third world war, Communist-style" is already under way. Instead of moving in force, as happened in 1919 and 1939, the Communists move one at a time against countries they consider helpless. In Senator Bennett's words, "The world is not to be swallowed whole, but chewed up in little bites."

The question of how the United States came to be involved in Vietnam on such a large scale is often asked. The answer as enunciated by Secretary Rusk and other administration leaders is that involvement is part of the containment program that worked so well in western Europe. In Europe the threat came from Communist Russia. In Asia it comes from Communist China. And nations like South Korea, the Philippines and Thailand, which lie directly in the path of a Chinese thrust, are well aware of the danger, and support the American effort in South Vietnam. The same can be said of neighboring Australia and New Zealand. In contrast, America's friends in Europe either oppose the war or look the other way. Not one of these friends is a power in Asia. But Communist Russia, the one nation that is both European and Asian, is very much involved in the war as a supplier of weapons to Communist North Vietnam. The Russians certainly are aware of the nature of the conflict and what effect the outcome can have on their policies.

Senator Bennett cited the heavy turnout of voters in recent South Vietnam elections

as evidence that the people of the country prefer their government, even though it is plagued with corruption, to the communism of the North. Our comment here is that we hope the new government in Saigon will now make a greater contribution to the war effort than has been the case so far. Those who want freedom should be willing to fight for it.

Talk of ending the war through negotiation is constantly heard. But negotiation, as Senator Bennett rightly said, should be "a process by which decisions are reached through mutual concessions," not, as the Communists would have it, "an extension of the conflict on another level." In Korea, where the wrong approach was used, so-called negotiation is still going on after 15 years.

We congratulate Senator Bennett for an excellent job of clarifying American policy. He has made a major contribution to the understanding of the issues in Vietnam.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, it was necessary for me to be out of town on October 19 and 20, 1967, when five roll-call votes developed. Had I been present, I would have voted as indicated below:

On rollcall No. 323—yea.

On rollcall No. 325—yea.

On rollcall No. 327—yea.

On rollcall No. 328—yea.

On rollcall No. 329—yea.

FACING THE BIG ONE IN 1968

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the analysis of a major political party in the United States is a very difficult undertaking. Nevertheless, this task has been accomplished with skill and imagination by two political professionals, Stephen Hess, a former assistant to President Eisenhower who is now an instructor of political science, and David S. Broder, a syndicated columnist and political correspondent for the Washington Post.

I wish to call the Hess-Broder product, "The Republican Establishment," to the attention of my colleagues. A review of the book by David Murry, which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times' "Book Week," follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Nov. 5, 1967]

FACING THE BIG ONE IN 1968

(By David Murry)

Late, late on election night, 1966, Ray C. Bliss, the Republican national chairman, sat in his Washington office watching the television screen record the impressive series of GOP victories across the land.

"I'd say we're on our way, Thrus," he remarked to Sen. Thruston B. Morton, the congressional campaign chieftain.

"You — betcha we are," Morton replied. "It's a new ball game and it's a long time coming."

Now, a year later, there are few signs that the Republican momentum has measurably slackened, and the party and its leaders are facing the Big One in 1968, if not with cockiness, at least with waxing confidence.

Into this precampaign climate, Stephen Hess, a student and practitioner of GOP politics, and David S. Broder, a political correspondent and syndicated columnist for the Washington Post, have brought *The Republican Establishment*. At the beginning of the season when one can expect a torrent of political guidebooks, they have produced a high standard for others to follow. Their book, the result of three years of work, is a superb inventory of the GOP assets and liabilities in the year ahead.

As someone has said, the Democrats are a party of organizations, the GOP a party of personalities. Broder and Hess provide exhaustive portraits and assessments of the major contenders for the presidential nomination—Gov. George W. Romney of Michigan, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, Sen. Charles H. Percy of Illinois and Gov. Ronald Reagan of California. But they also examine organization, finance, staff from Bliss on down, and find that the GOP, while it has made strides, is now basically made up of "clusters of independent organizing talents." Not, Broder and Hess say, that these clusters are incapable of mounting a successful campaign next year. The authors take the GOP leaders to the top of the temple to show them the world—or at least the politically arable U.S. land.

The nation as a whole is younger than ever (27 average age by 1968 vs. 33 in 1964), better-educated (half the young men reaching their majority have gone beyond high school), and urban (three-fourths of the population in metropolitan areas). The GOP must no longer rely on the old-fashioned, rural-and-small-town policies and philosophies, Hess and Broder write. And there is reason to believe that the Republicans are seizing chances to capitalize on the massive population shifts.

"But the question of which party will mobilize the new generation of voters is as yet unsettled," the authors say. "The Democrats are hardly dunderheads and not all of them are 80 years old." Given the proved Democratic penchant in the past to ride, in Dean Acheson's words, with "the drama of human progress," the Republicans have their work cut out for them.

At the top of one list they have candidates such as Percy and Reagan who are attractive to the younger group of voters, although for different reasons. Farther down, there is a handsome group of senators, governors and congressmen—young, articulate and responsive to the new professional and managerial class that now controls the economy.

Broder and Hess do not, however, seem to take into large account the one great factor that could re-elect Lyndon Johnson next year. That is the *kamikaze* complex to which the GOP has clung through the years. There is no reason the authors should have examined this in any great detail, because it becomes apparent only after the fact. Like a bad shot in golf, you know exactly what you have done wrong as soon as you have done it. But it is very nearly a physical law—or has been in the past—that if the Republicans are given the opportunity to miff a chance, they will almost invariably do it.

The authors do point out a number of ways in which this pitfall can be avoided, and even provide some encouraging signs that the party leadership is aware of it. But we shall see.

Broder and Hess, thank God, present no heroes or villains in their assessment. They do not, again the same grace, view politics as a holy calling. They write with high good humor about people and incidents. For exam-

ple, Nixon, the indefatigable campaigner for others in 1966, is described as making a speech in Oakland, Calif., "for 50 minutes, imbuing a soon-to-be-forgotten Republican congressional candidate with virtues his own wife never suspected he possessed." At another point, they characterize the troglodytes in the GOP as viewing the progressives of the Ripon Society as "button-down Mario Savios."

More enlightening even than the profiles of the front-runners is a solid, carefully researched look at the leaders in the different regions of the country, along with the gains and losses of the past and the chances for the future. For a political writer, this section is an advanced refresher-survey course; for the novice, it is required reading for an understanding of national politics.

URBAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT A REAL NEED

Mr. VANDER JAGT. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to continue today to discuss a matter of concern to me, and I know to all Members of the House—the proposals contained in title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act amendments which we will consider this week.

Title IV, in my view, contains a significant breakthrough in the necessary struggle to help our major metropolitan areas and in particular those residents of ghetto areas. Title IV contains a program to help develop businesses in those areas and in particular to provide the kind of managerial training and advice that is today so lacking for many ghetto area citizens. It would extend the title of this act, "Economic Opportunity," into a more meaningful phrase, since title IV is the only section of the act which truly is relevant to economic opportunity rather than training or educational opportunity.

There is a great deal of evidence that our programs to help build private enterprise in urban areas with a high proportion of disadvantaged have been a failure. Our programs to help members of minorities have been a failure. As I pointed out last Thursday in this regard, only 18 percent of the businesses in the 18th Congressional District of

New York—Harlem—are Negro owned. Too often the doors of opportunity have been closed and the key to opening them rests with a program combining training and financial assistance.

During this past summer of violence in our major cities, many arguments were advanced as to the reasons for the riots and the need for prevention of future riots. At this point no significant answer has been forthcoming, but one viable proposal is the concept of creating opportunities for the indigent of the area in which they live. It is obvious that the frustration and antagonism felt by many in urban ghettos is taken out against the small businessmen whose stores are located in inner core areas but whose residence often is not. Little has been advanced to answer this situation other than the need to update the economy and bring life in the ghettos up to the standards of other areas.

How then do we set out to accomplish this difficult and complex task?

It is my feeling that we must zero in on the large cities and their ghetto areas and provide meaningful programs that will build a better economic environment for those who live in the depressed areas. Such a program need not be what we would term "national" in scope. It need only be enough national to encompass all the major metropolitan areas of this country. What is needed for the New York City area in economic development certainly is not what is needed in the Florence County area of Wisconsin with a population of 3,437.

A program of economic opportunity and development through the building of local industry and business for the ghetto areas of this country should be narrow enough to encompass only those ghetto areas.

Many studies have been advanced that point out specifically that the population and job matching problem in this country is twofold. We need to provide programs that will build industry in both our rural and urban areas. What we face is not a single problem but one that must be attacked on two fronts.

A recent study by the Department of Commerce aimed at projections for 1975 points to this problem when it says:

The central cities will be the source of the job-shortage problem in these areas. Job opportunities in the suburbs are growing more rapidly than population. Although suburbs and outer-ring counties are expected to absorb labor (and hence population), this will not be nearly enough to solve the city problem.

Excluding California, which may be considered a special case because of its unusually rapid growth, even if all the labor force absorbed by expanding job opportunities in suburban and outer-ring counties comes from the central cities, 9.8 percent of the population of the 25 largest metropolitan areas still must either migrate to smaller, rapidly growing counties or find jobs at home not projected by our analysis. This 9.8 percent is an enormous figure in absolute numbers—7.1 million persons (or 2.9 million jobs).

What is needed then is a two-edged sword. One edge must be aimed at providing opportunities in the rural areas that will help stem the flow of migration to our cities. The other edge must be aimed at providing the larger metropolitan areas and the ghetto areas specifically with entrepreneurial manpower that does not exist today. We desperately need both programs and one must not exclude the other.

The Small Business Administration has done and is doing a tremendous job and an extremely effective job in building industry and aiding the small businessman of America. Its programs must be continued. The SBA should not, however, be burdened with projects that are unrelated to what it is doing and would tend to minimize its effectiveness.

The Small Business Administration operates an economic opportunity loan program. Originally intended for the small businessman in the major metropolitan areas, SBA has expanded the program to that of a nationwide program. Former SBA Director Bernard L. Boutin describes the rationale behind this expansion in this month's issue of Outlook. Boutin says:

In expanding the program to include individuals above the poverty level with strong managerial ability, as well as the low-income small businessman, SBA doubled the EPL allotment for fiscal 1967—from \$25 to \$50 million—and made the program national in scope. Now EO loans are available to residents of all 50 states, Washington, D.C., Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands through SBA's 73 regional and branch offices.

This program has been extremely successful and well worthwhile. I might point out, however, Mr. Speaker, that the vast majority of the loans made by the SBA under their program of "loans in unemployment areas" were made in the rural areas. For the information of my colleagues, I include a list of the loans by State made during fiscal 1967 by SBA under this program along with an indication of the average population of the counties receiving the money:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION LOAN IN UNEMPLOYMENT AREAS, FISCAL YEAR 1967

State	Number of participating counties	Population of participating counties	Average population of participants	Total funds	Largest participating county	Smallest participating county
Alabama	6	175,525	29,254	\$372,000	Walker, 54,211	Greene, 13,600.
Alaska	3	12,643	4,210	4,294,240	4th judicial division, 6,690	2d judicial division, 1,772.
Arkansas	24	362,625	15,105	2,246,800	White, 32,745	Perry, 4,927.
California	32	3,925,551	261,703	5,440,210	San Diego, 1,033,011	Mariposa, 5,064.
Colorado	5	25,638	5,127	207,900	Conejos, 8,428	Teller, 2,495.
Connecticut	2	809,411	404,705	544,000	Hartford, 689,555	Litchfield, 119,856.
Florida	5	1,159,475	231,895	5,957,800	Dade, 935,047	Franklin, 6,576.
Georgia	44	441,815	10,041	3,239,070	Floyd, 69,130	Long, 3,874.
Idaho	11	123,410	11,219	1,726,667	Kootenai, 29,556	Boise, 1,646.
Illinois	16	279,133	17,460	170,000	Williamson, 46,117	Pope, 4,061.
Indiana	12	224,471	18,706	241,500	Lawrence, 36,564	Ohio, 4,165.
Kentucky	61	1,126,772	18,470	3,563,450	Pike, 68,264	Menifee, 4,276.
Louisiana	18	622,773	34,600	1,553,500	Calcasieu, 145,475	Cameron, 6,909.
Maine	6	304,931	50,822	2,396,142	Aroostook, 106,064	Lincoln, 18,497.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION LOAN IN UNEMPLOYMENT AREAS, FISCAL YEAR 1967—Continued

State	Number of participating counties	Population of participating counties	Average population of participants	Total funds	Largest participating county	Smallest participating county
Maryland	6	186,273	31,045	\$813,850	Allegany, 84,169	Calvert, 15,826
Massachusetts	10	4,154,421	415,442	19,451,550	Worcester, 583,228	Nantucket, 3,559
Michigan	43	800,142	18,608	4,097,700	St. Clair, 107,201	Keweenaw, 2,417
Minnesota	26	621,760	23,900	2,701,830	St. Louis, 231,588	Cook, 3,377
Mississippi	7	199,110	28,444	1,002,500	Washington, 78,638	Greene, 8,366
Missouri	20	283,596	14,179	2,238,800	Pemiscot, 38,095	Hickory, 4,516
Montana	3	18,398	6,132	25,000	Park, 13,168	Meagher, 2,216
Nevada	1	2,431	2,431	6,000	Lincoln, 2,431	Lincoln, 2,431
New Jersey	5	1,348,071	269,614	2,800,000	Essex, 923,545	Cape May, 48,555
New Mexico	12	203,943	16,995	550,000	Valencia, 39,943	Guadalupe, 5,610
New York	13	706,903	54,377	1,660,800	St. Lawrence, 111,239	Hamilton, 4,267
North Carolina	19	407,299	140,593	1,480,200	Robeson, 89,102	Tyrrell, 4,520
North Dakota	3	30,782	10,260	597,800	Rolette, 10,641	Cavalier, 10,064
Ohio	16	630,400	39,900	256,000	Scioto, 84,216	Noble, 10,982
Oklahoma	32	596,255	18,638	3,153,242	Muskogee, 61,866	Roger Mills, 5,090
Oregon	7	167,409	23,801	73,000	Coos, 54,955	Lake, 7,158
Pennsylvania	15	1,456,792	97,120	1,456,792	Luzerne, 346,972	Perry, 26,582
Puerto Rico	8	714,475	89,309	11,679,400	San Juan, 451,658	Humacao, 33,381
South Carolina	2	71,913	35,957	180,000	Berkeley, 38,196	Chesterfield, 33,717
Tennessee	22	396,405	15,287	2,607,971	Greene, 42,163	Houston, 4,794
Texas	16	564,629	35,289	1,245,300	Hidalgo, 180,904	Kinney, 2,452
Utah	15	254,291	16,952	2,731,700	Utah, 106,991	Kane, 6,667
Virginia	9	202,713	22,523	492,900	Tazewell, 44,791	Richmond, 6,375
Washington	12	397,334	33,111	4,717,380	Yakima, 145,112	San Juan, 2,872
West Virginia	40	1,130,931	28,273	5,564,525	Cabell, 108,202	Doddridge, 6,970
Wisconsin	10	218,010	21,801	474,750	Kenosha, 100,615	Florence, 3,437
Wyoming	2	16,504	8,251	120,000	Lincoln, 9,018	Uinta, 7,484

Mr. Speaker, while we need a program of loans to unemployment areas nationwide, we also need very desperately an economic development program designed for use and implementation in our ghetto areas. If we do not have such a program, we will not be able to significantly help those areas. The problems of our ghettos are unique and pressing. They are unlike the rural areas or for that matter other areas of the city. We need a program of economic opportunity specifically designed for those areas.

Such a program is provided for under title IV of the EOA amendments. The program has been assigned to the Commerce Department because it is my feeling that they are better equipped and able to handle this program with its important technical assistance purpose. SBA, on the other hand, should continue its other very worthwhile programs; the two can and should supplement one another—they do not compete.

Support for title IV has been received from the Human Resources Administration of New York City and the American Association for Business and Economic Development. For the information of my colleagues, I include the letter I have received from AABED.

I urge my colleagues to maintain this section of the EOA amendments.

The letter follows:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR
BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
San Jose, Calif., October 30, 1967.

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STEIGER: Enclosed is a copy of the Poverty Hearing—Legislative Recommendations Report presented to the October 26-28, 1967 Hearings on Mexican-American Affairs at El Paso, Texas.

As you well know, over 1000 delegates considered to be experts on the plight of the Mexican-American in the United States, met with the President and Vice-President of the United States and several cabinet members to recommended solutions to numerous socioeconomic problems.

In order to reflect the "pulse of the community", the delegates were mainly (95%) Americans of Mexican descent.

The enclosed recommendation No. 11 is

called to your attention so that you may be aware of the significance that Title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act has for Mexican-Americans who desire to participate in and contribute to our free enterprise democracy.

It is indeed encouraging to observe that bi-partisan support in both the Senate and House of Representatives has approved the continuance of Title IV—EOA and additionally called for the programs of Title IV to be administered by the Department of Commerce through grants to local non-profit business and economic development organizations.

This is an admirable example of how our Congress serves the will and needs of the people and not the monolithic federal bureaucracy who decry local initiative. Legislative support for EOA Title IV is applauded by the 4-5 million Mexican-Americans of our nation as well as millions of entrepreneurs in all the United States.

The AABED sincerely desires your continued support for EOA—Title IV as approved by the Senate of the 90th Congress.

Sincerely,

JOHN K. LOPEZ,
Treasurer.

POVERTY HEARINGS—LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

(By Cabinet Committee Hearings on Mexican-American Affairs, El Paso, Tex., October 26-28, 1967)

Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs: Honorable Vincente T. Ximenes, Chairman, Commissioner of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission; Hon. Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture; Hon. W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor; Hon. John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Hon. Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; Hon. Sargent Shriver, Director of Office of Economic Opportunity.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 11

"It is recommended that legislation be enacted that continues Title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act—Employment and Investment Incentives and that the Title call for local, community operated, small business assistance programs to the minority and disadvantaged community."

The unanimous decision of the Report Committee was that business and economic development assistance be available to the 4-5 million Spanish-surnamed population of the nation by providing resources to local, non-profit organizations to serve that population.

The existing method of attempting to render direct service through federal agencies was severely criticized as ineffective and inadequate.

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS ON HOUSE FLOOR ON THE OPENING DAY OF POVERTY DEBATE

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, it is not too late for House Democratic leaders to abandon their city hall, southern strategy which dooms the poverty bill to torture and mutilation this week in the House.

No poverty proposal, including the committee bill and the Republican opportunity crusade, has the votes to pass the House today. After the committee bill is maimed, mutilated, and mangled, the pitiful end product may pick up enough votes to pass, but that is too high a price for the poor to pay.

Concerned Americans want a realistic program to help the less fortunate in our midst help themselves. They do not think the present poverty war is adequate, nor do I. They want substantial, realistic, and meaningful changes in the program.

The committee bill, on the whole, does nothing but tinker with the present program. The one major exception, where substantial change was made, amounts to a craven capitulation to those who oppose the concept of involving the poor in helping themselves. Self-help, self-involvement, and self-motivation are critical to any successful program to eliminate poverty. Innovation does not spring forth from big city political machines in the North, nor will meaningful measures to help the Negro poor emanate from southern city halls.

We must restore the independence of community action boards, involve State and local governments as partners in

community action, and eliminate the 10 percent local cash requirement. We must emphasize meaningful, productive jobs in private enterprise, not deadend, make-work public jobs.

I will offer a package proposal on the floor to reverse the regressive Green amendment adopted in committee. Whatever else the House does, we must not stifle the spark of genius in community action that involves the poor in their own destinies. It will be an uphill fight. I do not believe it can be won unless there is a strong bipartisan movement. I, and many other Republicans, stand ready to cooperate in a completely bipartisan way to accomplish this necessary change in the committee bill.

THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PRODUCT SAFETY

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that Senate Joint Resolution 33, passed this House today by an overwhelming vote. The measure establishes a National Commission on Product Safety.

As the resolution so clearly states, every American has the right to be protected against unreasonable risk of bodily harm from products purchased on the open market. The need for legislation to enforce these rights is brought home to us with frightening frequency by daily accounts of injuries in the home caused by hazardous goods.

The Commission, Mr. Speaker, will have the power to conduct a thorough and meaningful study of this question. After first establishing the categories of household goods which might present an unreasonable hazard to health and safety, the Commission will then review the extent to which self-regulation by industry presently affords protection and the scope and coverage of already existing Federal, State, and local laws relating to consumer protection. Upon completion of this study and investigation, the Commission will make a full report to both the President and Congress. This report will contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems appropriate.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I will await the report of this Commission with the expectation that the principles embodied in this resolution, and my own identical resolution, House Joint Resolution 869, will find their proper enunciation. This bill, very simply, is a just and major step in the direction of protecting our Nation's consumers.

LATIN AMERICA'S MILITARY EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House are deeply split on the issue of military assistance to underdeveloped countries. Nowhere does the issue seem to be drawn more starkly than in Latin America.

But I would ask: Have we analyzed the facts and are we debating the real issue, or what we have chosen to say is the issue?

Some say that the issue is an "arms race."

Let us look at the facts. Latin America is an area three times as large as the United States and with as many people. What is it spending on military equipment? The figures are not too precise but it is estimated that Latin America's total annual expenditure for military equipment is less than \$150 million—about the same as the annual cost of the Chicago police department and about half the annual cost of the New York Police Department.

Divide that up among all of the Latin American countries and it involves less than \$1 million per country in Central America, several millions in countries like Colombia and Brazil.

The truth is that:

First. Defense expenditures as a percentage of budgets have dropped 50 percent in the last 20 years. Only 10 percent of these defense expenditures, less than \$150 million annually, is for equipment. The other 90 percent is for civic action, and basic educational training, military training and pay and allowance of forces, and maintenance of equipment.

Second. Latin American defense expenditures—except for Africa south of the Sahara—are the lowest in the world.

Third. Almost all of the active naval vessels of the destroyer type or smaller in the Latin American navies are on loan from the United States and Latin America has not spent significant sums on naval equipment.

I, for one, consider that quite a good record. I wish that I could say that it would have been possible for us to have reduced our military budget 50 percent since World War II.

There are other significant facts that should be brought out:

In the last 6 years alone the number of fighter squadrons in Latin America has been reduced from 29 to 19, an apparently sizable reduction in fighter strength. And I am told that one of the objects of the Latin American governments in seeking more modern planes at this time is to phase out additional squadrons and cut operating costs. Many of the aircraft they now have on hand cost more to operate than the ones they want to buy from us.

I am told that if the Latin Americans buy more modern equipment from us it will lead to armed clashes. What is the record? There were absurd arms races in Latin America until World War II as the European nations, with the missions they maintained in Latin America, tried to promote arms sales and otherwise transport European rivalries to South America. But what has the record been since World War II?

There has been no significant incident

between Latin American countries since 1942 that the inter-American peace-keeping machinery has not promptly handled. There has been no arms race, and there will not be one if Europe will cooperate.

Quite the contrary, there has been a significant reduction in the proportion of budgets going to arms and a reduction in arms.

In the face of this record, how can this Congress speak of an arms race or increasing arms expenditures? I agree that the administration has not made its case, but this is no excuse for the failure of the Congress to determine the facts. I do not believe that an arms race is the issue.

Is the sale of jet aircraft the issue? A Member of the other Chamber has said in emotional terms that the willingness of the United States to permit its manufacturers to offer jet aircraft in Latin America is a sordid business.

How do the Latin Americans see this problem? Each of the large South American countries maintains a squadron or two of jet fighter planes. They feel that they need these planes to provide support to ground troops for insurgency situations. Surely no one will deny, in the face of the news over the last months, that insurgency is a fact in Latin America. What does a country do that wants a few fighter planes that can be maintained? It buys what is on the market. What I am told is that the F-5 is the best and most economic fighter we have to fill the needs of several Latin American countries.

What is the F-5? It was developed by the Department of Defense for use in less developed countries. It flies about 200 miles per hour faster than the jet planes the Latin American countries now have. It is more modern. It does cost money. But I fail to see how anyone can compare it with a French Mirage which flies twice as fast as an F-5 and costs twice as much to buy and operate. If costs are to be kept down, it seems to me there is a substantial difference between a squadron which costs \$15 to \$20 million and one that costs \$35 to \$40 million. And it seems to me that being willing to see Latin America buy the lower cost squadron and opposing the more expensive one is a policy of restraint.

I must be very frank in saying that for all the furor that has been raised about the F-5 versus the Mirage, or any other aircraft, I do not think that is the issue.

Some say the issue is that resources that could be spent on economic development are being diverted to military purposes. Any expenditures for military purposes are a diversion of resources. I would indeed be happy if this country could spend all of its resources for peaceful purposes. It is lamentable that the Defense budget of the United States exceeds the total annual gross national product of all of the Latin American countries combined. But we do not live in a peaceful world. We have not learned to live with one another. So each country maintains the forces it considers necessary. This is also true in Latin America. But as I have already pointed out, Latin America has a better record than any other area of the world. Moreover, Latin America is the only area in

the world that has established a nuclear-free zone. Although there may be a few specific cases where expenditures for military equipment could be trimmed, I am not persuaded that the alleged diversion of resources is the issue.

This House should understand clearly that the issue is one far exceeding the points I have discussed above—although they may have a bearing on the real issue.

The real issue is a political one. What is really being discussed in the U.S. press and in this Congress is the influence of the military in the politics of Latin America.

Does the military have an undue influence in the political affairs of Latin America? It is undoubted that it has an influence. In fact, it is undoubted that this Congress is influenced by military opinion. But the question is: Does it have an undue influence?

So we should look at the record. And if we look at the record, we see that every government in Latin America—except Cuba, Argentina, and Haiti—is operating in accordance with a constitutional mandate. We may think some of these governments are too far to the left and we may regard some as too far to the right, and we may question whether a duly elected constitutional government meets all of the standards of democracy. But even as we question, we must also ask—is there any other region in the world that is doing better than Latin America in trying to resolve its differences peacefully? Is it Africa? Is it Asia? Is it Europe?

Mr. Speaker, by any reasonable standard, the Latin Americans have a good record. If we can cooperate with them under the Alliance for Progress and be patient, the record can be even better.

How do we cooperate? Do we do it by putting out ultimatums that all loans will be cut out unless the Latin Americans knuckle under to our determination of their requirements? The United States would never accept such a condition. And yet some of us would try to impose it on our friends.

Do we achieve our objective by such invectives as calling Latin American officers "tin-pot flyboys?" After all, these people are human. These "tin-pot flyboys" were trained in the United States. These men, like many of our own pilots, may someday be asked to risk their lives for their countries. They are comrades of our own Air Force officers. Mr. Speaker, we demean ourselves when we act like this.

Mr. Speaker, I take no back seat to anyone in favoring reform in Latin America. But I do not believe you get it with threats, with invectives, but with patience and compromise. Politics is the art of the possible. Hardline, uncompromising positions will not get us there. Simply stated, we must negotiate, and our negotiators must have the flexibility provided by the Alliance for Progress and a reasonable level of military assistance. Otherwise, there will be no negotiation and no possibility for reasonable reform. We will abdicate our responsibility and help defeat the very purposes we seek to achieve.

My recommendation to this House is that we stop bombing Latin America with ultimatums and let the President negotiate.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Florida because the gentleman has made some very important points in a most eloquent manner with reference to this particular problem.

There has been, as the distinguished gentleman from Florida has said, some preoccupation with the thought that some of these nations and the fact that they are purchasing arms and weapons from European countries is not proper, and that we ought to reduce our aid to them in accordance with the amounts of weapons and arms which they are purchasing from those foreign governments by a like amount from the foreign aid program.

But I think there is another most significant matter which the distinguished gentleman from Florida has said, and that is the fact that there has been a tendency on the part of certain segments of our society to make casual and hostile remarks about these people, people who are not entitled to be the recipients of this kind of treatment and any such actions which engender their hostility should be dispelled.

So, Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks as I began by again complimenting the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] for his very important contribution in this area.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] for his comments and for his contribution, and especially in view of his particular experience with reference to this subject. It is my opinion that the distinguished gentleman from Texas has put his finger upon the very point involved here, which is the human point, as well as the political point. As all of us have recognized and have understood the fact that these Latin American countries are sovereign and independent countries. This has been in large part the approach which has been necessary for several reasons:

Because of internal security reasons, and because of external security reasons, both hemispheric and otherwise. And it is just unrealistic for us to take a position that they should not have those military establishments, and it is just not reasonable for us to say that they should not in a reasonable degree have modern equipment; because of human nature being what it is they are going to demand it and seek to obtain it in one way or another, and for us to turn our backs on them now and say "You ought not to be using your money for this, but you should be using all your money for plowshares or for building harbors or roads." There is no need for that, it is not realistic. We need to be doing all these things that we are doing under the Alliance for Progress in order to improve the economic and social and political situation of Latin

American countries, but at the same time within a reasonable degree we need these modern small military establishments which are in consonance with the needs of their country and the needs of the Western Hemisphere, and I might add in consonance with the needs of the United States, also.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to join with my colleague from Texas in commending the gentleman from Florida on his very splendid remarks today. I believe they are very timely. I will have to admit that the gentleman brought up some points today that I certainly was not familiar with. I was not familiar with the fact that the Latin American countries, since World War II, have reduced their military expenditures, and their military forces.

I find there is a tendency not to learn about countries that do not give us any trouble. The Latin American countries certainly have been our friends. I have a tendency—and I am sure other Members of Congress have a tendency—to overlook our friends sometimes, and really not to look at their problems. The gentleman certainly has pointed out some facts that the whole Congress and the people of this country should be interested in. Again I commend the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I might say that here again he has put his finger on a very important point. We are talking now about Latin America, our friends who have supported us and who continue to support us. The ties between North and South America are the bulwark, as indeed the whole Western Hemisphere is the bulwark, of the free world. That is why we ought to look at this as giving us the opportunity for closer ties with Latin America. We have done so much together in order to improve the conditions in Latin America that we ought not be blinded by such an unrealistic approach, and we should not take away their military establishment or relegate them to such a point as that in terms of equipment, manpower, and modernization, just so that they will not be able to fight each other or get mad at each other, or have an arms race; that is not the way to solve that problem, we solve it by the educational process, by training programs combined with their social, economic, and political improvements through the Alliance for Progress, and other equal programs. And I believe the gentleman from Mississippi has made a very good point.

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

CREATION OF A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, a most appropriate birthday gift that this Congress can offer Moscow, on the occasion of its 50th anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik revolution, is the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. This action is long overdue. Not only the Russian Bolshevik 50th, but also the numerous 50th anniversaries of the independence of the Ukraine, Lithuania, Estonia, Armenia, and others now held captive in the Soviet Union serve as an excellent occasion for us to seize the initiative in this vital respect.

The Russian Bolshevik 50th is no birthday for the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. November 7 is a day of tragedy and mourning for them. In our day, these captive non-Russian nations are a key to world peace, to the end of the cold war, and to the advance of freedom.

There has never been a thorough examination of the position of these captive countries from the viewpoint of American national interests. This alone more than justifies a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Throughout the 1967 Captive Nations Week this and other important themes were registered about the country, and I place the following material in the RECORD at this point:

PROCLAMATION BY THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER, N.Y.

By These Presents, Greetings:

Whereas, There exist today more than a dozen nations whose people have seen their national and cultural integrity dissolved by oppressive rulers selected for them, not by them, by the masters of the Kremlin; and

Whereas, It is vital to the security of free men everywhere that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the people of these captive nations be nurtured and strengthened by all honorable means; and

Whereas, There are in Rochester many residents with close personal and family ties with the peoples of Europe, Asia and Latin America who feel the heavy hand of Communist dictatorship, a hand which offers social justice and equality but delivers the chains of bondage; and

Whereas, The President and the Congress of the United States have proclaimed the Third week of July, 1967, as Captive Nations Week,

Now, therefore, I, Frank T. Lamb, Mayor of the City of Rochester, New York, do hereby proclaim the week of July 16-22, 1967, as Captive Nations Week in the City of Rochester and urge all residents of the City to observe the occasion by strengthening their understanding of the basic rights which make all men free.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the Seal of the City of Rochester, at the City Hall on this 14th day of July in the year of our Lord 1967.

FRANK T. LAMB,
Mayor, Rochester, N.Y.

REVIEW: CHICAGO, ILL., CAPTIVE NATIONS' WEEK OBSERVANCE, 1966

The Captive Nations' Week Observance in Chicago was started by Mayor Richard J. Daley's signed proclamation, asking the Chicago residents not to forget captive nations under the Communist regime. In his proclamation the Mayor asked not to deny all possible support towards observance of the Captive Nations' Week on July 16.

Viktors Viksnins, Captive Nations' Committee Chairman, presented a certificate of merit and esteem to Chicago's mayor, ex-

pressing gratitude for the support, which they have always received in Chicago.

On the evening of July 6, 1966, a Captive Nations' Week press conference was held at the Conrad Hilton hotel. The speakers were: Frank T. T. Sia, Consul General of China; Dr. Petras Dauzvardis, Consular General of Lithuania, and Chicago Mayor's Office Director of Special Events, Col. Jack Reilly. The conference was led by radio and TV commentator Sig Sakowicz. One of the press conference participants was Mr. Janis Grigalis, a recent refugee from an Iron Curtain country—Latvia.

The Captive Nations' parade was led by the motto: "Freedom and Independence for All Nations" and "Salute to Servicemen Fighting for Freedom." Honorary guests in the parade were the wounded in Viet Nam battlefields. Following them were Chicago's Mayor Richard J. Daley; Major Raymond Casteel, representing the United States Army; and Viktors Viksnins, Captive Nations' Week Chairman, followed by committee members. The units participating in the parade were as follows:

American Legion, U.S. Navy Band, Cosacks, Latvia, Slovakia, Cuba, Germany, Chicago Fire Department, Serbia, Armenia, Estonia, Byelorussia, P. J. Cullerton Drum & Bugle Corps, Hungaria, Bulgaria, Chinese Drum & Bugle Corps, Poland, Shannon Rovers Pipe Band, Lithuania, Chicago Lawn Moose Troop, Korea, Hornets Drum & Bugle Corps, Croatia, Albania, Ukraine and Czechoslovakia.

The parade was concluded in Grant Park with a special program. The speakers were: Dr. Lev Dobriansky, National Chairman of Captive Nations Committee, Washington; Joseph C. Murphy, American Legion Department Commander; and Senator Paul H. Douglas. The statement by Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice-President of the United States, was read. Messages were received from Illinois Governor Otto Kerner, Senator Everett M. Dirksen, and Congressmen E. Derwinski and D. Rostenkowski.

The Captive Nations' observance in Chicago turned out well; gratitude is due to all who contributed to the fine results. Our achievements were also evaluated by the National Captive Nations Committee, whose chairman Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky sent the following letter to mayor Richard J. Daley:

"By all evidence your observance surpassed all others, and in behalf of this committee and certainly the suppressed voices of millions in the Red Empire, I heartily congratulate you for your remarkable and outstanding leadership in this annual event. We look forward to the fitting occasion when our tangible recognition of your magnificent endeavors can be made."

A large share of our gratitude belongs to Mayor Richard J. Daley, and Col. Jack Reilly, Director of Special Events, for the great support and the good advice in organizing the Captive Nations' parade and program.

In closing this review, I wish to express sincere thanks to all committee members, and all nationality groups participating in the parade and program.

Sincerely,

VIKTORS VIKSNINS,
General Chairman.

HEADQUARTERS, U.S. MILITARY ASSISTANCE COMMAND, OFFICE OF THE COMMANDER,

Vietnam.

Mr. VIKTORS VIKSNINS,
Chairman, Captive Nations Committee,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. VIKSNINS: Thank you for your 25 July letter, informing me of your Annual Captive Nations Observance and for the resolution expressing support of the men here in Vietnam.

The support of those at home is an indispensable element in our effort to ensure that

the people of this nation can determine their future without fear of intimidation. It is particularly inspiring when such expressions of support come from those who have made personal sacrifices in the cause of freedom.

A parade such as you held on your Captive Nations Day portrays the patriotic spirit of those who participated and provides public awareness of this much needed support. We deeply appreciate these demonstrations of confidence on the part of the American people.

Your resolution will be brought to the attention of our troops through notice in our command-wide newspaper.

On behalf of all the servicemen of this command, I extend my heartfelt thanks to you and the members of the Chicago Captive Nations Week Committee.

Sincerely,
W. C. WESTMORELAND,
General, U.S. Army, Commanding.

COMMANDING OFFICER,
NAVAL HOSPITAL,
Great Lakes, Ill., July 19, 1967.

Mr. VIKTORS VIKSNINS,
Chairman, Captive Nations Committee,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. VIKSNINS: On behalf of the staff and patients at this Hospital I wish to thank you so very much for including some of our patients in the Captive Nations Parade held on July 15, 1967.

Those of us who work in a Hospital realize that keeping morale high is as important as the medical care which is administered. When the patients are aware that others are concerned for their welfare, this in itself is a "morale booster".

The patients felt honored that the Captive Nations Committee should have remembered them for such an important occasion. They also enjoyed the luncheon afterwards at the Conrad Hilton.

Again, thank you so much for your continued interest in our Hospital.

Sincerely yours,
J. W. ALBRITAIN,
Rear Admiral, MC, USN, Commanding Officer.

[From the Wanderer, Aug. 17, 1967]

CAPTIVE NATIONS
CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS,
Rego Park, N.Y.

EDITOR, THE WANDERER:

Last week our Nation observed Captive Nations Week. For a number of years, by resolution of Congress, each year in July we commemorate Captive Nations Week—commemorate, not celebrate, for it is a solemn, not a happy occasion. Under the resolution, the President issues an annual proclamation designating the week of commemoration. At first the Presidential proclamations were specific about the reasons for the observance, i.e., the holding in bondage by Communist Russia of a whole group of Eastern and Central European nations whose nearly two hundred million peoples are unwilling slaves of the Red bosses in the Kremlin.

However, over the years, as voices of those who would accommodate Red butchers, and tones singing of mellowing Communists grew louder in the Land, the Presidential proclamations—both Republican and Democratic Presidents—became more watery and spiritless. The names of the captive nations used to be included in the proclamations. Gradually this was dropped until two years ago the President managed to proclaim Captive Nations Week without even mentioning Soviet Russia or Communism; and last year our Vice President found himself unable to attend a Captive Nations Week dinner but somehow managed to show up the next evening at a party in the embassy of the Red bosses of Poland whose people are among the captives of the Communists.

The purpose of Captive Nations Week in

the United States was to let the peoples of Eastern European nations swallowed by the Red beast—the peoples who have been so rightly described as our secret allies in the war between freedom and slavery—to let them know that Americans did not regard their enslavement as permanent and devoutly hoped for their liberation from the Red Yoke. Regardless of the attitude of official Washington, we would do well to commemorate Captive Nations week all year round and to remember, as we pray for the liberation of these nations' peoples, that "there, but for the grace of God, go I."

TED BUDZINSKI,
Americanism Chairman.

[From the Truth-Forum, August 1967]
L. B. J. AND DEAN RUSK AID SOVIET AIMS
(By Edward L. Delaney)

President Johnson's annual proclamation of Captive Nations Week, 1967, followed the pattern and innocuous phrasing of his previous apologies to the Soviet, in this connection. A joint resolution of Congress, July 17, 1959, authorized and instructed the President to designate the third week in July of each year as "Captive Nations Week" and to continue this observance until freedom and independence is given all peoples and nations presently under Soviet-communist subjugation.

The first such proclamation, over the signatures of Dwight Eisenhower and Christian Herter, Secretary of State, July 17, 1959, refers specifically "to the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations" and urges our people to "support" the just aspirations of those people for their independence. But President Kennedy and Johnson apparently followed the policy so earnestly advocated by Walt W. Rostow, i.e., "we must do nothing to embarrass the Soviet."

Many members of Congress carefully avoided mentioning the utterly asinine tenor of LBJ's "Captive Nations" proclamation. It conveys the impression that the peoples in the several nations presently held "captive" may be in that plight because they wish to be under communist serfdom. The President and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, studiously omit reference to the "captor" of the several little and some large nations presently held as virtual prisoners of the Soviet or communist regimes that have been imposed on them.

By contrast, the Captive Nations Week proclamation of Ohio's Gov. James A. Rhodes, names 26 nations presently "Communist dominated and oppressed." Obviously he did not "clear" his proclamation with the White House tenant or Dean Rusk or he would not have been guilty of such discourtesy to the Soviet and their satellite slave states.

By coincidence—as noted elsewhere in this issue, Soviet Premier Kosygin stated before the General Assembly that the Soviet Union respects the wishes of all peoples for their "self determination" and freedom.

It would appear to be an insult to the natal common sense of the American people to be told by Kosygin—and his statement given the tacit approval of our State Department and the Johnson administration—that Soviet-communism does not impose its oppressive blight on smaller nations. On the contrary, according to Kosygin, the Kremlin caliphs want all peoples to enjoy self-determination, Moscow style.

Dean Rusk and the President should review Public Law 86-90, which initiated Captive Nations Week. It states, in part: "Whereas the Imperialistic and aggressive policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, White Ruthenia, Estonia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Georgia, North Korea,

Albania, Idel-Ural, Turkestan, North Vietnam and others, and—"

Of course Dean Rusk and the pro-Soviet coterie in the State Department would regard that as indelicate to mention—when they are "building bridges to the east." But so far none of the captive peoples cross over from serfdom to freedom on those "bridges." Small wonder that an increasing percentage of our people are urging a purging of the State Department. And perhaps next year that purging will make a change in the White House Tenant.

[From the New England Committee for
Captive Nations]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK IN BOSTON
(By O. Szczudluk)

BOSTON, MASS.—This year's Captive Nations Week was observed here by informing the public, through newspapers and radio, about the captive nations. Governor John A. Volpe and Mayor John F. Collins of Boston enhanced the observance by issuing proclamations designating the week of July 16-22 as "Captive Nations Week" in Massachusetts and Boston respectively. The official signing of proclamations was witnessed by delegations representing the New England Committee for Captive Nations and included representatives of American, Armenian, Ukrainian, Latvian, Lithuanian and Hungarian organizations.

Each major daily and radio station in the State received a press release, together with copies of the official proclamations. These newspapers commented on the observance: The Boston Herald Traveler, Boston Record American, The Standard Times (New Bedford, Mass.), Manchester Union Leader (Manchester, N. H.), Morning Sentinel (Waterville, Maine), Halrenik Weekly (Boston, Mass.).

The Boston Herald of July 19, 1967, carried a letter by James H. Tashjian, Chairman of the NECN, urging concrete efforts in support of freedom for captive nations, such as exposing the fraudulent 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution and urging the U.N. to investigate Russian Communist aggression against and demanding free elections in captive countries.

The Boston Herald of July 6, 1967, carried an interesting article, written by Ted Lewis. The nationally syndicated columnist, citing an interview with Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, Chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, chided the Administration for paying only a "lip service to the cause of freedom" in captive countries. The article was entitled, "Captive Nations Get Lip Service."

The New England Committee for Captive Nations sponsored this year's observance, in cooperation with several other civic organizations. The Committee is headed by Dr. James H. Tashjian as Chairman and Orest Szczudluk as Executive Secretary.

ACTION ON SPECIAL COMMITTEE

In separate letters, 25 New England Congressmen were urged to initiate action in the House Rules Committee on pending legislation and to vote for the establishment of a permanent Special Committee on Captive Nations in Congress. So far, favorable answers were received from Speaker McCormack and Congressmen O'Neill, Philbin, Burke, Cleveland, St. Onge, Conte.

BOSTON, Mass., July 31, 1967.

[From the Boston Herald Traveler, July 19, 1967]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

BOSTON.

To the HERALD TRAVELER EDITOR:

The week of July 16-22 is observed as Captive Nations Week in this country. The observances of Captive Nations Week have been vituperatively condemned by Communists

because they spread the truth about Communist aggressions.

The 1967 Captive Nations Week provides immense opportunities for advancing the cause of captive nations by:

Exposing the fraudulent 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution. The national revolutions of the captive non-Russian nations were, indeed, the genuine revolutions, because they expressed the principle of freedom, national self-determination and sovereign equality of all nations. The Bolshevik revolution brought aggression and slavery.

Urging the United Nations to investigate Russian Communist aggression in Armenia, Ukraine, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Georgia, and other captive nations.

Challenging Communist dictators on free elections, as they were once promised, in Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and East Germany.

JAMES H. TASHJIAN,
Chairman, New England Committee for
Captive Nations.

THYNG FLAYS U.S. APATHY AT CAPTIVE NATIONS RITES

ASHLAND.—The eighth annual Captive Nations Rally was held yesterday at Captive Nations Cemetery here with Brig. Gen. Harrison Thyng USAF (ret.) of Pittsfield, and Josef Mlot-Mroz of Salem, Mass., president of the Anti-Communist Confederation of Polish Freedom Fighters in USA Inc. giving addresses.

"We have got to end this war!" said Gen. Thyng speaking of the Vietnamese war. "You hear the claim that to declare war will bring Communist China into the war; that is a lie. We have 100,000 men there in Southeast Asia. Who is being kidded? Why aren't we being told the truth?"

"Because of apathy, because you have a TV, a car, a good job, you want to sit back and enjoy it, not let anything disturb you. Maybe you can have a second car if you can keep this war going. What about it, America? Are you and I ready to sacrifice some more? Insist that we have peace and freedom, whether we have a job or not," urged the general.

He continued, "We don't need a war to have economy. We can have the greatest economy in the world without a war."

"With your son over there and my son over there, I'm not going to give up the fight. My son has flown 10½ months, almost 300 missions. I know his nervous system has been disrupted and he will never overcome it," said the general.

"This is what happens because we have a pilot shortage," Thyng continued. "You've been told there's no such thing, but there is one of the biggest pilot shortages in the history of our country."

"There are some things they can lie to us about, but you and I must insist upon the truth. You and I who live in this country have got to have the courage to speak out," the general went on.

"The greatest country on earth, the greatest people on earth, the greatest capacity on earth and the greatest potential, let's fight for it," concluded Thyng.

HOOR IS LATE

In his address earlier, Mlot-Mroz assailed communism as a "cancer," and said: "It is foolish to talk about keeping ourselves and the rest of the Free world from Communist domination without planning the liberation of the enslaved 900 million freedom fighters. To save ourselves we must work to free the captive nations, the hour is late. Americans be on guard tonight."

The program opened with the entrance of the color guard of Dupuis-Cross American Legion Post under the direction of George Ober, the national anthem and the pledge of allegiance. Dr. Ryki-Ryski, formerly of Byelorussia, opened and closed the program with prayer.

Messages were read from Sen. Norris Cotton and U.S. Rep. James C. Cleveland.

A highlight of the observation was the placing of a wreath in the Captive Nations Cemetery by Mlot-Mroz, Thyng and Ted Marksimowicz, secretary of the Polish Freedom Fighters of the USA.

The Torch of Freedom was lit by Mrs. George Faucher of Bedford, who was wearing her native Polish costume.

SILENCE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

(By Barry Goldwater)

This column is deliberately late. It concerns something that happened a month ago, but I have not written about it until now to make my point more forcefully.

One month ago the President, under a mandate from Congress, "proclaimed" Captive Nations Week.

The proclamation was so silent that few Americans heard it. It didn't cause a ripple.

It was so silent that it might as well not have been done. Between the theoretical date of Captive Nations Week and now there hasn't been enough made of it to produce a whisper that could be heard beyond the few communities that did something about it.

Captive Nations Week meant something in the years immediately after a concerned Congress established it as a beacon of hope to the captive millions behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. It was important to the many Americans who have relatives in the captive nations and to millions abroad to whom the U.S. attitude toward the Communist conquerors is the only ray of hope left in a dark world.

It meant something in particular to the mood of American foreign policy. It meant nationwide recognition that communism is a naked aggressive force, that millions of formerly free men are oppressed behind a barrier of Red bayonets and that the cold war is essentially a war of liberation.

Dwight Eisenhower, for instance, did not hedge when he first proclaimed Captive Nations Week. He referred honestly and flatly to nations "made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism." There, for all the world to see and hear, was the statement of a man who knew the realities of the world in which he lived, of a people who knew them, also, and of a leader and a people dedicated together to getting on with the fight against aggression by every peaceful means available to them.

The Captive Nations Week proclamation ever since has been a barometer of the Administration's firmness or softness toward communism.

On the scale of such a barometer, Lyndon Johnson's versions of Captive Nations Week have hit dead bottom.

This past one was throttled with official indifference at the outset.

Just as surely as a barometer foretells a storm, this attitude reflects the Administration's incredibly paradoxical attitude toward communism.

Thousands of Americans have lost their lives fighting Communist aggression in Vietnam. And yet the same President who ordered them there has not effectively extended this firm policy to communism on other fronts.

Communism supplies the battlefield, and yet this Administration asks that we step up trade with communism.

And rather than even embarrass communism, this Administration has buried Captive Nations Week as deeply as communism promises to bury us.

CELEBRATE THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RED FASCIST REVOLUTION BY REMEMBERING AMERICA'S SHAME: THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

"None of the nations now behind the Iron Curtain (known as 'captive nations') would be enslaved by the Soviet dictatorship today were it not for the aid given

that dictatorship by our Government and our sources of information."

If ours were an enlightened self-interest, what would be the normal position to take on the captive nations? We would work continuously to promote their freedom and to publicize their present enslavement.

Why?

The captive nations are testimony to the fact that we cannot do business with Communists. Americans should remember that there is not a single nation or territory under Communism which did not have relations with the Soviets. Moreover, the more high-sounding the treaties and agreements made with the Soviet empire, the quicker and more absolute was the enslavement. By exploiting the captive nations for the lessons they can teach, we learn that:

1. Red Russia cannot be contained by disarmament pacts, cultural exchanges, windy debates, give-and-take agreements, appeasement.

Rather, the seed of communism's destruction lies within itself. The conquered are longing and planning for their freedom. To shake hands with a Khrushchev, a Brezhnev, a Kosygin—or with the one who may soon replace them and start the cycle over again with friendly smiles and lofty proposals—is to snuff out the captive's spark of resistance, a weapon against our own enslavement. Even for our own sake, therefore, we should work to keep Americans aware of the present state of the captive nations and of the best natural hope for our victory which comes from them.

2. The strongest advantages of the enemy are not military, but political and psychological.

It was not armed might that locked the galling chains about the necks of the captive nations. Although Russia's greatest conquests occurred in times of war, the armies came second. First there came subversion in government, education, and communications. In government, the puppets of appeasement assured the people that peace, friendship, and freedom were to be the gifts of cooperation with the Reds. In education, traditional moral standards and patriotism were held up for examination as curiosities, and then suppressed. In communications, what the people could not know was not reported and what they could know was subtly distorted.

The string about each nation's throat became a cord, the cord became a rope and the rope eventually became an iron chain. The captive nations are watching the thread around America's throat. If we but listen to their cries, perhaps we shall snap the string before it becomes a chain. Certainly, we must be totally prepared militarily, but no amount of armed might will protect us if we rot from within.

If all we know is what is in the refrigerator, what is on TV, how much gas is in the car, and which cigarette pleases most; if all we have time for is luxury, then we should hoard well our comforts, for we have not long to enjoy them. We must take time, in the name of enlightened self-interest, to learn and teach the lessons of the captive nations, to win this Soviet-declared war of politics and psychology.

3. To work for our own preservation, we must work toward the liberation of the captive nations.

Communism is a cancer. A man who is told that he has lung cancer would be a fool to take steps to protect his heart with never a thought about curing the cancer. It is foolish to talk about keeping ourselves and the rest of the Free World from Communist domination without planning the liberation of the enslaved nine hundred million Freedom Fighters.

Declaring military war is not the way to free them. Waging ideological, political, and psychological war is the way. The Free World must become absorbed, in international deal-

ings with the subject of the captive nations. Every crack in the Iron Curtain must become an echo chamber for freedom's voice. Every reliable report of Red suppression of the enslaved must become subject to investigation by the Free World.

Next time one of the captive nations breaks the slavery chains, we should be ready to recognize the new government and to send in American representatives and real "foreign aid." It is our obligation to elect representatives who will do this. It is our obligation to make the present representatives of the Free World aware of the need for non-violent aggression on behalf of the captive nations.

War is what will result from appeasement: war when we can only lose. A strong, unyielding stand today will make war unnecessary. From within and without their prisons, the people will rise to drive back to hell the father of lies with his false philosophy.

The sufferings of the captive nations are beyond comprehension. Justice and charity demand that we preface any evaluation of "peaceful co-existence" with consideration of the plight of every captive nation.

It is not practical, it is not just, it is not Christian to negotiate on other matters without insisting on freedom for the enslaved; for by doing so we write off the millions who look to us for help, we invite further Communist aggression, we become slowly reconciled to surrender by default.

There is only one standard for America: if a policy advances the cause of freedom, let us pursue it vigorously; if it injures the cause of freedom, let us reject it vehemently. In the words of John Donne:

"No man is an island unto himself. Every man is a piece of the continent . . . a part of the main.

"Every man's death diminishes me because I am involved in all mankind.

"Therefore, send not to learn for whom the bell tolls . . . it tolls for thee."

[From Freedom's Facts, July 1967]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 16-22, 1967

Participants in a Captive Nations Conference in Washington, D.C., July 15 urged that Captive Nations Week observances be extended year round. Specific quotes from the Conference:

Congressman Edward J. Derwinski (R., Ill.)—"You can't have peace and freedom in the world until all people live in countries with governments of their own choice."

Congressman Michael A. Feighan (D., Ohio)—"We have tens of millions of allies inside the Communist Empire. They call out to us for support in their aspirations for liberty, freedom and national independence."

Henry Kirsch, International Department, AFL-CIO, speaking for Mr. George Meany, President AFL-CIO, and Honorary Chairman, National Captive Nations Committee—"The trade union movement stands with clear, unequivocal support for the aspirations of all people for freedom. . . . Unless all people are free none of us is secure in our own liberty."

Conference speakers also included Dr. Peter P. Lejins, President, American Latvian Association, and Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of American, and Chairman, National Captive Nations Committee.

IMPORTANT NEW PUBLICATIONS

"U.S. policy toward the USSR"—This 16-page publication by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Professor of Economics, Georgetown University, and Chairman, National Captive Nations Committee, points out a series of misconceptions which have led to disadvantageous American positions viz-a-viz the Soviet Union. The publication calls for a full Congressional review of U.S.-USSR relations in respect to Viet Nam, East-West trade,

establishment of consulates, and the like to "eliminate the conceptual cobwebs which misdirect us into new disadvantageous positions." "Review of U.S. Policy Toward the USSR," 16 pages, \$50 per copy, National Captive Nations Committee, 1028 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

[From the Ukrainian Quarterly,
Summer 1967]

TRADE WITH THE RED EMPIRE (By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Although cold war evidence of Russian and Red Syndicate aggression against the Free World accumulates daily, the pressure for the swift buck in East-West trade remains unrelenting. Moscow's material support of totalitarian Hanoi, its triggering of the Israel-Arab war, and indirectly, through Cuba and the Communist Party in the U.S., its political warfare exploitation of the American civil rights movement, leading to organized insurrection in our cities, make little impression on those who would beef up the Red economies to commit even greater and more disastrous cold war aggressions. In short, the Cold War is not at an end; on the contrary, it is more intense and complex than ever before, and trade is a vital part of it. If they knew what is being shipped to the Red Empire as "non-strategic material" under the Administration's irrational policy, the American people would be both horrified and rebellious.

Developments since World War II in the area of Free World trade relations with the expanded totalitarian Red Empire can be intelligibly reduced to a few essential and determining points. These are: (1) a repetition of errors committed in the prewar trade with the totalitarian Axis powers; (2) an almost total indifference to our past economic contributions to the Imperium in Imperio, namely the Soviet Union; (3) a grave limitation in general understanding of Red economic strategy in the Cold War; (4) a consequent lack of appreciation concerning the discernible outlines and inroads of Red trade aggression; and (5) the absence of a rationally appropriate and effective Free World trade policy to cope with the implicit dangers and threats of Red economic strategy and aggression. A thorough examination of all outstanding literature on the subject discloses the presence of one or any combination of these basic, ultimate points.

A NEW GENERATION OF ERRORS

In our thinking on East-West trade the one conspicuous oversight is the lessons taught by our experiences with totalitarian economies prior to World War II. Except for a few references here and there, it would appear from current discussion that no such experiential background existed. What in essence is transpiring is a new generation of errors, characterized by a basic repetition of self-legitimized mistakes which, with new actors and a different setting on an old stage of imperialist totalitarianism versus freedom, yield substantially the same lines and sounds.

"Trade for peace," "trade to change the attitudes of the people," trade to reduce the power of domination and influence by the totalitarian state over another, trade to reorient a totalitarian economy from heavy capital goods production to more consumer goods activity and also toward multi-lateral world trade as against economic autarchy with bilateral trade sieves, trade because other democracies are profitably indulging in this with the totalitarian states, and an inability to define precisely the nature of a "strategic item"—these dominant rationalizations and aspects marked the period of the thirties as they do now. They were employed to justify Free World trade with the totalitarian Axis powers of Nazi Germany, Imperial Japan, and Fascist Italy as they are now in relation to the totalitarian economies in the

extensive Red Empire.¹ Supposedly, there were "good and bad Fascists" then as there are now "good and bad Communists."

In the welter of discussion on East-West trade the striking similarities between the thirties and now deserve incessant re-emphasis. As will be shown below, the present Cold War context with all its subtleties, evasiveness, and calculated maneuvers makes the present situation an even far more perilous one. The awareness shown, for example, by the AFL-CIO Executive Council should be generalized. Referring to business deals with Communist governments, the Council has clearly stated, "It is not true that in such deals 'the only thing that matters is profit and competitive advantage.' This practice of doing 'business as usual' with the Nazi and Fascist dictators proved disastrous before World War II. 'Business as usual' with Communist dictators will certainly be no less disastrous."²

Some of the ideas suggested here have received only minor emphasis in the current discussion. For example, a nationally known columnist has observed, "But if, as in the 1930's, the private greed supersedes the interests of the people as a whole, the world may again see a global conflict. For it was the failure of the embargo on oil against Mussolini in 1935 and the flagrant indifference of the nations of Europe to the plea of President Roosevelt in 1937 for a 'quarantine' or economic embargo against Hitler that brought on the very conditions which made World War II inevitable."³ Quoting a *Chicago Tribune* editorial, he observes further, "Although grain is not usually classified as 'strategic material' in the sense of arms and ammunition, it certainly becomes strategic when our enemies are hungry and can't feed themselves."

That our experience before World War II must be recalled over and over again with a necessary dimension of thought conveying the new context of protracted cold warfare is further underscored by much limited thinking on liberalizing trade with Eastern Europe. For example, a commission established by the President to report on the subject well demonstrates this with its unrealistic and narrow conception of what constitutes "strategic trade" in the contemporary context. It states in its report to the President "we rule out from these considerations any kind of strategic trade that could significantly enhance Soviet military capabilities and weaken our own position of comparative military strength."⁴ Although this represents an improvement over the difficulties of thought encountered in the thirties, when far more than just scrap iron was shipped to the Axis powers, to think that strategic trade is related solely to military capability sufficiently indicates a conceptual insularity concerning the psycho-political content of the Cold War. Red propaganda employed in programs of subverting governments in the Free World, notably in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, doesn't place stress on the military powers of the USSR or even Red China but rather, and almost entirely, on the rapid economic advances of "the socialist countries."

It is noteworthy, too, that the commission

¹ See Lev E. Dobriansky, "Historical Lessons in U.S.-Totalitarian Trade," *The Intercollegiate Review*, Philadelphia, Pa., November-December 1966.

² Statement on East-West Trade, AFL-CIO Executive Council, Bal Harbour, Florida, March 1, 1965.

³ David Lawrence, "Trade With Best Bolsters Reds," *Syndicated Column*, October 1965.

⁴ Report to the President, Special Committee on U.S. Trade Relations With East European Countries and the Soviet Union. The White House, April 29, 1965, p. 1.

virtually disregards the interrelated complexity of modern industry and agriculture, which is even more so now than in the thirties. The shipment of oil facilities, chemical plant structures, transport means, plastic and synthetic processes, high-grade fertilizers, various types of machineries for even consumer goods production, and valuable intangibles of managerial organization and talent cannot but have either direct or indirect beneficial influence for Red military capabilities. In terms of waging a psychopolitical cold war, i.e., paramilitary capability, such measure of aid is absolutely unquestionable. But this perhaps more important factor escapes the understanding of not only the President's commission but also most analysts of the subject.

Moreover, on the bases of developments over the past thirty years, an examination of all current output on East-West trade and the new cold war dimension, it is no exaggeration to conclude and argue that up to this point we have developed an outlook of military preparedness toward the Red challenge, which we did not have toward the Axis threat, but as of now we still are fully exposed to cold war Pearl Harbors because of our fundamental unpreparedness in cold warfare, which embraces economic weapons as well as all others. These cold war Pearl Harbors may occur in the Dominican Republic, Brazil, Sudan, Thailand, anywhere in the Middle East and numerous other areas in the Free World, and ironically the leading economic powers of the Free World would in some indirect way be contributing to these outbreaks by beefing up the Red totalitarian economies through liberalized trade. In this broader framework of understanding, wheat shipped to the USSR so that it could meet its cold war commitments to Egypt, Cuba, and several other states is itself clearly a strategic item.

When one recounts how much the Red Empire expanded since World War II with inferior resources, one dreads to think about the long-term prospects of the empire's cold war operations, equipped with superior resources supplied in part by the Free World. Strangely enough, most analysts ignore the cumulative long-run record and concentrate exclusively on separate annual statistics of either absolute or percentage amounts. Yet, in the case of grain for example, it requires little imaginative thought to contemplate what the possible consequences might have been had the Red Empire been deprived of 40 million metric tons which it obtained from the Free World in the short period of 1960-64. There is no end in sight on this yet. In the sphere of complicated industrial equipment the same perspective should apply on both the military and cold war scales. Over the years of the thirties, the Axis powers acquired sizeable amounts of economic aid for their war plans.

TRENDS IN HELPING THE RED EMPIRE

The past twenty years of developments surrounding the issue of trade with the Red Empire lend themselves to an intelligible patternization of dominant trends and phases, in terms of both volume and controls. Bearing in mind the experiences of the thirties, it is remarkable how easily the natural instinct to exchange, veritably the economic side of the instinct for peace, can be exploited to advance the strategic objectives of the Red economies. It is also startling to observe how few pay any heed to our substantial economic contributions in the past to the build-up of the USSR imperium in Imperio.⁵

Some who do recognize this past record

⁵ See "Five Perspectives On East-West Trade," *East-West Trade, Part II, Hearings, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate*, 1965, pp. 94-104.

rationalize it away on the basis that selective trade now would not contribute nearly as much because it would constitute a small percentage of Red gross product, estimated about \$500 billion, and that in time the Red economies will develop their own respective economic capabilities. But, then, the basic question still remains, "Why are they so anxious to indulge in trade with the industrial Free World?" What in this rationalization is overlooked, too, is the fact that the global goals, commitments, and cold war operations of the USSR in particular and the entire Red Empire in general are more positive, expressive, and costly today than they were decades ago. In effect, the industrial Free World is being called in to expedite these for the far-flung empire.

Control policy over the period logically bears an inverse relationship to volume of trade; a hard policy with many extensive controls means less trade, a soft policy with fewer qualitative and quantitative controls conduces to more trade. Three distinct phases punctuate the post-World War II period. Immediately after the war, in 1945-47, Western trade with the USSR and the "satellites" was on the increase, this exclusive of residual lend-lease deliveries and UNRRA operations. By 1948 broad controls were instituted by the U.S. and its Western allies to curb the shipment of goods important to the empire's military strength.

This early control picture from 1948 to 1953 was reflected statistically in the decline of exports and imports concerning the empire, whether one views them on the basis of the OECD countries, the Free World, or the United States alone. OECD exports to the empire declined from \$1,161.7 million in 1948 to \$770.8 million in 1953, imports from \$1,263.8 million to \$934.1 million.⁶ In the same period total Free World exports decreased from \$1,969 million in 1948 to \$1,389 million in 1953, imports from \$2,008 million to \$1,631 million. U.S. trade dropped in exports from \$269 million in 1947 to \$1.8 million in 1953; imports from \$154 million in 1947 to \$46 million in 1953.⁷

A new trend followed this early period, thus initiating the third phase. The year 1954 may rightly be accepted as the starting point of a period of liberalization or breakdown in controls which has continued to the very present, with forces and pressures seeking a marked relaxation particularly in the U.S. The end of the Korean War, the death of Stalin, the bilateral and multilateral control stings felt by the empire, and a deceptive policy of peaceful coexistence resurrected by Moscow account for this change. COCOM lists were successively subjected to review and scaled down markedly in 1954, 1958, 1963, and 1964. In conformity with COCOM rules on individual country privilege, the U.S. however, had maintained its extensive control lines until recently.

The consequences of the soft multilateral control policy are plainly evident in the statistical data. OECD exports to the empire jumped from \$770.8 million in 1953 to \$2,481.4 million in 1960, and \$2,972.4 million in 1963; for the given years its imports from the empire also rose from \$934.1 million to \$2,448.8 million and \$3,150 million. Total Free World exports to the empire increased from \$1,389 million in 1953 to \$4,425 million in 1960 to \$5,173 million in 1963; imports showed equally significant increases from \$1,631 million to \$4,462 million and \$5,389 million, respectively. By virtue of a discrepancy in controls U.S. exports to the empire rose only from \$1.8 million in 1953 to \$194 million in 1960 and \$167 million in 1963;

imports also increased from \$46 million to \$84 million and \$85 million for those years.

Since 1962 powerful pressures have been generated in the U.S. for relaxed export controls. While the campaign progresses, numerous disquieting features of slipshod control administration have been emerging, as though to reinforce the campaign. In addition to renewed pressures for U.S. wheat sales to the USSR, clearances have been given for the sale of advanced technologies, specialized machinery and equipment, and industrial plants, products and data to the empire. Of the far too many examples than can be mentioned, a few should be observed here as being typical of the present trend, notably from the viewpoint of strategic materials.

In July 1965, for example, the Department of Commerce issued an export license for the shipment of over \$3 million of chemical woodpulp to the USSR. This wood is ultimately used in the production of tires, both passenger cars and trucks for both military and economic build-up uses. Another license issued that month was for over \$2 million worth of grinding machines to the USSR, also important militarily and economically in the transport industry. A license for the export of polystyrene to the USSR was also issued, despite the fact that the item enters critically into the manufacture of explosives, demolition blocks, nonmagnetic mines and the like. In addition, much technical data and a broad assortment of advanced machineries are being released to Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Bulgaria without certain knowledge as to their end use. Moreover, many of the clearances give every indication of prototype purchasing by the Red regimes.⁸ Through July 31, 1965, the Export-Import Bank has authorized 83 commercial credit guarantees to Red states, totaling some \$66 million. The 1966-67 clearances are abounding and incredible, including steel mill components, computers, missile guidance devices, industrial chemicals, converting machinery, magnetic tape units, Boron isotopes, aircraft equipment, and wide assortments of machineries.

To complete this picture in outline form, it should be emphasized that Red exports consist largely of raw materials, food, fuel, and finished natural products for imports that are chiefly of highly developed finished industrial products, whole plants, and new technologies, such as chemical processing plants, oil refineries, synthetic rubber plants, electronic computer parts, research laboratory equipment and so forth.

Given a long-run cold war viewpoint, in the 15 years of the 1950-1964 period Free World exports to the Red Empire have totaled some \$49 billion, and in 1965 they well exceeded the \$50 billion mark. Although total imports from the West make up only a little over 1 per cent of USSR's gross product and about 2 per cent of the combined gross product of the other East European Red states, and despite the even lower aggregate significance of this trade for Western Europe and the United States, over time this trade is substantial for the build-up and cold war potential of the Red Empire. And in any given year it bears disproportionate significance for selected Red industrial targets; trade between the Red states of Eastern Europe and the Western industrial countries was about \$3.5 billion each way in 1964, or a total trade turnover of approximately \$6 billion. It grew over the past decade by nearly 10 per cent, exceeding the rate of growth in the overall trade of the Western industrial states. For Western European countries this trade has averaged about 3½ per cent of their total trade, for the United States scarcely 1 per cent.

⁸ Export Control, 73rd Quarterly Report, 3rd Quarter, 1965, Department of Commerce, pp. 4-5, 19-20.

Those overemphasizing these small proportions as justification for more liberalized trade demonstrate their insufficient grasp of Red economic strategy in the Cold War. Regardless of the facades of "increasingly independent" Yugoslavia, Poland, and Rumania, this strategy is substantially no different from the past totalitarian economic strategy of the Axis powers, with stress on overall self-sufficiency, accelerated build-up by overcoming current deficiencies, and controlled trade and foreign exchange operations. In essence, the errors of thirty years ago are being repeated again. Some 50 per cent of all trade between the empire and the Free World is accounted for by the COCOM countries, predominantly the West European ones (non-European are the U.S., Canada, and Japan). In relation to the Red Chinese sector of the empire, Free World trade has also increased over the past decade, rising from \$740 million in 1953 to \$1,505 million in 1963.⁹ West Germany, Japan, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Canada show up in the figures as the leading traders with the Red Empire, taking into account all sectors.¹⁰

When talking about "strategic items," one need exercise only a minimum of common cold war sense in assessing these day-to-day reports: (1) according to Moscow, USSR trade with developed capitalist nations rose 15 per cent in 1964, chiefly in industrial products (USSR foreign trade increased more than 75 per cent since 1958, to about \$15.3 billion, of which 75 per cent is with other parts of the empire);¹¹ (2) Swedish firms contracted to supply Red China with heavy duty trucks valued at \$30 million, apparently the most important single industrial contract between Red China and a Western country;¹² Similar items abound monthly and add up to sizeable absolute amounts yearly, at least in the light of their significance for Red economic strategy.

RED ECONOMIC STRATEGY

As stressed at the outset, there have been grave limitations in general understanding of Red economic strategy, which is part and parcel of overall Cold War strategy as directed mainly by Moscow, the chief power center of the Red Empire, and to a lesser degree by competitive Peking. Also as indicated above, this strategy is not new, though it enjoys a considerably broader framework than prevailed prior to World War II at the hands of the Axis powers which did not command the resources now at the disposal of the Red totalitarians.

The elements of Red economic strategy, which even lends itself to diagrammatic exposition, include accelerated economic growth, self-sufficiency, overcoming short supplies, selective bilateral trading, sustaining cold war commitments, inroads into the underdeveloped areas, Eastern European industrial assistance for the USSR, increased productivity and fulfillment of plans, acquisition of late technology, data, and managerial ability, Russian exploitation of the empire, concentrated deficit payments in gold, and a growing integration of the empire—all interrelated and oriented to serve the consummate goals of political subversion, takeover, and empire expansion. All of these fundamental elements fit into a working pattern of operation in which the industrial Free World countries are to play their vital, assisting role.

Many salient points in this deficient un-

⁹ A Background Study On East-West Trade, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 1965, p. 67.

¹⁰ Op. cit. East-West Trade, Part II, pp. 186-187.

¹¹ Reuters, Geneva, May 5, 1965.

¹² Toronto Globe and Mail, Peking, June 7, 1965.

⁶ Direction of International Trade, United Nations, 1948; Statistical Bulletins, Foreign Trade, Series A, OECD, 1953.

⁷ Annual Trade Statistics, Department of Commerce.

derstanding, in not perceiving the situation as a whole, can be elaborated upon. For example, on past empire assistance, Secretary of State Dean Rusk has admitted, "Even before we recognized the USSR diplomatically, the Soviet Trading Company, Amtorg, operated widely in the United States, and American engineers and private corporations helped to build industrial plants and installations in the Soviet Union."¹⁴ This valuable assistance contributed heavily to the economic and military build-up of Soviet Russian imperialism, the effects of which have been felt by the West since. Today, under the illusion of fostering the "independence" of East European "satellites," we are being pressed to strengthen the extended Soviet Russian Empire largely through trade with its outer integral parts. It is not generally recognized that an extraordinarily high percentage of USSR imports from its Red partners in Eastern Europe is made up of industrial equipment and machinery. Rising significantly over the recent period, this machinery component represented 39 per cent in 1958, but 45 per cent in 1963 and with greater overall trade.¹⁵ Thus, when one reads "Present trends toward decentralization of the economic systems of the Eastern countries deserve a positive response from the West," he cannot but wonder about the politico-economic vacuum such statements are conjured up in.¹⁶

Thirty years ago statements of intention and aims issuing from the Axis powers were virtually ignored and even scoffed at. It is quite evident that today similar Red statements are not read or understood. They will support the facts presented here. Just to cite a few examples, it is well to recall the Marx-oriented statement of Lenin, "When the time comes to hang the capitalist class, they will compete with each other to sell us the rope." Khrushchev clearly stated in 1959, "We will soon need a large amount of equipment which must be designed and produced anew. It would also be expedient to order a part of this equipment in capitalist countries, primarily the United States, West Germany, and Britain." In 1959, during his visit here, he spoke quite frankly, "Some thirty years ago when our country started building a large-scale industry, good economic contacts were established with leading United States firms. Ford helped us build the motor works in Gorky. Cooper, a prominent American specialist, acted as a consultant during the building of the hydroelectric power station on the Dnieper, which in those days was the biggest in the world. Your engineers helped us build the tractor works in Stalingrad and Kharkov. Americans, along with the British, were consultants during the construction of the Moscow subway." He also stated he wants more, following this up to the end of his reign, "We need to study all the best achievements, the best foreign experience, and apply this ourselves in order to obtain higher labor productivity."¹⁷

One of Khrushchev's successors, Premier Kosygin continues this strain by indicating the USSR's desire to "link the long-term economic planning with foreign trade prospects to expand the Soviet market for western goods and the production of Soviet goods for export."¹⁸ In the Red trade campaign in the Middle East and Southeast Asia, the Czechoslovak Statistical Institution observed ten years ago: "Czechoslovak participation in this expansion of trade is not guided by purely practical considerations. It follows a plan carefully drawn up in accordance with

political considerations."¹⁹ The director of the Department of Circulation of Goods in the Rumanian State Planning Commission states plainly: "We put great emphasis on modern techniques. We do not purchase equipment from abroad unless we are convinced that it is at the top of the world in technology. We find that the United States, West Germany, France and Great Britain make the finest equipment and we want to procure it. This accounts for the increase in our trade with the West."²⁰

An East German economist sheds light on another dimension, eventual military and political concessions by the West: "The fact that not only the working people but a substantial section of the bourgeoisie in Western Europe want closer economic relations between the two systems opens up broad opportunities for supplementing the political struggle for peaceful coexistence with economic struggle. The creation of a nuclear-free zone in the center of Europe, renunciation by Bonn of nuclear armaments and the policy of revenge, and peaceful settlement of all outstanding questions, could create a favorable climate for closer economic collaboration between all the European countries."²¹ Here a Communist writer gloats, "During 1964, big holes were torn in the remaining barriers against free trade between Socialist countries and U.S. Allies. The volume of such trade spurted forward at an accelerated rate. A further shift in domestic views put a majority of American business in favor of East-West trade."²²

These statements are sufficient to indicate the primary factors at work in this issue. Discussion about laws, patent rights, copyrights, outstanding indebtedness and the like is of secondary importance and suggests a blind willingness to trade with the empire. If we believe, for example, that more liberalized trade would contribute to peace, the growing independence of the "satellites," and a fairer share for American business, then an easy resolution of these secondary problems should take effect, with the Red regimes doubtlessly accommodating it in no small degree. Prior to its recognition by us in 1933, the USSR repudiated debts to the U.S. valued about \$628 million. During World War II, the USSR received approximately \$11 billion in U.S. lend-lease aid. By pillage, repatriation, and expropriation Moscow collected over \$30 billion worth of property in Germany and elsewhere. All this did not deter us in 1951-52 to offer a negotiating figure of \$800 million for Moscow to settle its debts. It balked with a counter-offer of \$300 million.²³

If we disregard the content of Red economic strategy and plunge into liberalized East-West trade, some nominal settlement of outstanding obligations may be expected or the Johnson Act may be repealed. Concerning patents and copyrights, the trade-eager Russians have already demonstrated their civility by becoming the 68th member of the Paris convention for the protection of industrial property. This "concession" is not without several subsidiary advantages to the Russians, such as buying the complex know-how along with the patent, obtaining foreign exchange from the sale of its own patents, and continued difficulties we would encounter in finding out how our patents are being used in the closed society of the USSR. Moreover, with the dubious argument of increasing

their purchases here, the Russians will seek the elimination of what they consider a discrimination against their exports to us, namely withholding the most-favored-nation treatment from their exports.

Exclusive concern with these secondary problems cannot but abet the objectives of Red economic strategy for it reinforces the underlying assumption of liberalized trade. In 1955, Khrushchev illumined the essence of Red totalitarian trade when he said, "We value trade least for economic reasons and most for political reasons." It appears rather naive for many Americans to believe that trade with the empire is a peace-contributing, normalizing agent. Trade has been and will continue to be an essential weapon in the arsenal of Red economic warfare. The outlines of Red economic strategy are clear for all to see: (1) acquisition of the best of Western technology in its broadest sense to augment productivity, accelerate economic growth, and reap surpluses for intensified Cold War operations; (2) furtherance of the empire's integration on the bases of national division of labor and a heightened intra-empire trade facilitated by products from the Free World; (3) marginal penetration of the markets in the underdeveloped areas, also indirectly assisted by Free World industrial trade and leading to political involvements designed for eventual takeover, and (4) playing off one Free World industrial competitor against another with the aim of advancing political divisions among allied Free World nations.

Anastas Mikoyan, the skilled Armenian trader and former president of the USSR, confirmed the foundation of this strategy when in 1961 he indicated how the industrial part of the Free World was to assist: "It will be necessary to make wide use of foreign trade as a factor for economizing in current production expenditures and in capital investment, with the aim of accelerating the development of corresponding branches." In short, whether by direct trade with Moscow or indirectly through the parts of the CEMA network (Council of Economic Mutual Assistance) meaning Bucharest, Warsaw, or Prague and others, the West is to enable the empire to leap over years of research and development cost so that it may be strengthened to pursue more rapidly its global objectives.

A POSITIVE POLTRADE POLICY

What goods are strategic? From the analysis given here it becomes clear that virtually no goods for export to the empire is nonstrategic. Its cold war economies thrive on fertilizers, food, transport facilities, plastics, clothing, etc., as they do on imported technological data, heavy machinery, and military weapons. As a vital instrument of the Red states, trade covers deficiencies in the economy, influences policies of less powerful states, affords channels for acquiring useful information, permits industrial espionage, has wide propaganda uses, allows for psycho-political penetrations of countries and their dependence on the empire without having to go "Communist," and gradually leads to a displacement of Western influence in the areas, primarily through political agitation for socialism, nationalization, and the imitation of totalitarian economic plans. In sharp contrast to normal, standard Western practices, the Red trading mechanism embraces all of these factors—ingredients of economic warfare.

One of the striking aspects of East-West trade discussion is the confusion surrounding the definition of "strategic materials." Either the discussant prattles the term with no precise definition offered or he defines it solely in terms of military weapons, disregarding the intermeshed military-political-economic mix in a totalitarian economy oriented fundamentally toward Cold War goals. It cannot be said that the Reds, like the Nazi and Fascist totalitarians, haven't

¹⁴ *The Observer*, December 11, 1955.

¹⁵ *Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, November 12, 1965, p. A6427.

¹⁶ Karl-Heinz Domesday, "Economic Contacts Between the Socialist and Capitalist Countries of Europe," *World Marxist Review*, November 9, 1965, pp. 9-14.

¹⁷ Victor Perlo, *New World Review*, December 1964.

¹⁸ "Special Study Mission to Europe, 1964," Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, 1965, p. 8.

¹⁴ *East-West Trade*, Part I, Hearings, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 1964, p. 3.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.* *Current Economic Indicators for the USSR*, p. 154.

¹⁶ *East-West Trade*, Committee for Economic Development, 1965, p. 18.

¹⁷ *East Europe*, October 1964, p. 40.

¹⁸ *New York Times*, December 10, 1964.

time and time again specified their desires, methods, and aims. As another example, Eugen I. Cortemiev, deputy chairman of the USSR Committee for Inventions and Discoveries, frankly told a National Association of Manufacturers conference in New York that for the latest and best technology "We are prepared to conclude not only separate license contracts but also permanent agreements on the exchange of patent rights and technical information between your companies and us."²⁴ An examination of the reports by the recent U.S. business mission to Poland and Rumania, shows a hungry appetite by the Red regimes for American techniques. Concerning the Polish, "They are very much interested in any form of cooperation with U.S. computer manufacturers, peripheral equipment manufacturers, and U.S. producers of integrated circuits, measuring and testing instrumentation."²⁵ The same applies to the Rumanians. American businessmen are quite capable of meeting this demand, but they also make clear their inability to determine the politico-strategic importance of such trade.

Clearly, our failure to recognize the varying strategic character of all goods, consumer and capital, to the planned cold war economies of the Red Empire has bred a series of policy failures that render our posture irrational and self-defeating. Inadequate food, for instance, does not exactly bolster a Red regime's relations with the underlying populace in terms of exacted productivity, stoic acquiescence, and reduced frictions and resistance, all of which have their impact on the overall strength of the state. Our basic failure to face up to the broad strategicity of goods has accounted for the little pressure exerted on our allies to restrict their trade with the empire, the little discipline we've displayed with our own recent exports, our own violations of the Battle Act during the Korean War and since, and the rash of Free World trade with Red China while the U.S. defends the sovereignty of South Vietnam. The proliferating anomalies in the vital situation are logically traceable back to this basic failure.

The problem is not as complex as the confused thought on strategicity would make it appear. Chemical plants, for example, are a top priority item in Red import demand. Missilry, space technology, munitions, agriculture, and general industry depend heavily on such plants. Strategic? As a restricted study by the Center for Strategic Studies at Georgetown University discloses, our Manufacturing Chemists Association knows they are and, despite naive State Department urgings on Rumanian trust as to use, the group has consistently shown a reluctance to support their export to the empire. The oil offensive of the empire is a story in itself, an excellent example of empire integration through the Friendship Oil Pipe Line and also economic aggression. Strategic? The American Petroleum Institute knows it is and has opposed exports of oil processing facilities to the empire. These cases can be multiplied along the entire spectrum of economic goods entering into a planned cold war economy.

What can we do? On the basis of given evidence, the first thing is to recognize soberly the absence of a rationally appropriate and effective Free World trade policy toward the Red Empire. Second, to urge a complete embargo, such as exists against Red China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Cuba, or to advocate freer trade with Eastern Europe because our allies indulge in it or because of accidental gestures on the part of the "satellites," is in the present situation an extreme

course disproportionate to our strategic cold war needs. It is obviously not entirely true, as the President's Commission maintains, that "The United States has three alternatives. It can leave things as they are. It can eliminate this disparity through action across the board that would bring U.S. trading practice into line with those of our allies. Or it can modify its practices selectively and on a country-by-country basis."²⁶ In reality, there are two other alternatives—a complete embargo and selective country-by-country trade on the basis of political concessions; in other words, the latter being a poltrade policy with the same approach as the commission's third alternative but with a different and realistic, cold war political basis.

The poltrade policy has these five dominant characteristics: Cold War realism, freedom instrumentation, a via media approach, a formula for maximum flexibility and consistency, and a structure for positive Free World action. The first characteristic has been reflected throughout this analysis. Its content constitutes the very foundation of this poltrade policy. It refutes as illusory the basic assumptions and major reasons given for liberalized trade with Eastern Europe and emphasizes the Red economic strategy, the aggressive nature of Red trade, the vital distinction between Red states and the underlying captive nations, Red empire anarchy and integration, and the self-defeating character of unconditional Free World trade with the empire.

Indeed, the more one contemplates the clear-cut benefits of unconditional trade to the Red totalitarians, the more concerned one becomes about the acute vulnerabilities of the Free World. The trade issue cannot be divorced from "wars of liberation" and a host of other interrelated phenomena. Even this would be indicatively pertinent, "We have evidence," disclosed the Venezuelan Minister of the Interior, Gonzalo Barrios, "that Venezuelan Communists have been getting money from the Soviet Union, using the Italian Communist party as a vehicle. The Venezuelan Communists recently asked for additional funds designed to organize a large-scale subversive plan."²⁷

Freedom instrumentation is the second characteristic, meaning the full use of trade as a means of sustaining and expanding freedom. Liberal trade advocates argue in terms of freedom, too, but their false notions about the weaning process and evolution have already been noted. With cold war realism, we should scarcely hesitate or fear utilizing trade as a freedom weapon just as the Red regimes manipulate it as a weapon for conquest. Vague rhetoric about bridges of understanding, contacts with peoples, and exchanges of ideas could hardly forge such a weapon for freedom. In the present-day context only trade predicated on specific political concession values, involving even pecuniary subsidy, can guarantee such a weapon.

The Red regimes would not, of course, find this policy to their liking. Early in 1965 the Polish premier, Josef Cyrankiewicz, already "warned the West not to demand political or ideological concessions in exchange for increased trade."²⁸ He seems to forget that the empire desperately needs this trade, not we. On the Free World side former Chancellor Ludwig Erhard of West Germany issued another type of warning when at the 13th Congress of the Christian Democratic Union he bemoaned the fact that some Western nations are "competing with each other to give the Communist East long-term credits without getting any political concessions in return." Short-term credits are also important, and on this basis West Germany has led the others in East-West trade. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that the

United States leads in overall technological development, and it is this fact which places it in a unique position to determine how far the Red regime can partake of it.

Another important characteristic of the poltrade policy is its via media approach, a general avenue between a complete embargo and free trade, yet participating in their negative and positive natures in unlimited possible combinations of bids and offers. The approach would be sharply differentiating, in breadth and depth even more so than that of the present policy. The reasons for this are an awareness of the general strategic character of all goods for the Red cold war economies and their varying degrees of strategic importance, and of the different political conditions existing in various parts of the empire in terms of oppression, persecution, special restrictions, and opportunities for internal pressure. These are the two broad bases for the operation of the poltrade formula, which would proportion trade bids to political concession bids.

Much is uncritically made of Yugoslavia as an example of wisdom in our present policy, for \$3.5 billion in U.S. assistance chalked up are its "Independence" from Moscow, about 70 per cent of its trade being done with the West, and a cozy association with Free World economic organizations. Yet it's extremely difficult to perceive the political values of this pragmatic wisdom. From viewpoints of ultimate survival and ideological hue, Belgrade's interests are inextricably tied up with Moscow's and, just to mention one example, Tito's record of condemnations against U.S. action in the Congo, Vietnam and the Dominican Republic and concerning Cuba, constitutes ironic compensation of the most indescribable type. Belgrade trades with Havana and, despite its minor power on the global scale, has played for the empire a unique role of diplomatic broker. Also, the thought of Yugoslavia setting a pattern of profitable practice for others in the Red Empire, and to the net advantage of the empire, seems to elude many. This pattern was formed not by design but rather by necessity of response to internal and external problems. In any case, the wisdom of our policy toward Yugoslavia has worked against the freedom of the various nations in that totalitarian state, as its broadened application certainly will against those in Rumania, Poland, Hungary and others.

Turning to the poltrade formula, one can see that it would be practicable and adaptable for all changing circumstances. Scaled to priorities of political consideration, the formula allows for long-term and short-run credits, as well as cash payments. It deals in producer, capital goods and consumer goods, as well as managerial ability, organization, and technological data. In sharp contrast to present U.S. policy, it advances a principle of consistency in that its application would be directed at the Asia sectors of the empire as well as the European and Latin American. The avid use of the formula would produce considerable politico-propaganda values, since all trade transactions would necessarily be tied to specified political items. Bids for specific political concessions would make the latter integral parts of the economic valuation process just as much as Red bids for machines, etc.

Moreover, application of the formula would unambiguously work in behalf of the captive nations; it would not accommodate without real cost the empire's economic plans; it would uphold the efficacy of our foreign aid program by relating Red subversive efforts in the underdeveloped areas to trade offers; and it would provide the U.S. with an effective leverage to solve the problem of unconditional West European trade with the empire and reorient much of this trade toward intensified intra-Free World trade. A vigorous and well-planned poltrade policy with alternative advantages

²⁴ "U.S. Technology Sought in Soviet," *The New York Times*, June 12, 1965.

²⁵ Thomas P. Collier, "Poles Enter Electronic Age," *International Commerce*, November 15, 1965, p. 14.

²⁶ *Op. cit.* Report to the President, p. 5.

²⁷ AP, Caracas, Venezuela April 12, 1965.

²⁸ *Reuters*, East Germany, March 1, 1965.

for our allies and a consuming emphasis on trade for freedom would find few, if any, Free World nations seeking to help the empire unconditionally, particularly as concern savings in intangible values of time and costs of research and development.

Steps in applying the formula would in general be simple, methodical, and in graded order: (1) as in present policy, military weapons and space technology face complete embargo; (2) most advanced producer goods, technology, managerialism and data would be proportioned to poltrade bids of the highest value, entailing free elections, enforcement of the national self-determination principle, the opportunity for political party opposition, and the satisfaction of legal obligations in World War II treaties; (3) trade in less advanced producer goods, engendering the set-up of whole factories and organizational plans, would call for proportionate poltrade values in the order of dismantling the Berlin Wall, Russian, Czech, etc. exodus from Cuba, the withdrawal of USSR troops from Hungary and other captive areas, a vastly expanded cultural exchange program, proven Red support of subversion in Vietnam, etc.; (4) trade in consumer goods would also be differentiated on scales of recency, quality, and quantity and proportioned in terms of prevailing conditions and acts of religious oppression, slave labor employment, civil suppression, unjust arrests and imprisonment of Free World citizens, atrocities, the need for rehabilitating political prisoners and so forth.

These are the four general categories of poltrade application into which further specific poltrade bids would be fitted as developments and circumstances demand. Another manifest advantage of such constant predication is that the real cause of our foremost problems today will be kept in the forefront of world attention and thought. Except for a complete embargo and its justifying reasons, this is not the case with the other alternatives; indeed, they submerge these causes into temporary oblivion. Again, the argument that the empire would refuse to trade under such poltrade conditions misses the whole, crucial point of trade as a weapon for real freedom and the tremendous leverage possessed by the West. Pursuit of the present course means endowing the Red economies with intangible values of shortened time and reduced real costs of development without, in this dimension, receiving anything in return except the spurious satisfaction of believing that dispersed contacts would lead to "greater understanding" and "evolution toward peace." Also, in the cold war context, to literally aid them to undermine us in time and everywhere is the height of folly. Rationally, a quid pro quo is demanded in these dimensions and can only be realized through advanced bargaining for counterpart, intangible freedom values. If the Red states are desperately in need of this trade, as they indicate to be, the best test of their determination is this quid pro quo approach.

As mentioned earlier, the formula's application would, of course, receive detailed treatment in relation to each Red state. If Hungary, for example, seeks Free World trade, in addition to the items stated above there are the genocidal abortion laws, the case of Cardinal Mindszenty, the reduction of the Iron Curtain, release of political prisoners, freedom of assembly for the Petofi Circle and others, and a reciprocal distribution of U.S. literary output in Hungary. The same detailed treatment can be applied to any other Red state. Doubtless, the totalitarian regimes will cry about "interferences in internal affairs," their "national sovereignties" and the like, but these protestations are thoroughly arid in the light of history, the empire network, the basic

solidarity of the Communist Parties, and the international Red conspiracy.

Lastly, the structure of positive Free World poltrade would to a notable degree be erected by the initiative and leadership of the U.S. and its poltrade policy. Though the structure should be built concurrently with the adoption of the policy, unilateral U.S. action would itself become a constructive, efficient cause for the moulding of the institution. The objective is, of course, a unity of action primarily with our West European allies. The present lack of such unity is to a great extent ascribable to our own failure in providing the necessary leadership in the Cold War, over and beyond the military umbrella and foreign aid. A new, concentrated initiative by us should aim at the formation of a NATO Council on Free World Trade. The move would undoubtedly infuse a new life of working partnership in the Atlantic community.

The Council's prime function would be a multi-lateralization of the poltrade policy. Free World countries, such as Japan, would be included as associates. Japan has been pushing its trade with the empire (Japan's trade with it increased 15 per cent over 1964 and amounts to less than 7 per cent; about \$400 million with Red China, jumping 60 per cent over 1964, \$30 million with North Korea, and small amounts with North Vietnam). With this economic power assembled, in the ratio of 3 to 1 to the entire Red Empire, the so-called Communist economic offensive would become a sterile exercise as the Free World market, particularly in the underdeveloped areas, becomes in every sense a true, free market. The new structural framework, would, with qualification, accommodate the inclinations of our allies as expressed, for example, in a resolution by the six-nation Common Market Assembly stressing "the political and economic importance of trade relations with state-controlled trade, in particular with neighbor countries of East Europe, and the desirability of developing them"—yes, toward genuine freedom. Canadians selling \$403 million of wheat to Red China, Italians buying natural gas from the USSR, Greeks selling wheat to Bulgaria, and multiplying day-to-day reports on unconditional Free World trade with the empire would receive an entirely new assessment under the sway of a rational poltrade policy.

Only thirty years ago we substantially committed the same trade mistake with another breed of totalitarian powers. This time it is even worse because of the cold war subtleties involved and the trained capacity of the enemy to compound the use of his relatively inferior resources. In the final analysis, the requirements of the present situation are a firm understanding of Red economic strategy, the launching of a poltrade policy to counter this strategy, and a national will to see it through. Frequent comments on the current disunity, the alleged ambiguity of strategic materials, and "our allies are trading them" are only convenient rationalizations for less than firm action in behalf of expanded world freedom.

WHO ARE THE SPENDERS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a great deal in recent days about the need for cutting back on spending by the Federal Government.

And there is a real need. The Government's spending has skyrocketed in the

past 3 or 4 years, and not all of the increases, by any means, can be traced to the Vietnam war.

The only strange aspect of this recent burst of enthusiasm for economy in Government is the fact that we are hearing it in substantial strength only now.

An observer from another planet would have cause to wonder why a congressional move to limit Federal spending is approved with substantial majority in October although it would have been only laughed at in May.

He would wonder what surprises in economic trends had occurred to bring about such a transformation in the mood of the Congress and of the White House.

It would be worthwhile to take a few minutes to look back at the voting patterns this year. The RECORD shows that Republicans have been no "Johnny-come-lately" to the cause of making responsible cuts in levels of Federal spending. It shows that all through this year, for example, Republicans have voted overwhelmingly for responsible spending limitations.

The RECORD also shows that the great majority of Democrats in the House of Representatives have overwhelmingly favored the "business as usual" approach, opposing efforts to hold down the spending level.

A look at the record of voting in the House this year shows 23 key votes on issues relating to Federal spending. On all of these votes Republicans have voted overwhelmingly for reduced spending only to be confronted with consistent opposition from President Johnson's Democratic party Congressmen voting the White House line.

If more Democrats had chosen to side with Republicans in support of responsible spending cuts the fiscal situation now would be far stronger because the budget deficit would be far smaller.

The major reason why the deficit is rising virtually out of control is that the President has used his Democratic party majority control in Congress throughout his term of office to introduce vastly wasteful and nonessential domestic spending programs.

All during this period Republicans in Congress have warned of the danger of the very same fiscal crisis which administration people are now finally admitting is upon us.

Republicans have provided the initiative for fiscal responsibility in two ways: first, by urging the President and the Democratic party majority to establish priorities among the flood of Great Society programs, and failing that, to seek congressional action to hold back on increases in spending on nonessential programs which the Johnson administration has continued to request in spite of the danger signals.

Policies of the President and of his Democratic Party majorities in both Houses of Congress have led us into a real fiscal mess, by their own tacit admission.

We face a budget deficit of staggering proportions, upwards of \$30 billion. It is the direct result of the skyrocketing

Federal spending policies of an irresponsible administration and of a bureaucracy whose main attitude seems to be one of "let the public be damned."

Let us not kid ourselves. The budget deficit will be dangerously large with or without a tax increase. It will mean higher prices for everything the consumer buys, outrageous interest rates, a worsening balance-of-payments problem, and possibly a need for wage and price controls.

A tax increase by itself will not solve this problem. It could even aggravate the whole situation if it would serve to en-

courage more and more nonessential spending. The vital element in any solution has got to be substantial reductions in current spending plans along with paired-down programs in the non-military field over the next few years.

I invite close examination of the 23 key economy issues showing the voting pattern among our Democratic and Republican colleagues. It will be seen that on five occasions Republicans voted unanimously in favor of economy.

And although the greater number of Democrats on each occasion voted the other way, on 11 of the 23 votes enough

Democrats voted with the Republican position to swing the issue in support of economy. But keep in mind that it was the Republican position to which these few Democrats adhered, and not the position of their own party.

Let the President acknowledge the record and we will then have made progress in moving back to fiscal policies which will give our Nation the economic strength and the kind of overall capability required to attain the goals we all seek.

Following are the 23 key economy votes of 1967 through November 6:

VOTES ON ECONOMY ISSUES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1967

	Yes	No	Percent for economy		Yes	No	Percent for economy
1. Feb. 8: To increase the temporary national debt limit ceiling from \$330,000,000 to \$336,000,000; the 9th increase during the L. B. J. and Kennedy administrations:				12. June 21: To increase the permanent national debt limit ceiling to \$365,000,000,000 but do it over a 2-year period:			
Republicans.....	2	173	99.0	Republicans.....	0	176	100.0
Democrats.....	213	26	11.0	Democrats.....	217	20	8.5
Total.....	215	199		Total.....	217	196	
2. Mar. 22: Amendment to eliminate 15 new executive-level jobs the administration requested in the Treasury Department:				13. July 18: Move to limit spending under Transportation appropriations bill to 95 percent of budget estimates:			
Republicans.....	157	15	91.5	Republicans.....	174	6	96.5
Democrats.....	54	160	25.6	Democrats.....	39	183	17.6
Total.....	211	175		Total.....	213	189	
3. Mar. 22: Move to limit spending under Treasury and Post Office appropriations bill to 95 percent of budget estimates:				14. July 25: To cut funds for the Dickey-Lincoln public power project in Maine:			
Republicans.....	153	19	89.5	Republicans.....	176	2	99.2
Democrats.....	15	198	7.0	Democrats.....	57	167	25.5
Total.....	168	217		Total.....	233	169	
Apr. 27: Move to limit spending under Interior appropriations bill to 95 percent of budget estimates:				15. July 25: Move to reduce appropriation for public works and AEC by 5 percent:			
Republicans.....	134	39	77.5	Republicans.....	146	32	82.0
Democrats.....	24	192	11.0	Democrats.....	20	207	8.6
Total.....	158	231		Total.....	166	239	
May 11: Increase in telephone allowance for each Member of Congress:				16. July 26: To cut the increase in U.S. contribution to Inter-American Development Bank as requested by the administration:			
Republicans.....	52	105	67.0	Republicans.....	152	21	88.0
Democrats.....	137	52	27.5	Democrats.....	33	196	14.4
Total.....	189	157		Total.....	185	217	
6. May 17: Amendment to cut \$10,000,000 from the rent supplement program:				17. Aug. 24: Motion to reduce authorization for foreign aid:			
Republicans.....	163	12	93.5	Republicans.....	153	23	87.0
Democrats.....	69	159	30.4	Democrats.....	81	140	36.6
Total.....	232	171		Total.....	234	163	
7. May 17: Move to cut \$225,000,000 from the demonstration cities program:				18. Sept. 14: Amendment to cut \$50,000,000 from total authorized for Appalachian area projects:			
Republicans.....	141	35	80.0	Republicans.....	146	14	91.5
Democrats.....	52	178	22.5	Democrats.....	53	147	26.5
Total.....	193	213		Total.....	199	161	
8. May 31: Amendment to limit the amount of Federal subsidy in the sale of SBA participation certificates:				19. Sept. 27: Motion to recommit continuing appropriation resolution in an effort to bring about \$5,000,000,000 cut in Federal spending:			
Republicans.....	150	0	100.0	Republicans.....	168	0	100.0
Democrats.....	36	144	20.0	Democrats.....	34	182	35.7
Total.....	186	144		Total.....	202	182	
9. May 31: Move to limit spending under State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary appropriations bill (excluding FBI) to 95 percent of budget estimates:				20. Oct. 3: Vote on previous question on continuing appropriation resolution in an effort to make it in order to consider spending reduction amendments. A "yes" vote would prohibit offering amendments:			
Republicans.....	135	12	92.0	Republicans.....	0	180	100.0
Democrats.....	36	144	20.0	Democrats.....	213	25	10.5
Total.....	173	156		Total.....	213	205	
10. June 6: Move to limit spending under Agriculture appropriation bill (excluding school lunch and special milk programs) to 95 percent of budget estimates:				21. Oct. 4: Move to make cuts in appropriation for Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare. (Conference report.):			
Republicans.....	149	24	86.0	Republicans.....	157	23	87.0
Democrats.....	26	198	11.6	Democrats.....	69	151	31.4
Total.....	175	222		Total.....	226	174	
11. June 7: To increase the temporary national debt limit ceiling from \$336,000,000 to \$365,000,000,000:				22. Oct. 17: Move to make cuts in appropriation for Department of Transportation. (Conference report.):			
Republicans.....	0	176	100.0	Republicans.....	113	60	65.5
Democrats.....	197	35	15.0	Democrats.....	11	208	5.0
Total.....	197	211		Total.....	124	268	
				23. Oct. 18: Move to limit overall Federal spending to about \$131,500,000,000:			
				Republicans.....	171	9	95.0
				Democrats.....	67	155	30.0
				Total.....	238	164	

INTEREST IN OMBUDSMAN CONTINUES TO MOUNT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the interest in establishing an American ombudsman at various levels of government continues to increase.

On the national level, for the last several years I have been sponsoring a bill to establish a congressional ombudsman. In its present form, it is H.R. 3388.

On the State level, the State Legislatures of Hawaii and New York are considering bills to provide funds for an ombudsman.

On the local level, New York City and Buffalo are running full-scale ombudsman programs. Last February, in my home district of Milwaukee, Wis., I ran an experimental ombudsman project. Milwaukee will soon seek funds to run a full-scale program.

Last Saturday, October 30, the American Assembly of Columbia University held a meeting on the ombudsman at which I was privileged to speak. A text of my remarks follows:

THE FEDERAL OMBUDSMAN

(Remarks of Representative HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin, at the American Assembly, Arden House, N.Y., October 28, 1967)

My interest in the Ombudsman goes back to early in 1963, when I first heard of him. Flying from London to Paris, I picked up the London Times and there read an editorial about how New Zealand had just established its Ombudsman.

This led me to prepare and introduce a bill for a Congressional Ombudsman in July 1963. Nothing much happened. Then, in 1965, through the courtesy of the American Political Science Association, I was lucky enough to have in my office for some months as a Congressional intern an up-and-coming young political scientist, Professor Stanley Andersen. He was especially interested in governmental administration, and his ancestors came from Scandinavia. He just had to be an Ombudsmaniac, and he kept my interest in the Ombudsman from flagging. The current version of the Congressional Ombudsman is my bill H.R. 3388, introduced on January 23, 1967.

I shall describe how the bill approaches the problem of the Congressional Ombudsman, and then tell of an experiment in Ombudsmanry which I conducted in my Milwaukee district earlier this year.

The Ombudsman at the state and local levels, described by other speakers, is necessarily primarily because we need him. The Congressional Ombudsman, on the other hand, is necessary primarily because the Congressman, as a de facto Ombudsman, just doesn't have enough time to be that and to do the job that he has to do on the great national and international issues of the day.

This week, like every week, the great issues are before every Member of Congress. What of the war in Viet Nam? Are we headed for inflation? If so, should we cut expenditures? If so, should it be space, the SST, rivers and harbors appropriations, or should it be education, pollution control or the war on poverty? Should we raise taxes? If so, should we raise them across the board, by blocking particular loopholes, or how? What shall we do

about the reform of the international monetary system, about the need for more funds for the World Bank, about arms aid to developing nations, about East-West trade?

All these questions require thought, study, and debate. Yet the time that can be given to thought, study, and debate on the great issues is inevitably diminished by the need for Senators and Congressmen, and their staffs, to devote more and more of their time to so-called "case work"—the job of helping citizens with their problems with the federal bureaucracy.

By a unique coincidence, the tough policy questions with which a Congressman must deal keep increasing at about the same rate as do citizens' problems with the bureaucracy. As one newly-arrived Congressman said: "I came here thinking I was going to be a Daniel Webster, but I find myself an errand boy."

Social security and welfare programs inevitably involve administrative error, abuse of discretion, delay, or discourtesy. New laws bring millions of citizens into direct relationship with their government for the first time. Medicare has spawned a whole family of administrative problems. The Cold War GI bill and the scholarship provisions of the Higher Education Act make thousands of college students depend upon efficient federal administration for completing their education. Mounting public criticism of the selective service system has produced a skyrocketing of draft cases.

To an aggrieved citizen, the only remedy to his grievance in many cases is to call or write his Congressman. This is exactly what millions of Americans do every year.

"Cases" are estimated to comprise anywhere from a third to two-thirds of all the mail that pours into congressional offices. Every year, the average Representative must deal with several thousand "cases". They range from simple ones that can be cleared up with a telephone call—such as a delayed social security check—to complex matters which require many hours of work by the Congressman and his staff.

How complex these cases can be may be judged from the following example.

A few years ago male employees of the Hilltop post office in Milwaukee were outraged by an invasion of their privacy. Toilets in the post office's men's room were without doors. When the door to the men's room was open, the toilet facilities were in full view of the occupants of the adjoining lunchroom. The employees got nowhere with their complaints and turned to me for help. I wrote scores of letters to the Milwaukee postmaster, regional postal officials, Washington postal officials, and finally the Postmaster General. I inspected the station. I even offered to buy a partition to allow some privacy.

The Post Office offered a whole series of "reasons" why nothing could be done—such as the need for inspectors to be able to watch for thefts from the mails, and the cost of doors. Not until seven years later, after I threatened a House committee investigation, was an elementary right to privacy respected. In an historic decision, the Post Office Department put up partitions.

Take another case. Recently, John J. DeFrancisco of Milwaukee, penniless and unable to hire an attorney, came to me after the Army had obtained a \$5,253 judgment against him.

DeFrancisco, a copper miner, had been drafted into the Army on August 7, 1942. After three months of basic training he was sent with other "soldiers" to Houghton, Minn., with instructions to report to the copper mine. He was issued a card by the Army stating that he was "on furlough from the U.S. Army". He was ordered to keep his uniforms in shape and be ready to move out on 24 hours' notice. Thinking they were still in the Army, DeFrancisco and his com-

panions worked in the mines from November 4, 1942 until June 11, 1945, when DeFrancisco was sent with an Army unit to the west coast. He was discharged at Camp Beal, Calif., on April 19, 1946. While working in the mines, DeFrancisco was paid \$4.60 a day by a mining firm, almost all of which was spent on room and board. He received no pay from the Army. His wife, a son, and his wife's two minor sisters lived on an \$80-a-month Army allotment check.

In 1958 the Army filed suit to recover the allotments plus interest. DeFrancisco, who had only a grade school education, ignored the notice of the suit and the Army obtained the judgment.

After listening to DeFrancisco's story, I dug out his Army records. They confirmed his story in every respect except that they listed him in the "ready reserve" instead of "on active duty" during the period he worked in the mines. Following exhaustive legal research which showed that the Army had no legal basis for recovery of the allotment, I went into Milwaukee Federal court on several occasions to plead DeFrancisco's case. By this time the case had attracted national publicity. Finally the Army decided to drop its unjust claim.

As a result of the newspaper stories, other men who had been drafted and sent to the mines were able to have similar judgments against them dismissed. Several men who were disabled in mine accidents, and had been denied veterans' disability payments, instituted court proceedings to collect compensation as a result of the DeFrancisco case.

This congressional casework role is important in humanizing Government bureaucracy and making it responsible. It is constructive to have the actions of remote, permanent civil servants reviewed continuously by Congressmen and Senators who must answer to the people every 2 or 6 years. The effect is to prod bureaucrats into the best possible administration of the laws.

But the great difficulty is: How can Members of Congress continue to give citizens the help they need in problems with the Federal bureaucracy and still find time to be effective, thoughtful, original legislators?

The solution I have advanced is the Congressional Ombudsman, embodied in H.R. 3388.

The bill delimits the types of cases which the congressional ombudsman would review:

"The Congressional Ombudsman, unless he believes that the complainant has available another reasonable remedy, shall review the case of any person who alleges that, as a result of any action or failure to act on the part of any officer or employee of the United States (a) he has been subjected to any improper penalty or has been denied any right or benefit to which he is entitled, under the laws of the United States; or (b) the relevant proceedings are being conducted in a manner that is unreasonable, unfair, oppressive, dilatory, or inefficient."

The Congressional Ombudsman would centralize much of the casework now being handled by 535 Congressmen, Senators, and their individual staffs. He would be appointed by the Speaker and the President pro tempore of the Senate solely on the basis of fitness and without regard to party. An eminent jurist or administrative expert, he would be paid the same salary as Members of Congress. He would be assisted by a staff of experts in the major types of casework, perhaps a few score at the start. He would have power to obtain any necessary papers and files and to consult with Federal officials without the permission of their supervisors.

He would investigate only cases referred to him by a Member of Congress. When he completed his investigation, he would report to the Congressman who referred the case to him and also make known to the agency concerned any recommendations for remedial action.

In the case where an agency was unwilling to correct what the ombudsman considered a serious administrative error or abuse, the ombudsman could make a special report to Congress which would be printed as a public document and be available to the press. He would also make an annual report to Congress, containing more general recommendations and reports. Thus, like his overseas prototypes, he would have the power to investigate, recommend, and publicize.

In addition to the primary objective of freeing Members of Congress and their staff of much case work, so that they may concentrate upon the substantive issues before them, the Congressional Ombudsman would have three other major advantages.

1. It would more effectively protect citizens' rights against administrative abuse. Under the present system, congressional casework is handled by men-of-all-work in the offices of Representatives and Senators, almost none of whose staff budgets can afford true experts in even the major categories of casework. The result is that in complex cases the citizens' advocate, a congressional office, is frequently at the mercy of the administrative branch's experts. Through centralization under the Federal ombudsman, Congress would have its own experts looking into citizens' grievances. Professor Walter Gellhorn of Columbia University Law School, in his November, 1966 work on the Ombudsman, "When Americans Complain: Governmental Grievance Procedures", makes the point that staff experts of an Ombudsman's office would be able to protect citizens' interests faster and better than can a jack-of-all-trades in an individual Congressman's office.

2. It would allow more effective diagnosis and the elimination of root causes of recurring difficulties between citizens and the bureaucracy. With complaints so scattered under present arrangements, it may not be recognized that a vast number of problems arise from a single source. The ombudsman, seeing the entire pattern of citizens' complaints, would be better able to identify trouble spots and recommend remedial action.

3. It would be more efficient than continuing increases in individual Congressmen's staffs. The casework burden is bound to increase in the years ahead. The population of House districts is growing rapidly and in 1980 will average 564,000 inhabitants per district, compared with 410,481 in 1960. Most Senators also will serve larger populations. To respond by merely adding to existing office staffs would provide only an unwieldy, costly, inefficient means of handling the growing volume of casework.

Professor Gellhorn, after sampling how Congressional offices handle their individual case work, concludes that "most offices have little slack, either in available personnel or in available space . . . unless Congress were to continue to expand its quarters indefinitely, a bursting-point must soon be reached."

The American ombudsman is based not only on the Scandinavian institution but also on our own experience with the Legislative Council and the Legislative Reference Service. Through them, Congress has given itself the benefit of expert, centralized assistance in the drafting of legislation and in legislative research. The ombudsman or Administrative Council would extend this service into the area of casework.

H.R. 3388 would carefully continue the interest of the Congressman in the problems of his constituents. Unlike in the Scandinavian prototype, cases could come to the Ombudsman only through Members of Congress. Congressmen could continue to handle their own casework if they wish, as they do now. If the Congressman were dissatisfied with the Ombudsman's final recommenda-

tion, he could pursue the case further on his own.

This method of funneling cases through the Congressman would continue the present tradition of "Write your Congressman," but at the same time relieve him of much of the time-consuming work involved. Incidentally, it vastly improves the bill's chances of passage, since Congressmen are not eager to divest themselves of their vote-getting function of serving constituents. The Congressional Ombudsman is not included in the Congressional reform legislation now before the House; I doubt whether this matters, since the reform legislation has been officially pronounced dead by the House Committee on Rules.

So the Congressional Ombudsman is plainly an idea whose time has not come. Its time will not come until congressmen realize that an Ombudsman would strengthen their position, not weaken it.

Recognizing this reality, earlier this year I decided: If Congress won't do it, I'll do it; there is nothing to stop me from setting up an Ombudsman of my own back in my home district of Milwaukee.

So, for four months last spring, I experimented with my own private Ombudsman in Milwaukee. The Ombudsman selected was Mr. James Buckley, a live-wire in his early thirties who had been until January, 1967, clerk of the Wisconsin State Assembly. At that point, the control of the assembly changed parties, and Mr. Buckley was, as the saying goes, at liberty.

My experimental Ombudsman had no statutory authority. I made room for him during the experimental four months on my Congressional Clerk allowance at a salary of \$708 a month.

The experimental Ombudsman was a far different affair from the statutory Washington-centered Ombudsman which is the subject of H.R. 3388. Far from relieving me from case-work, he made more case-work. But Mr. Buckley established by the experiment that a sensitive and energetic person may do a great deal to humanize government and to ease the administrative difficulties of the average citizen.

My Ombudsman used as his headquarters my own Congressional office in downtown Milwaukee. At times, he had the assistance of volunteer workers who pinch-hit for him. He held regular office hours—widely publicized in press, radio, and TV—each week in six post offices in my district, the north side of Milwaukee. At the appointed hour each week, he would set up a table, some chairs, and an identifying poster in the post office lobby. While the post masters offered Mr. Buckley the use of their private offices, he figured that the marking "private" on the official door might scare some people away. In fact, situating himself in the public lobby did not seem to inhibit complaints in the least.

Of the six post offices, three were in the inner core of Milwaukee, with heavy concentrations of low-income Negroes; two were in lower-middle to middle-income areas; and one was in an upper-income area.

Particularly during the first four weeks, the volume of complaints was almost overwhelming. People stood in long lines at the post office to see the Ombudsman.

In the four months of the projects, 467 "cases" were received. About 60 percent were cases involving Federal agencies, the remainder cases involving state and local agencies or private matters. Mr. Buckley received all complaints, handling the Federal ones through my office, and doing what he could with state and local government, like the State Insurance Commission or the Industrial Commission. While of course he had no investigatory power over the agencies involved, he reports that in no case was this a handicap. He also reports that the Congressional imprimatur was an effective entree to officialdom at all levels.

The break down of the 467 cases received is instructive:

Social Security	114
Miscellaneous	61
Medicare	47
Veterans' Administration	35
Military	35
Local government	34
Suggestions for new or amended legislation	29
Legal matters	19
Immigration and Customs	18
Small business and patents	17
Taxes	14
State government	14
Job requests	14
Local government—welfare	11
No action taken	5
Total	467

What was the result of Mr. Buckley's action in the 467 cases? In 90 cases the complaint was justified and the constituent's grievances redressed; in 62 cases complaints had previously been made to governmental agencies, and the Ombudsman's work was to expedite; in 75 cases the complaint seemed reasonable, but a final result had not been obtained by the end of the experiment last June (many of these cases have since had a successful outcome); in 148 cases the complaint was finally determined to be unjustified (though in most of these cases the Ombudsman's efforts were appreciated and the constituent felt better); in 91 cases the subject matter was not a complaint but an expression of opinion or a request for information.

The Ombudsman reports that those using his services come from a wide variety of income groupings, and are by no means confined to the poor.

Sometimes the Ombudsman's solutions are simplicity itself. For example, Mr. Buckley had some complaints that in one federal office building in Milwaukee employees were forced to use toilet paper to dry their hands in the lavatory, because of a paper towel economy drive. With a little leg work, the Ombudsman was able to convince the various federal building managers that agencies with surplus paper towels—and there were some—should share them at the week's end with the deficit areas. It turned out there are enough paper towels to go around.

Here are some observations Mr. Buckley made on the pattern of his 467 complaints:

1. The biggest single citizen difficulty was with governmental delay in the completion of cases. Take case #165. He had been waiting 5 months to begin receiving his monthly social security benefits. He had exhausted all of his resources, and had to keep pleading with the manager of a hotel to forestall eviction. There was no question of eligibility. #165 was himself partially to blame for not getting the necessary age-proving documents a bit sooner from his native land. After all the initial processing was completed, however, he still had to wait, and after several months was in severe straits. The Ombudsman repeatedly called the local Social Security office, and was assured they were doing all they could, that they had placed an "Urgent" status on the case with the Chicago Payment Center of the Social Security Administration. Repeated calls to the local office and their repeated calls to Chicago availed nothing. Finally, my office in Washington interceded with the Chicago office. After a day, we were informed that the source of the problem had been traced, and #165 could expect his initial benefit payment in about 10 days. But 10 more days of this was too much. A second intervention got #165 his check in three days.

2. Complaints related primarily to ordinary problems, and did not involve gross injustices. No great scandals were uncovered by the experiment, which stressed the meat

and potatoes of everyday existence; the denial of a Veterans Administration disability claim; the unwillingness of the Small Business Administration to give a reason for refusal of a loan; coaxing the Social Security office to expedite the payment of a death benefit claim.

3. A surprisingly small number of complaints belonged in the "nut" category. Despite the Ombudsman's fears that he might have to spend endless hours with people who had thought up new ways to send rockets to the moon, or a secret elixir for maintaining eternal youth. Surprisingly few such ear-benders showed up, although a number of citizens found in the Ombudsman a new source of friendship and took the occasion to "visit" with him longer than a statement of the complaint would have required.

4. The possibility of press publicity can help get action.

One of the first cases received concerned a lady who paid over \$40 a month on a utility bill, yet had no heat or hot water to show for this expense. The Ombudsman suggested to her in the presence of a reporter that the Public Service Commission might be interested in her problem. The day after this appeared in the local press, representatives of the utility volunteered their willingness to look into the problem and to handle it on a purely local basis. They investigated, found mechanical problems in the equipment, repaired the default, and went one step further by putting the customer on their monthly low-cost budget payment plan. They probably would have done this anyway, had they known of the problem, but there is little doubt that the press attention given the case, and uncertainty over possible future attention, was helpful in eliciting a response, and spurred by the hope that the case would not be passed on to a regulatory agency.

My Ombudsman experiment may lead to something more permanent. The Law School of Marquette University in Milwaukee is now applying, at my suggestion, for a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity to enable it to sponsor at least two Ombudsmen to operate within Milwaukee. The OEO has already funded a somewhat similar grant to Buffalo, N.Y., through the State university. The idea of the Ombudsman has been approved by the county executive, which affords him, in my judgment, enough of an official status so that he can do most of the good that the admirers of the device envisage. If the problem that arises is a federal one, I foresee no difficulty in his handling it directly, or referring it to me in Washington.

All told, more will be heard from the Ombudsman in America. The United States has created many of its political institutions by borrowing and adapting. We took the name of the Senate from Rome, our Speaker from the British House of Commons, and our doctrine of the separation of powers from the French philosophers. We could do worse than to borrow and adapt the concept of the Swedish Ombudsman.

TEXAS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the press the other day—on the eve of the 1968 tourist season—a story that automobile liability rates in

the District of Columbia are \$208 for coverage that is available for as little as \$52 in Tallahassee, Fla.

Now, I have no fuss with the great recreation State of Florida, nor with its beautiful capital of Tallahassee. But, before they reap the sole benefit of a mass exodus of automobile insureds from the District of Columbia I want equal time to plug the winter and summer vacation attributes of Texas—without the deterrent of misinformation about our auto insurance rates.

This business of Tallahassee running off with all the tourists is as serious to Texas, with its six flags on the edge of Fort Worth and its HemisFair in San Antonio, as Billy Joe's problem on the Tallahatchie Bridge was to the Choctaw Ridge community of Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I have with me conclusive proof of the reasonableness and stability of auto insurance rates in Texas over the last 43 years in the form of a copy of an old insurance policy and comments from the chairman of our State Board of Insurance.

In 1924 Mr. George Fritz, a tailor in San Antonio, Tex., insured his Ford automobile for bodily injury liability protection for \$21.16. That Ford had a list price of \$393.

Today, should Mr. Fritz have prospered to the extent of ownership of even a Lincoln Continental, he could buy the same basic limits, with the currently broader coverage, for but \$23. Even should he today use his car to go to and from work, the rate is only \$27 for any Ford product, and, those rates are before policy dividends. And, sir, those rates are no exception within Texas for the classifications appropriate to Mr. Fritz apply to some 85 percent of our insureds.

In conclusion, while I wish Tallahassee a prosperous tourist season, I would hope for Texas to share with Florida some of the exodus from the cold, cold North.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the arguments that has been made against the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 is that the war on poverty has not been popular with the American public. On the basis of what I know about my State of Minnesota, I regard this argument as a false one.

The chief reason for my belief is the usually reliable Minnesota poll of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune. On October 22, the poll asked this question, among others: "Which do you think should receive priority, Vietnam or the war on poverty?"

The answer was almost a tossup: 45 percent of the Minnesotans questioned would give priority to Vietnam, 42 per-

cent to poverty. Also significant was the response from residents of the State's three major cities of Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth—where more than half the population lives—50 percent for poverty, 39 percent for Vietnam.

I cite these figures, Mr. Speaker, because they are a clear indication of support for programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity by the people of my state and of the Fifth Congressional District—the city of Minneapolis—which I represent.

One official who has contacted me in recent days is Mayor Arthur Naftalin, of Minneapolis. His letter began:

I write you with a feeling of great urgency concerning the desperate importance of immediate action by Congress in appropriating funds for the anti-poverty program at a level that will sustain the constructive effort now evident in our Hennepin County programs.

The mayor's letter went on to discuss the development of the important neighborhood center project—made possible by OEO funds and threatened with extinction because of the possible cutoff of those funds by an indifferent Congress. The complete letter follows:

NOVEMBER 1, 1967.

DEAR DON: I write you with a feeling of great urgency concerning the desperate importance of immediate action by Congress in appropriating funds for the Anti-Poverty Program at a level that will sustain the constructive effort now evident in our Hennepin County programs.

We are especially apprehensive over suspension of funds for the new multi-purpose North Side Neighborhood Center. While the difficulty results from failure of Congress to approve the appropriation, we are concerned that, even when authorized, it may not be sufficient to cover the commitments already made for this and other important anti-poverty projects.

On Monday night of this week an election was held for members of the board of the new Center, and this election was based upon an expression of mutual confidence which, I deeply fear, we may lose if effective action for the future is not assured.

We have made in Hennepin County extraordinarily successful use of the Anti-Poverty Programs. The Neighborhood Center Project—which we refer to locally as the Pilot City Project—is of special concern to us because it will encompass a variety of services that are extremely important to residents of the North Side.

The development of the Center has served as the framework within which it has been possible to achieve a new level of communication and understanding and I am fearful that failure to provide sufficient funds for the operation of this project will be interpreted as a further action of indifference and insincerity.

This project reflects the cooperative efforts of the OEO, HUD, HEW, Department of Labor and the Bureau of the Budget, and represents a breakthrough in the direction of coordinating related federal services: It holds unusual promise for the delivery of essential services in health, education, recreation, employment, legal aid, and other areas of social need.

The Anti-Poverty funding is central to the entire effort and failure to fulfill the commitments which have been made will have a devastating effect not only upon this program but upon all of our efforts to cope with poverty and its effects.

The Pilot City Project, however, is only one of many programs that will be jeopardized if Congress fails to provide sufficient appropriations. Our programs for youth, for pov-

erty area parents, for the unemployed and underemployed, for young children have given us promising beginnings in coping with the effects of poverty. They have created hope on the part of many who would otherwise be slipping further into despair. They have given encouragement and assistance to people who want to improve their lives.

The threat of a 40 per cent reduction in these programs creates concern of the most critical magnitude. If the appropriation level compels cutbacks and further curtailments we will have irresponsibly contributed to the heightening of frustration.

I am further concerned over the growing feeling that Congress is in a punitive mood concerning the Anti-Poverty Program, as evidenced by the action excluding OEO employees from the federal pay increase. This action is unprecedented and unconscionable and must not be allowed to stand.

Also, amendments which are designed to redirect and reorganize OEO must be viewed without partisan concern. OEO has brought to the anti-poverty struggle new imagination and new approaches which are still in the process of being tested. To redirect the OEO activity at this point will cause further delay in delivering on the commitments which have been made to those the programs are intended to serve.

In the wake of the last summer all of us have pledged our best efforts to alleviate the conditions that breed frustration, despair and violence. One of our efforts here has been the Anti-Poverty Program, and I want to urge most fervently that you give your full support to an adequate appropriation and to the continuance of this program that has meant so much for so many of our citizens.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR NAFTALIN, Mayor.

Tonight in my district, a mass meeting is scheduled for the citizens of Minneapolis to arouse community support for the continuation and expansion of anti-poverty programs. The news release, containing details on the potential damage to antipoverty programs in Minneapolis and Hennepin County, follows:

Now Is The Time

A mass meeting at Lincoln Junior High School, 2131 12th Avenue North, at 8:00 P.M., Monday, November 6, 1967, to which the public is invited is being called by a number of concerned citizens to express their indignation over Congressional mistreatment of Economic Opportunity Programs and to arouse community support for the continuation and expansion of Anti-Poverty programs. As a result of Congressional action or inaction, a number of Anti-Poverty programs are in danger of being lost or reduced to the extent that they become totally inadequate to serve the needs that exist.

Some of the programs that are in serious jeopardy are the North Side Pilot City Program which is an attempt by the Federal Government to provide multi-services such as a 24-hour health clinic, employment, social services, community planning, and educational programs on the North Side. The North Side Pilot City Program, in particular, will be a tragic loss because of the recent evidence of real community involvement and participation from a cross-section of our community to help to enable this program to get underway. If the Appropriation Bill of \$1.2 billion as passed by the House of Representatives is passed by Congress, it will mean in Hennepin County a 40% reduction in the number of children that will be able to participate in Head Start. It will mean a 40% reduction in the services provided by the Citizens Community Centers such as Home Management and Home Maker Services, Debt Adjustment, Employment Counseling and Referral, and Neighborhood Out-

Reach and Organization. It will mean a 40% reduction in free legal services that are now being provided through the Citizens Community Centers to the poor persons. There will be a total loss of the Summer Program (Operation Youth) which this year employed 1,000 low-income youths. In addition to the employment, another 4,000 youths ranging in age from pre-school through young adults had an opportunity to participate in educational, recreational, and cultural enrichment programs.

The poor in our society cannot combat all of the obstacles that confront them by themselves. The poor in our society include many persons such as the very young, the disabled, senior citizens and others who through no fault of their own are dependent upon the compassion and commitment of our society for their continued existence, and even more importantly a continued existence with dignity.

It is vitally important that all citizens in our society become concerned now about those in our society who are less fortunate than others. It is not enough, also, that citizens be concerned and not exercise that concern through commitment and activity. Citizens must express indignation over injustices wherever it occurs, whether overseas or in our community. The poor in our society daily face injustices, many times purely as a result of their economic circumstances. It is our task as responsible concerned citizens to not only be compassionate but to work diligently so that our society may be a community of hope and opportunity for all.

Yesterday the western conference of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, meeting in Phoenix, Ariz., adopted the following resolution, a copy of which arrived in my mail this morning:

RESOLUTION No. 1

Whereas, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, through direct action and collective support, have always promoted increased opportunities for all Americans, that every individual, regardless of race, color, creed or ethnic background, might share in this Nation's abundance; and

Whereas, the Veterans of Foreign Wars recognize that the seeds of communism and subversion are sown in the soil of poverty and nurtured by the fertilizer of despair, and,

Whereas, the Economic Opportunity Act, as originally passed by Congress in 1964, and since extended and amended in 1965 and 1966, has established self-help programs and mechanisms, in the best American tradition, to enable the poor of our Country to break their shackles of poverty,

Now therefore, be it resolved, by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Western Conference, composed of 18 states, Okinawa, Panama Canal Zone, Provisional Department of Pacific Area strongly urges the enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967, and

Be it further resolved that all U.S. Congressional Representatives of the States represented by the Western Conference of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, be furnished a copy of this resolution.

Several other communications have come into my office on this subject. Among them was the following letter from the American Association of University Women:

NOVEMBER 3, 1967.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FRASER: The American Association of University Women was among the supporters of the Economic Opportunity Act at the time of its enactment. We have fol-

lowed the progress of its implementation with great interest. On the whole we are convinced that much that is good has been achieved in the short period this program has been in operation. We are equally convinced that a far greater contribution to solution of the social ills that plague this country is possible if this program is extended and strengthened. Therefore we urge passage of a bill extending the Economic Opportunity Act.

We are gratified that day care, family planning, and senior opportunity and services for the elderly, as well as emergency food and medical service programs are incorporated in S. 2388 now under consideration. But we are gravely concerned that the bill before the House so drastically alters the 10-90 formula of sharing between local and Federal sources that was a part of the original act.

We are certain that many communities will be forced to drop immediately many very worthwhile and even indispensable projects when required to put up in cash rather than "in kind" so much higher a percentage of the total cost.

We urge enactment of authorizations, at a minimum, at present levels and preferably at higher levels so that the war on poverty can continue.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. GLORIA PETERS,
Area Representative in
Community Problems.

Miss LOIS ROTH,
Area Representative in Education.

Miss VICTORIA SCHUCK,
Chairman, Legislative Program Committee.

But not all the letters, by any means, have come from organizations or officials. Many have come from ordinary citizens. For example, one woman in North Minneapolis wrote:

I urge you to do everything in your power to see that the House passes a bill equivalent to S. 2388 passed by the Senate. Now that the hopes of the poor and minority people have been raised to the extent which brought them out to vote earlier this week in Minneapolis the cutting off of the promised funds would destroy any faith they could have in the promises made by anyone at all claiming to wish to help them. . . . Let us use funds which are presently being wasted in Vietnam to take care of our needs at home before riots and rebellions force us to do so on a much larger scale and in a much more painful way than will be the case if we act now.

And another woman wrote in obvious anguish:

We must have lost our sanity to be talking about such a cut.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the message contained in these letters, polls, resolutions, and mass meetings is clear to the Members of this House. We need to pass the strongest possible antipoverty bill. Failure to pass a strong bill would amount to nothing less than irresponsibility. Many communities, such as the one I represent, have kept their share of the bargain with OEO through extensive planning and energetic development of local support. Now we must keep our share of the bargain. If we want to continue fighting poverty, we must pass the bill that is before us.

VOLUNTEER FROM FRESNO PUSHES PROGRESS IN FLORIDA SLUMS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentle-

man from California [Mr. Moss] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, America's social conscience has been aroused by the tragic consequences of poverty to our own citizens and neighbors. Among those most severely afflicted by poverty in our country are the Spanish-speaking minority groups. The Office of Economic Opportunity's VISTA program has confronted and challenged the conditions of poverty that prevail in so many urban and rural areas of America, and among the Spanish speaking. The Sacramento Bee published an article recently that recounted the effort of VISTA volunteer Robert Ramirez in dealing with Spanish-speaking migrant workers in Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I believe VISTA has established itself as a real credit to the OEO. VISTA volunteers such as Robert Ramirez, who can completely identify with those in poverty, is one of the most salient and effective features of the VISTA program. I am certain my colleagues will derive as much interest and appreciation about VISTA's work from this article as I have and I include it below:

VOLUNTEER FROM FRESNO PUSHES PROGRESS IN FLORIDA SLUMS

FORT MYERS, FLA.—The children were always getting sick in Harlem Lake, a cluster of 65 Spanish-speaking migrant families outside Fort Myers, Fla. The sickness was traced to contaminated water, caused by an overflowing septic tank.

The apartments where the watermelon and chili harvesters lived six months of the year were arranged to house too many people in a small space, and there was no play area for children. Water from the overflowing tank soaked their improvised playground.

"There were other problems," said Robert Ramirez, 20, a VISTA (Volunteer in Service to America) from Fresno, who was assigned last March to work with migrant workers in the Fort Myers area. "Doors and windows were broken, the wiring was a fire hazard, and the plumbing was primitive. But all complaints to the rental agency were ignored."

TENANT GROUP

Today, Harlem Lake is a healthier and prettier place because of action taken by tenants who formed the Harlem Lake Community Action group. With the help and encouragement of the Spanish-speaking VISTA, the people demanded respect and fair treatment. And they won it.

Ramirez spoke to church groups to describe the migrants' living conditions and how the workers were trying to help themselves. "Church members wrote to their elected officials to protest the conditions," he said. "Newspapermen came and took pictures of the crumbling plaster and accumulated trash."

They also observed men, women and children painting and cleaning up the premises. The owners of the buildings—absentee landlords in Miami and New York as well as some in Fort Myers—began to receive criticism about the conditions.

The migrant sanitation in Fort Myers tested Harlem Lake's drinking water and quickly ordered the people not to use it. The building inspector warned that the dwellings would be condemned.

After six weeks of withheld rents the rental agency, under public pressure, be-

gan listening to the tenants. At summer's end the septic tank was repaired, garbage cans were bought and a plumber and electrician were hired.

"There are many more things that need doing," Ramirez said, "but we know that everything can't be done at once. What has already happened has been wonderful. The people are very excited because now they know their ability to change things."

Ramirez helped organize the people first to help themselves by working with the children, then with the parents.

"They are a friendly, sociable people," he said. "They were deeply concerned about the children but were afraid to protest as a group. They had never heard of the Legal Aid Society and they didn't know how to tap the good will of the community—if they knew it existed."

Out of several informal social gatherings grew the community action group which was ultimately responsible for the improved conditions.

In August, Ramirez was transferred to Miami. He lives and works in a Negro ghetto in the deteriorated central district. The problems there are similar to those of the migrants in Fort Myers—substandard housing, lack of education, ill health, unemployment, a feeling that nothing can be done.

Again Ramirez is working with children and through them getting to know the parents.

Ramirez' year in VISTA will be up in March 1968. If he does not re-enlist, he plans to return to Fresno State College, where he was majoring in Spanish and social studies.

One of 12 children in the family of Mr. and Mrs. Lupe R. Coronado, he is a graduate of Edison High School. He was a member of the Mexican-American Political Association and of the Fair Employment Practices Commission in Fresno. While working with migrants in California, he decided on a course of social action through VISTA.

THE OPPOSITION CRUSADE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, several Republican Members of Congress have proposed a substitute to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended. They call their proposal the "opportunity crusade."

If the Republican proposal is an opportunity crusade, it is a misguided one indeed. It is designed to seize the partisan opportunity afforded by this preelection year to launch a crusade against the Office of Economic Opportunity. It is more aptly entitled an "opposition crusade."

This mischief is unworthy of the Republican Party. In a real sense, it is playing politics with poverty; it is manipulating the hopes and expectations of the poor.

A sponsor of this opposition crusade told the House of Representatives on June 8, 1967:

The Republican proposals would eliminate the Office of Economic Opportunity.

This, in the very words of a draftsman of the scheme, is the outrageous principal purpose of the misguided opposition crusade.

Yet, without the coordination and stimulation provided by the OEO since the Congress created that agency in 1964, the attack on poverty in America would still be unfocused and uninspired. In fact, under Sargent Shriver the OEO's versatile attack on poverty is showing tremendous results.

This is a fact implicitly recognized even by the sponsors of the opposition crusade. In their so-called redirection of the war on poverty they have retained disguised versions of virtually every one of the major achievements of the OEO.

To masquerade their overdue recognition of the necessity for OEO programs, and to justify their purpose of abolishing the OEO, the opposition crusaders have evolved a plan almost amusing in its simplistic deviousness. Although regular critics of the size and alleged unresponsiveness of Federal departments, they now seek to bury OEO programs, all dressed up in different names, in the larger bureaucracies of other Federal agencies.

In a burst of frenzied partisanship these come-lately crusaders want to destroy the OEO but keep its programs; reduce the size of Federal Government but add to the Federal bureaucracy; help the poor by strangling the only voice the poor have ever had in the councils of government—the Office of Economic Opportunity.

This puzzling plan is one which only madcap political partisanship explains. It is a plan designed to play to the knowing segment of American public opinion. It is a plan to label the OEO as a kind of mischievous dragon, somehow responsible for community unrest, then to slay that dragon and present both ears and tail to the electorate in 1968. It is worse than a shortsighted plan; it is a deceit which cannot succeed.

Even a cursory review of the Republican opposition crusade will show that it is not a real, but a superficial, alternative to the present antipoverty war. It is interesting only because it is a part of a deliberate attempt to obscure the tremendous good accomplished over the last 3 years by the OEO.

Imitation is the homage that skepticism pays to success. We must not be surprised, then, that the opposition crusaders have weakly duplicated almost all of the OEO programs. But, they are determined to wipe out the OEO, the command post in the war on poverty. It is to their credit, I suppose, that they are enough aware of the problems of hunger and poverty in America to see the need for a continuation of some kind of antipoverty programs. But in my firm opinion their crusade is wholly misguided. They offer no compelling reasons whatsoever to justify their proposal. Indeed, their proposals invite administrative and bureaucratic chaos at a critical juncture in a national effort barely 3 years old.

If the Republicans feel that they must go to the voters in 1968 with a positive program, I invite them to abandon this negative opposition crusade and support the Office of Economic Opportunity as the coordinator of the existing programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The war on poverty requires the

resolute commitment of every American, but the opposition crusaders seem to prefer to do battle with those who are fighting poverty, rather than to fight poverty itself.

We have some serious questions facing us at the end of this explosive summer of 1967. And how we answer these questions, I believe, will be more than an indicator of how we regard our national priorities. In a real sense, the choice is simply whether we choose to meet our domestic responsibilities or evade them. And to evade them in this season of our national life is to invite the steady decay of our social order.

Poverty is not, of course, at the root of every one of our domestic problems, but it is related to most of them. I am firmly of the belief that a defeat of poverty and its consequences is the imperative destiny of the American experiment—bearing in mind that to wage war on poverty effectively is to do more than meet the material needs of the poor. It is, as well, to defeat a poverty of the spirit that afflicts us all whenever fellow citizens, denied their full opportunity to share in our American abundance, live ignored in anger and despair.

FIREARMS, LIMITED

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the Birmingham News of Wednesday, October 4, 1967, entitled "Firearms, Limited" pointing out in a reasoned fashion the evils of the so-called administration or Dodd bill and presenting calmly the need for adequate controls along the line of the Hruska bill.

There is need for control of firearms moving in interstate commerce to prevent them from falling into the hands of criminals, lunatics, dope fiends, minors, and similar irresponsible persons.

At the same time public policy should prevent enactment of legislation which strips the law-abiding citizen of the right to own arms and use them for legitimate sporting and defense purposes.

The editorial referred to follows:

FIREARMS, LIMITED

Debate over fresh efforts to write a reasonable and meaningful federal firearms control law goes on. Nebraska's Republican Senator Roman Hruska seeks to rebore specific provisions of the measure supported by the White House.

Actually, the basic difference centers over whether rifles and shotguns, used in far greater part by millions of Americans for hunting and target sports, should be placed in the same category as handguns, concealables and destructive devices.

Sen. Hruska considers placing all guns in the same restrictive rack to be an unreasonable position. And he has stout support from rifle and shotgun owners, firearms

manufacturers and the vigorously outspoken Nation Rifle Association.

The Hruska proposal says this about the sale of handguns: (1) The mail order sale to minors should be prohibited; (2) the mail order sale or over-counter sale to non-residents 21 or older must be accompanied by an affidavit that the recipient is not barred by federal or state law or local ordinance from receiving and possessing a handgun and then supply the name of the principal law enforcement officer of the locality to which the gun will be shipped; (3) the statement must be sent to such officer by registered or certified mail including a description of the firearm and an acknowledgment received; delivery of the firearm to the purchaser then must be delayed for another seven days.

The Dodd bill would prohibit the mail order and non-resident over-counter sales completely. Additionally—and herein lies a basic rub—the Dodd plan would attach the affidavit procedure to mail order sales of all rifles and shotguns.

In addition to other provisions, Dodd's bill would repeal the National Firearms Act of 1938, generally known as the "Machine Gun Act," which specifically addresses itself to and polices the sale and possession of machine guns, sawed off rifles and sawed-off shotguns.

This federal act is considered generally to be effective and Hruska's bill would leave it untouched.

Opponents of the administration-Dodd plan see inherent dangers in its contents, not the least of which is what they consider to be an intrusion into the rights of states to enforce their own firearms laws. And 36 states, including Alabama, have such statutes on their books.

There are no substantial records to sustain the argument that crimes of violence are more prevalent in states where firearms licensing is not required. Available statistics indicate that crimes of violence in licensing and non-licensing states are about the same.

To be considered before any catch-all legislation is enacted is whether tossing rifles and shotguns, in effect, into the same category with handguns and concealables, where purchase is concerned, is wise. The Dodd proposal presents a substantial danger of overkill, potentially penalizing many thousand times more law-abiding rifle and shotgun owners than it would deter would-be law violators.

There is no reasonable argument against effective controls of firearms which present a potential threat to the public's safety. Both Dodd and Hruska proposals contain such provisions and the public is entitled to all reasonable protection. And certainly our law enforcement officers deserve consideration for similar reasons.

Ideally, the Senate Judiciary Committee would put all political considerations and pressure group arguments aside, coming to the floor with a compromised version of the Dodd and Hruska bills that would not infringe upon the rights of anyone but would prevent firearms predominantly employed in criminal acts from ending up in the hands of the criminally disposed.

ANTICS OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I never

cease to be amazed at the antics of the Department of Justice. This latest exchange is almost unbelievable if it were not a documented fact.

You recall that sometime ago during an Armed Services Committee meeting on the draft bill, Assistant Attorney General Fred Vinson, Jr., testified he had never heard of a criminal statute that I read to him.

Now comes another Assistant Attorney General, John Doar, who defies the request of a Member of Congress contrary to a statute which he uses as authority for the defiance.

It is absolutely amazing.

I am including herein three documents, which speak for themselves. I draw attention to the language which Doar uses in the letter as authority for denying my request as it is right above the language in the law on the last page which specifically says:

Nothing in this section authorizes withholding of information or limiting the availability of records to the public except as specifically stated in this section, nor shall this section be authority to withhold information from Congress.

Mr. Doar conveniently and deliberately has withheld the words "nor shall this section be authority to withhold information from Congress."

I submit the three documents so you may see for yourself these unbelievable antics of the Department of Justice.

OCTOBER 30, 1967.

Mr. JOHN DOAR,
Assistant Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.:

Request of Federal agencies here for list of names of individuals who have "volunteered" to serve as watchers at the polls on election day have been denied me. I respectfully request you to cite the law on which a Member of Congress is denied the names of Federal employees on the public payrolls. The Department heads have referred me to the Department of Justice. I am now calling on you to give me the lists of names of those civil service employees who have "volunteered" and to which Department they are attached.

F. EDW. HÉBERT,
Member of Congress.

NOVEMBER 3, 1967.

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HÉBERT: This will respond to your telegram dated October 30, 1967, requesting a list of the names and agencies of civil service employees who have volunteered to serve as observers at the polls on the forthcoming election day.

The observers assigned under Section 8 of the Voting Rights Act have the function of collecting facts upon which the Attorney General can base the judgments he is required to make in enforcing specific terms of the statute. Their fact-collecting and reporting function is no different from that performed by the investigative agents of many agencies having law enforcement functions.

The Freedom of Information Act authorizes exemption from disclosure of "matters that are . . . investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes except to the extent available by law to a party other than an agency." 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(7). We think the exemption covers the information you have requested.

The regulations of this Department au-

thorize disclosure of exempt material when such disclosure is in the public interest. See Section 16.1(a) of the regulations, published at 32 F.R. 9663, July 4, 1967. Our experience with law enforcement functions leads us to believe, however, that advance disclosure of the names of agents who will perform any aspect of an investigation will permit such disruption of the investigative function as to be inconsistent with the public interest.

We must be mindful, too, that public disclosure of the names of observers could lead to the opportunity for needless harassment of them. Our concern for proper execution of the Voting Rights Act prevents us from finding that such disclosure would be in the public interest.

The observers do, of course, identify themselves to the election officials at the polling places to which they are assigned, as would any investigative agent. But this is quite different from disclosure in mass and before undertaking their assignments. House Report No. 1497, 89th Congress, 2d Session, pages 5-6, acknowledges that "there may be plans which, even though finalized, cannot be made freely available in advance of the effective date without damage to such (i.e., public and private) interests. There may be legitimate reasons for non-disclosure, and S. 1160 is designed to permit non-disclosure in such cases."

On this basis we believe our decision is proper under the Freedom of Information Act.

Sincerely,

JOHN DOAR,
Assistant Attorney General,
Civil Rights Division.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 3, 1967.

MR. JOHN DOAR,
Assistant Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOAR: I am deeply shocked by your letter of November 3, 1967 denying to me, as a member of Congress, the names of individuals who have "volunteered" to serve as observers at the polls in Louisiana tomorrow.

I am dismayed not only by your unreasonable refusal but by the fact that you, a lawyer backed by the powerful legal talent of the United States Department of Justice, would cite as your legal authority for refusing the information to me a law which cannot be made to apply by even the wildest stretch of imagination.

You claim that the Freedom of Information Act which went into effect July 4, 1967 permits you to keep secret "matters that are . . . investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes." Whether or not it is possible to twist that phrase of the law to withhold the names of "volunteer" observers from the public, it certainly is most absurd legal reasoning to try to apply the law to my request for information as a member of Congress.

The most junior law student, Mr. Doar, could read and understand the provision of the Freedom of Information Act which states that nothing in the law "shall . . . be authority to withhold information from the Congress."

My request for the names on October 30, 1967 clearly asked that you "cite the law on which a member of Congress is denied the names of Federal employees on the public payrolls." Instead, Mr. Doar, you claim as authority for secrecy a law which, by its very language, does not apply to the Congress.

I repeat my request for the list as a member of Congress and as dean of the Louisiana delegation in the House of Representatives. There is no statutory authority to withhold routine government information from a member of Congress.

In the past, information has been withheld from the Congress under a claim of Executive Privilege flowing from the Constitution, but this broad claim of bureaucratic power has been cut down to size by action of the last two Presidents. I am sure you are aware that both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson formally stated that the claim of Executive Privilege would be exercised by the President and the President alone.

If you do not immediately provide the government information requested, I demand you cite the pertinent legal authority, and if you rely on the claim of Executive Privilege, I demand that you follow the Presidential directive that he, and he alone, will make the decision.

Sincerely yours,

F. EDW. HEBERT.

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE OF OEO

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, as we move into consideration of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 amid the threat of the concerted drive to dismantle OEO by reassigning some programs to other agencies, by phasing out others, and by granting more control over its functions to State and local governments, I would call to the attention of my colleagues the growing nationwide support for our Federal war on poverty in its present form. As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I have heard from civic groups, veterans' organizations, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, businessmen representing their corporations, labor organizations, religious groups, and countless numbers of individuals, virtually unanimously opposed to this threatened fragmentation or any sort of dilution of the activities of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The concept of a centralized agency dealing directly and solely with the impoverished of America has finally been proven to overwhelming numbers of Americans as the most hopeful way to attack the shameful poverty that is still so widespread in America and so tied-in with the social unrest endemic in our cities. Many of the early and most virulent critics of OEO have become converts in these brief 3 years of experimentation, optimism, frustration, and bitter controversy. I number myself as one who has seen the beneficial results of Headstart, who has witnessed the solid evidence of personal rehabilitation being made possible by the Job Corps, of the tremendous salvaging of human talent through Upward Bound, and, overall, the general spirit of uplift and hope that so many thousands of the poor have found through their own involvement in community action. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a continuation of the Office of Economic Opportunity as presently functioning, under the dedicated and capable leadership of Director Sargent Shriver, is absolutely essential if we are to maintain any momentum at all in our drive for social and economic justice for all

Americans, and I insert in the RECORD a sampling of letters and wires I have received as evidence of the broad spectrum of public backing which the OEO has deservedly won in these first few crucial years of its operation.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
November 6, 1967.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Washington, D.C.:

The National Association of Social Workers opposes any transfer of programs in the Office of Economic Opportunity to other Federal departments.

We consider the Economic Opportunity Act as one of the most creative and innovative pieces of legislation enacted by the Congress, and urge that the authorization for the Office of Economic Opportunity be extended for another 2-year period under, essentially, its present provisions. We have solid evidence, and have so testified before the House Education and Labor Committee, that the Economic Opportunity Act initiated the development of an opportunity structure for low-income individuals that deserves not only continuation but expansion. Through its work programs, through Headstart, through the opportunities provided by the community action programs to the poor, for participation in shaping their own affairs, the Economic Opportunity Act has opened doors previously closed to hundreds of thousands of individuals.

We urge your support for the \$2.06 billion authorization, continuation of the present optional approach to the operation of community action programs under either governmental or private auspices elimination of the 50-percent cash requirement for the local non-Federal share and the retention of the work programs, Headstart, and other special emphases programs within the Office of Economic Opportunity.

CHARLES I. SCHOTTLAND,
President, National Association of Social Workers.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 6, 1967.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Delta Sigma Theta urges the prompt approval of H.R. 8311, the Economic Opportunity Amendment of 1967. As an organization of 45,000 college women we are especially concerned that the merger budget proposed for all antipoverty programs not be cut any further, that attempts to transfer all successful programs such as Headstart and Job Corps out of OEO be defeated. Continuation of OEO as the strong central coordinating headquarters for the war on poverty is essential to success of this crucial effort. The poor need your help and Delta Sigma Theta urges that you personally work in support of, and vote for, H.R. 8311.

FRANKIE M. FREEMAN,
National President,
Delta Sigma Theta, Inc.

WEST VIRGINIA STATE COLLEGE,
October 27, 1967.

Hon. PATSY MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mrs. MINK: The Community Relations Council for the Charleston Job Corps Center for Women, Charleston, West Virginia, has been actively serving this center as an advisory board in the matter of policy operation and public relations for more than two years. The Council consists of more than 30 volunteer members from various segments of society who feel adequately rewarded with the feeling that they are rendering a service in the war on poverty.

We are writing you now because of our concern about the welfare of this center and

its continuation under the Office of Economic Opportunity.

During our more than two year association with the Office of Economic Opportunity we have always felt that dealing directly with an agency such as OEO is the best way of handling the numerous administrative problems that arise. We share the belief that OEO, during the past three years has arrived at a stable position in regard to organizing and administering this program. It is our feeling that it would be a mistake, after three years of organizing and building the Office of Economic Opportunity, to transfer the various projects to other branches of government.

It would seem to us, therefore, that OEO control of Job Corps Centers should not only remain intact, but should be strengthened in order to do the job that must be done and which has been well begun. We recommend to you that the present trained and experienced administration of the OEO be continued.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW H. CALLOWAY,
Chairman,
Community Relations Council.

RESOLUTION 1

Whereas, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, through direct action and collective support, have always promoted increased opportunities for all Americans, that every individual, regardless of race, color, creed or ethnic background, might share in this Nation's abundance; and

Whereas, the Veterans of Foreign Wars recognize that the seeds of communism and subversion are sown in the soil of poverty and nurtured by the fertilizer of despair; and

Whereas, the Economic Opportunity Act, as originally passed by Congress in 1964, and since extended and amended in 1965 and 1966, has established self-help programs and mechanisms, in the best American tradition, to enable the poor of our Country to break their shackles of poverty,

Now therefore, be it resolved, by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Western Conference, composed of 18 states, Okinawa, Panama Canal Zone, Provisional Department of Pacific Area strongly urges the enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967, and

Be it further resolved that all U.S. Congressional Representatives of the States represented by the Western Conference of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, be furnished a copy of this resolution.

Dated, at Phoenix, Arizona, this 4th day of November, 1967.

WALTER H. MARSHALL,
Chairman, Western Conference Veterans
of Foreign Wars.

Attest:

ROBERT A. DURKEE,
Secretary.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
UNIVERSITY WOMEN,
Washington, D.C., November 3, 1967.

Hon. PATSY MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: The American Association of University Women was among the supporters of the Economic Opportunity Act at the time of its enactment. We have followed the progress of its implementation with great interest. On the whole we are convinced that much that is good has been achieved in the short period this program has been in operation. We are equally convinced that a far greater contribution to solution of the social ills that plague this country is possible if this program is extended and strengthened. Therefore we urge passage of a bill extending the Economic Opportunity Act.

We are gratified that day care, family planning, and senior opportunity and services for the elderly, as well as emergency food and medical service programs are incorporated in S. 2388 now under consideration. But we are gravely concerned that the bill before the House so drastically alters the 10-90 formula of sharing between local and Federal sources that was a part of the original act.

We are certain that many communities will be forced to drop immediately many very worthwhile and even indispensable projects when required to put up in cash rather than "in kind" so much higher a percentage of the total cost.

We urge enactment of authorizations, at a minimum, at present levels and preferably at higher levels so that the war on poverty can continue.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. GLORIA PETERS,
Area Representative in Community
Problems.

Miss LOIS ROTH,
Area Representative in Education.
Miss VICTORIA SCHUCK,
Chairman, Legislative Program Com-
mittee.

NEW ROCHELLE, N.Y.,
November 1, 1967.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House Education and Labor Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Our promising antipoverty community programs are being dismantled, our trained staff and volunteers are discouraged because of deep cuts in Federal funds.

We submit that the poor, the aged, the children, the urgent need to prevent anarchy in our cities, should have the money that is spent on the war in Vietnam, supersonic planes, and space spectacles.

MILTON HEIMLICH,
Chairman,
Citizens Committee for War on Poverty.

ST. PETER'S HEAD START,
Yonkers, N.Y., October 24, 1967.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House Committee on Education and Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: It is with deep distress that St. Peter's Head Start Advisory Board takes note of the recommendation of the House Education and Labor Committee to restrict, almost to the point of impotence, the Poverty Program by not only its financial strictures but also its administratively cumbersome machinery for access to federal funds. As citizens, we cannot emphasize too much the success of the Head Start Program with which we are closely aligned. You may hear of some spectacular programs that hit the front page. Our program has thoughtfully, efficiently and somewhat quietly gone about its business of changing a whole neighborhood called the "flats" of Yonkers where our people are gaining new hope and a sense of dignity.

St. Peter's Head Start will undoubtedly have to close up in the face of the amendment proposed by your House Committee. May we beg you to reconsider what it does to hope, self-esteem and a sense of community rebirth to so restrict federal involvement—as is now being proposed. We have not only emphasized aid for children but also for their parents and the entire neighborhood. Changes are being made. The Head Start Program has had no small influence on positively assisting the city in breaking the roadblock to relocation housing. Our children and their families have benefited from the Poverty Program on a very meager budget in this very high cost of living area. We urgently beg you to reconsider the drastic consequences of such cuts—a re-entry into frustration and despair and all the violent children of these two evils.

We request that you reconsider your action of Friday, October 20, and don't kill hope.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN M. HARRINGTON,
Coordinator,
St. Peter's Head Start.
WILLIAM R. OFFUTT,
Chairman,
St. Peter's Advisory Board.

OCTOBER 11, 1967.

Hon. EVERETT DIRKSEN and Hon. GERALD R. FORD,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

We, the undersigned Mayors and Members of the Republican Party endorse the continuation or expansion of the programs fostered by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

All of us are greatly concerned as we are continually pushing forward those projects in our individual cities which are aimed at improving neighborhoods that can be rehabilitated and to also raise the economic, educational, and social standing of those citizens who are living in poverty. We feel the implementation of our local programs as sponsored by OEO are giving great impetus toward our goal and any slowing up of such programs will greatly deter the progress which has been made thus far.

We fully realize that in any new program, such as the War on Poverty, there are bound to be certain imperfections and criticisms from some corners. But in our daily activities of actually seeing these programs administered they are proving to be successful and getting the job done. It is our considered opinion that the programs are a positive force in lessening social tensions in our cities. All of us are confident they will continue to improve and are so meaningful as to give our less fortunate citizens a new hope in life. You can readily see people involved and active. These programs are realities and are no longer in the talking stage. The strong leadership provided by this agency in administering the various projects has been most impressive.

We strongly urge each of you to encourage members of Congress to support the OEO budget so that these dynamic and imaginative programs may be carried on in a successful manner.

Neal S. Blaisdell, Honolulu, Hawaii;
John S. Ballard, Akron, Ohio; J. D. Braman, Seattle, Wash.; Stanley A. Cmich, Canton, Ohio; Frank M. Dulan, Utica, N.Y.; Dave Hall, Dayton, Ohio; James M. Hewgley, Tulsa, Okla.; Orville L. Hubbard, Dearborn, Mich.; Floyd H. Hyde, Fresno, Calif.; Ronald R. James, San Jose, Calif.; Erik Jonsen, Dallas, Tex.; Lawrence F. Krammer, Jr., Paterson, N.J.; Robert J. Lehnhausen, Peoria, Ill.; John W. Lindsay, New York City, N.Y.; Theodore R. McKeldin, Baltimore, Md.; John W. Potter, Toledo, Ohio; Kenneth A. Schmied, Louisville, Ky.; A. V. Sorensen, Omaha, Neb.; Edwin W. Wade, Long Beach, Calif.; George C. Whitmer, Des Moines, Iowa; Charles W. Wright, Jr., Topeka, Kans.; Clarence E. Vollmer, Wichita, Kans.

U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1967.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The United States Conference of Mayors endorses legislation to continue and expand the war on poverty.

We strongly support the Community Action Program within the Office of Economic Opportunity through which programs have been locally initiated and locally developed. It is essential that this local character be maintained. It is for this reason that we are

disturbed by reports that your Committee might act to limit the ability of the communities to determine the nature and structure of their community action agencies. We need more flexibility at the local level—not less.

We know that real community action requires the active participation of local units of government but at the same time we appreciate the need to include all segments of the community within the program. Perhaps in the past there has been too much emphasis at the national level on encouraging a particular form of local CAP structure. We have resisted such efforts. It would be a mistake at the same time to move further in this area by requiring that all local CAP's be either units of government or private non-profit corporations.

On behalf of the Conference of Mayors we urge that we be permitted in the communities to move ahead with our programs as we have developed them. We cannot afford at this time to stop for total reorganization.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH M. BARR,
Mayor of Pittsburgh,
President, U.S. Conference of Mayors.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
October 21, 1967.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

After adjournment of National Headstart Conference, 292 key local officials remained and gave personal financial support to following plea:

Urge no change in present structure of Headstart and community action program.

Do not force cash contributions: would close most local programs.

Local communities will express same concern.

Mrs. RHEABLE M. EDWARDS,
Chairman, Ad Hoc Committee To Save
Community Action Program.

NATIONAL CONSUMERS LEAGUE,
Washington, D.C., October 10, 1967.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: The National Consumers League urges that you as a member of the House Education and Labor Committee vote to report out favorably legislation which will keep the Office of Economic Opportunity intact, as the central organization to coordinate the efforts in the War on Poverty, and that you provide adequate funds for the coming year. The battle against poverty in the United States has just begun. OEO should be strengthened and its programs expanded so that progress can be continued and stepped up.

Our organization feels that the bill passed by the Senate is a fine one although we were sorry to see the Clark-Javits Emergency Employment Amendment defeated. We urge your Committee to report out an equally strong bill.

Sincerely yours,

SARAH H. NEWMAN,
General Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL JUSTICE,
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE
CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE
U.S.A.,

New York, N.Y., October 9, 1967.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: The invaluable role of the Economic Opportunity Act of the Office of Economic Opportunity in continuing to provide the supporting sinews of the nationwide war on poverty is demonstrated on every page of the enclosed just-off-the-press study of church-related anti-poverty projects.

Its authentic description of the many ways

in which these private-sector, non-profit groups depend upon OEO for staff and financial help testifies to the basic, positive contribution of the Federal program to date and the strategic importance of its extension under its present structure. As the writer warns (p. 10):

"To lose this momentum now, when many communities and leaders have just learned what can be done and how, would be not only an immediate, but an historic, tragedy."

I am rushing this copy to you in the belief that its contents may prove pertinent to the current debate in the Education and Labor Committee on the 1967-68 Poverty War legislation.

Sincerely yours,

LAROLD K. SCHULZ,
Director, Antipoverty Program.

PACKARD BELL,
Los Angeles, Calif., September 28, 1967.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: Packard Bell has been actively participating with the Office of Economic Opportunity for the past two and one-half years in the various War on Poverty projects. We are presently operating two Women's Job Corps Training Centers located in Charleston, West Virginia and Albuquerque, New Mexico. These centers are presently training 675 young girls, ages 16 to 21.

When OEO was established approximately three years ago, Packard Bell felt very strongly that industry, education and government should and could make an excellent combination in the training and rehabilitation of young people through the establishment of Job Corps training centers. Industry recognizes the shortage of trained, educated and qualified personnel at all levels and the surplus of uneducated and unskilled workers. Consequently, Packard Bell was one of the industry leaders in joining with OEO in the establishment of Job Corps training centers. It has indeed been a most interesting and meaningful project and one that has proven to be largely successful in educating, training and motivating these disadvantaged young people to the point where 70% of them were employed after graduation.

Certainly there have been problems in starting up a program of this nature. During our three-year association with the Office of Economic Opportunity we have always felt that dealing directly with an agency such as OEO is the best way of handling the myriad of administrative problems that arise. We believe that OEO, during the past three years, has arrived at a stable position in regard to organizing and administering this program. It is our feeling that industry as a whole shares this opinion, and we believe it would be a mistake, after three years of organizing and building the Office of Economic Opportunity, to transfer the various projects to other branches of government. We believe this would dilute and confuse the effort. We believe this program must be pinpointed and clearly identified and directly managed. It would seem to us that OEO control of Job Corps Centers should not only remain intact, but should be strengthened in order to do the job that must be done and which has been well begun.

Packard Bell and the other industries involved in this program strongly feel our responsibility to the program, and we hope that this letter will clearly indicate our position in this matter. We feel that the basic job is to rehabilitate and motivate the hard core of the young unemployables and that vocational training only will not do the job. If you believe, as we do, that Job Corps Centers can accomplish this mission, then we further recommend to you that the present trained and experienced administration of the OEO be continued.

Cordially,

ROBERT S. BELL,
Chairman of the Board.

GRAFLEX, INC.,

Rochester, N.Y., September 25, 1967.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: When I was privileged to testify before your Committee on July 20th, I furnished each of you with copies of my prepared testimony containing certain statistics on the experience at Breckinridge, and Job Corps overall.

For example, I reported 1,137 Breckinridge graduates from July 1, 1966 to July 11, 1967. Of these, 601 had been placed in jobs, and an additional 466 were so recently graduated that meaningful reports on them were not yet available.

In response to your questions, I predicted that the majority would be reported to be performing satisfactorily in their jobs. While our surveys are by no means concluded, it is clear that this prediction is borne out by experience.

It is not surprising to read in the September 19, 1967, Wall Street Journal: "But the controversial Job Corps gets surprisingly high marks; 60% of the 159 companies hiring corpsmen rate them satisfactory workers."

Apparently, many of them change jobs to improve themselves, even to vocations different from those in which they were trained—but this indicates that their training makes them flexible enough to adjust to the changing world of work, without losing the basic motivation which many of them once lacked.

In substance, now that most of the growing pains are behind us, Jobs Corps is producing self-reliant, taxpaying citizens from material which otherwise might have become additions to our relief roles, or worse.

Based upon the results, which are constantly improving with experience, may I again urge your support of O.E.O.'s Job Corps program, as a worthy investment in the Youth of America.

Sincerely,

G. C. WHITAKER,
Chairman.

DRESSER INDUSTRIES, INC.,
Dallas, Tex., August 25, 1967.

DEAR MADAM: The Office of Economic Opportunity needs your support. This function is essential to the health and well-being of our country—especially during this period of rioting and lawlessness.

I call your attention to the enclosed tear sheet of an advertisement that will appear in the September 1967 issue of Nation's Business and earnestly urge you to maintain and continue the Office of Economic Opportunity in its present structure.

Sincerely,

JOHN LAURENCE.

SCRIPPS-HOWARD NEWSPAPERS,
Cincinnati, Ohio, September 7, 1967.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: I am a member of the Business Leadership Advisory Council of the Office of Economic Opportunity. In this capacity, I would like to express my personal concern about certain efforts in Congress that would tend to weaken the O.E.O.

I believe a strong O.E.O. is needed for the time being, for the following reasons:

An aggressive and immediate effort to deal with the problems of poverty continues to be essential to the welfare of the country. A centralized management of programs to this end should rest in a single agency until considerably more progress has been made.

Any dismantling of O.E.O. would result in increased frustration and agitation in our cities. Efforts to this end would provide effective propaganda for the extremist agitators.

There is no escaping the fact that over the past four decades poverty has become in-

creasingly a part of the everyday working economy of the nation. This condition is here to stay. It is a negative part, and extremely expensive.

At one time, the poor were relatively isolated physically and economically, but public welfare and migration to the cities have greatly changed the picture. This condition isn't likely to change. The only economic answer is a major effort to eliminate the causes of poverty wherever possible.

It seems evident that the traditional local public and private programs and institutions have not been equal to the task. Migration to the cities, and increasing public acceptance of responsibility for the poor, and a number of other contributing factors have overwhelmed the capacity of the local agencies to deal with the jobs they were designed to do.

I am encouraged to note that O.E.O. has made it a point to work through local and private agencies wherever possible. This has resulted in some cases of poor judgment, poor management, and errors. These can be corrected. In the long run, I would hope that the local agencies would become fully competent to handle local problems.

I am encouraged also to note that O.E.O. has been able, at the Federal level, to spin off certain programs to H.E.W., Small Business Administration, the Department of Labor, and perhaps other agencies.

It seems to me that this is the kind of progress that O.E.O. should make. Ideally, I would hope that O.E.O. could be so successful that eventually there would be no need for it.

As for now, we need a strong O.E.O. to develop programs to meet critical present needs, and to help local agencies develop the capability to do what is needed. At the Federal level, a centralized responsibility in O.E.O. is best able to create and initiate.

The most important thing that the United States of America can say for our form of government and way of life is that every citizen enjoys freedom, has a useful job, and enjoy decent health services and living conditions. Words cannot communicate this, but the visible existence of the condition would be most eloquent.

Peoples around the world must wonder how the richest and most powerful nation can tolerate conditions that breed deep poverty, substantial housing, substandard health, substandard education, and finally riots.

What we can demonstrate now is that our society and our form of government can recognize our problems and deal with them quickly and effectively.

I have not attempted to discuss the merits or lack thereof of any specific O.E.O. programs. You are closer to the situation than I. What O.E.O. programs are doing in your own community will be more significant than my comments.

I'm sure you and your staff have plenty to do. I have already burdened you with the above communication, so please don't trouble to acknowledge.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. SCRIPPS.

(This message appears in the September 1967 issue of Nation's Business)

A HAND UP NOT A HANDOUT—THAT'S WHAT THE OEO IS ALL ABOUT

We believe that businessmen, legislators, indeed all citizens should understand and support the Office of Economic Opportunity. For what it does, as well as for how it does it.

What does the OEO do? As businessmen we look at it this way: The OEO and its programs give people a hand up, not a handout . . . get people off relief roles and onto payrolls. Our payrolls. It helps people move up the economic ladder; equips them through education and training to become productive and constructive members of society. The

way we see it, the OEO turns out workers and consumers.

Now, how does the OEO operate? It's set up and run like a big business should be. A central management governing and administering a variety of diverse programs in 1100 communities in all 50 states, plus 120 Job Corps Centers. The OEO runs tightly, cleanly, economically. And it does this largely because of the way it's organized.

Operationally, the OEO follows the proven management concept of *single responsibility*. As businessmen, we practice this principle within our own organizations. And therefore, it's only natural for us to believe that the OEO must be preserved as the single responsible agency for the conduct and management of the many and diverse activities of the economic opportunity program.

It is the best way to get a vital job done.

Robert S. Benjamin, Chairman of the Board, United Artists Corp.; Ralph M. Besse, President, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.; Cabell Brand, President, Ortho-Vent Shoe Co.; George R. Brown, President, Brown & Root, Inc.; Carter Burgess, Chairman of the Board, American Machine Foundry; Donald S. Carmichael, Attorney at law; Richard H. Carter, President, Foster Corp.; Walker L. Cislser, Chairman, The Detroit Edison Co.

Donald C. Cook, President, American Electric Power Co., Inc.; Richard Cudahy, President, Patrick Cudahy, Inc.; C. Malcolm Davis, President, Fidelity Union Trust Co.; John D. deButts, Vice Chairman, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; Dr. A. G. Gaston, President, Booker T. Washington Insurance Co.; Harold S. Geneen, Chairman, International Telephone and Telegraph Corp.; Carl A. Gerstacker, Chairman of the Board, The Dow Chemical Co.

Ell Goldston, President, Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates; Lewis Gruber, Honorary Chairman, P. Lorillard Co.; Robert Hilbert, First Vice President, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia; Joseph H. Kanter, President, Kanter Corp.; Harding Lawrence, President, Braniff International; John Lawrence, President and Chairman, Dresser Industries; C. Virgil Martin, President, Carson Pirie Scott & Co.

James McCormack, Chairman, Communications Satellite Corp.; William Patrick, Assistant General Counsel, Michigan Bell Telephone Co.; Harvey Russell, Vice President, Pepsi-Cola Co.; Charles E. Scripps, Chairman of the Board, Scripps-Howard Newspapers; Olcott Smith, Chairman, Aetna Life Insurance Co.; Roger P. Sonnabend, President, Hotel Corporation of America; Jay Wells, President, Wells Television, Inc.; W. H. Wheeler, Chairman of the Board, Pitney-Bowes, Inc.

BRUNSWICK CORP.,

Chicago, Ill., October 3, 1967.

HON. PATSY T. MINK,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: I have been following carefully the progress of the Economic Opportunity Act and understand that the House Education and Labor Committee is preparing to make decisions which are quite important.

As an officer of the Brunswick Corporation, I want to take this opportunity to express our point of view regarding, specifically, the Job Corps. Brunswick's interest in Job Corps stems from the fact that we are operating two Job Corps Centers—one in Chicago, and the other in Marion, Virginia. Our experience to date indicates that the concept of Job Corps is a practical and effective one, and deserves support and continuation.

As a businessman, I can state that the investment being incurred to house, train and place a Job Corps enrollee makes sense when compared to the return that can be expected when an individual takes his or her place as a productive citizen.

I am hopeful that my comments will be helpful to you in reaching a positive decision about the Job Corps.

Sincerely,

R. G. BENSINGER.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,
AFL-CIO,

Washington, D.C., September 12, 1967.

Re Office of Economic Opportunity.

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: The recent Convention of the American Federation of Teachers adopted a resolution recommended unanimously by its Committee on Legislation to support the continuation of the Office of Economic Opportunity and its programs, with these considerations:

A. The American Federation of Teachers strongly supports the efforts of the Urban Coalition and Senator Joseph Clark of Pennsylvania, including the \$3 billion grant proposed by the Senator, to wage massive war on poverty in our central cities, administered through the Office of Economic Opportunity, and involving matching efforts by city government, business, and labor in our nation's cities.

B. The American Federation of Teachers strongly urges the Congress to provide that Job Corps Centers—both urban and conservation—be expanded under the Office of Economic Opportunity, provided that guarantees are written into law for fair labor conditions and collective bargaining rights as defined otherwise by Federal law.

Sincerely,

CARL J. MEGEL,
Director of Legislation.

THE DETROIT EDISON CO.,
Detroit, Mich., August 25, 1967.

HON. PATSY T. MINK,
House Education and Labor Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MINK: I am writing to you of my deep concern for the Economic Opportunity Act of 1967 and related appropriation requests now being considered in the Congress.

It has been my valued privilege to have served for the past two years as Chairman of the Business Leadership Advisory Council for the Office of Economic Opportunity. This group of key executives of many leading corporations from all sections of the United States consults with and advises the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Sargent Shriver, and participates actively in the planning and evaluation of the programs of that office.

As business and community leaders deeply concerned with the causes and effects of poverty in our society and as citizens who have been privileged to assist those directly responsible for the work of O.E.O., we know full well of the many problems which must be faced and overcome if meaningful progress is to be made. I and other members of the Council have personally visited and seen firsthand the work of many of the organizations and establishments associated with the endeavors of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Our approval of the beginning which has been made and our confidence in the organization and the leadership to which this great task has been assigned is well expressed in a resolution adopted at our recent meeting on May 10 in Washington, D.C., at which time we also met with President Johnson to tell him of our support for the Poverty Program.

Introduced by Mr. R. H. Carter, President of the Postoria Corporation, following resolution had the unanimous support of Council members.

"Whereas, the Business Leadership Advisory Council, which includes members of both political parties, reaffirms its support for the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity, which the Council believes are being effectively administered in the interests of our country, and,

"Whereas, the Council believes that the success of the O.E.O. programs has been made possible by its organization as a central command post in the War on Poverty which enables it to coordinate a broad spectrum of programs that represent many needs and touch many age levels with strong thrust of purpose, be it

"Resolved, that the Council be on record that it believes the Office of Economic Opportunity should remain as presently structured, retaining the overall administrative responsibility of the scope of the entire Poverty Program, and that dispersal of its programs with divided responsibility would seriously deter the impact of the total campaign that is now the charge and responsibility of the Office of Economic Opportunity."

This position has been further endorsed by a number of chief executives of major corporations in a statement which will appear in the September Nation's Business. A reprint is enclosed for your information.

As with all citizens, I have been deeply concerned with recent unfortunate events in many of our cities, including my own City of Detroit. Many of our Detroit Edison employees were closely involved in maintaining and restoring service in the riot area, with support and protection of civil and military personnel. I have personally gone into these areas and have talked with many who are involved at all levels of our community. As a member of the Mayor's "New Detroit" Committee, I have a deep and continuing concern for those endeavors which will contribute to the well-being of our people and our community. It has been a significant part of my daily life.

During the riots and following, I find only good work being done by those involved in programs here developed and supported by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Many were working actively to contain the disorder and to keep others from participating. Considering the short time these programs have been under way, I believe the present and potential benefits are clearly evident. This good work must be continued and strengthened if we are to resolve the crucial matters facing us today. Time cannot be lost.

The recommendations made to the Congress by the Administration redefine and strengthen those areas of the War on Poverty which experience has proven most effective. It merits your full support and I commend it to you most highly.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely,

WALKER CISLER.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,

Philadelphia, Pa., August 21, 1967.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: From a purely administrative standpoint, I feel very strongly that the proposed amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act would be a serious mistake. Everyone shares a deep concern for the very complex poverty problems in their entirety, and it will take the combined cooperative efforts of all public and private institutions to make visible progress in this area.

It is of crucial importance administratively, that Congress provide a central focus of responsibility for all efforts in this area. Centralized responsibility should provide a more effective means of keeping the poverty problem before public and private institutions as

well as the general public, and at the same time, provide a greater degree of operating flexibility in dealing with rapidly changing conditions. Moreover, from an organizational standpoint, it is essential to clearly identify those responsible for accountability for the performance of the numerous programs established by Congress in this field. Once again the present program seems superior to the proposed amendments. While criticism is certainly appropriate of some of the administrative efforts of the present organization, I am afraid that it would only be accelerated under the proposed amendments because of diffused and confused responsibilities inherent in these proposals. I can just see buck-passing rising to new heights if the proposed changes are made.

It is my understanding that the present organization has, in fact, spun off programs and activities to existent agencies whenever possible and it is most likely that this trend may be accelerated in the near future. This, in itself, would seem to answer or anticipate some of the implied criticisms toward which the proposed amendments address themselves.

On balance, therefore, I find it difficult to see the advantages to be gained administratively by adopting the proposed amendments.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIS J. WINN,

Dean.

BOARD OF SOCIAL MINISTRY,
LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., July 24, 1967.

HON. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee which is considering the future of the "War on Poverty," I want to forward to you, for your information, a communication that was sent by this office to the president of the thirty-two synods as well as the thirty-two synodical committees.

I am enclosing also a copy of a statement on Poverty adopted by the 1966 convention of the Lutheran Church in America. The Lutheran Church in America is composed of some 3.2 million members in the United States and Canada.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely yours,

CARL E. THOMAS,
Executive Secretary.

BOARD OF SOCIAL MINISTRY,
LUTHERAN CHURCH OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., July 17, 1967.

Memorandum to: Synod Presidents, Staff and Members of Synod Social Ministry Committees/Boards LCA Board of Social Ministry Members.

From: Board of Social Ministry Staff.

Subject: The Crisis in the House of Representatives with Regard to the War on Poverty.

The Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) is facing a battle for survival. Committees of both Houses of Congress are currently conducting hearings on the Administration bill to extend (and amend) the Economic Opportunity Act, originally passed in 1964.

Because the War on Poverty has incurred a great deal of criticism, the Administration's bill attempts to meet the opposition by tightening the administration of the program in various ways. The proposed changes are too great to suit its liberal supporters, but not drastic enough to assure that the bill will get past its most determined critics.

House Republicans have mounted a frontal attack on the Administration program in the form of their Opportunity Crusade bill (H.R. 10682), introduced on June 8 with the sponsorship of 10 of the 14 GOP members of the Education and Labor Committee. It is

believed that the Republican alternative has the support of many Democrats as well. It calls for an appropriation of \$1.7 billion for fiscal 1968, compared to the \$2.06 billion called for by the Administration bill. This economy is made possible by the abolition of the OEO as the central agency of the poverty program, and the scattering of its present functions among other government agencies; and by seeking to stimulate greater anti-poverty efforts in the private sector.

The General Board of the National Council of Churches, meeting on February 21, resolved that in its judgment "the OEO represents an essential spearhead in the war on poverty," and called for support of the funding of that agency in the coming fiscal year at no less than the Administration request. Representatives of other responsible religious bodies, including the United States Catholic Conference and the Synagogue Council of America, agree with this judgment.

Our first concern, which we hope you share, is that the appropriations for the anti-poverty program be adequate. This surely is not the time to reduce funds for this crucial effort to eradicate poverty. Rather we need patience and continued financial support in a battle that will not be won in a short time. The importance of this battle for our nation and its people would justify a substantial increase, rather than a reduction, in the appropriations.

Our second concern is that OEO continue as the central agency of the anti-poverty thrust. Although the Republican proposal seems to commend itself in terms of logic and sound organization, its effect would be to scatter the government's programs just when there is need to further coordinate them under the Director of the OEO. Moreover, the OEO has become the symbol of the War on Poverty. To abolish it would be a serious mistake.

Our third concern is for the retaining of the aspect of the anti-poverty program which is the most controversial, the Community Action program with its basic emphasis upon "maximum feasible participation of the residents of the areas and the members of the groups to be served." This principle is the cutting-edge of the anti-poverty program, for it spells the difference between the dispensing of charity and the extension of democracy. But it points to the acquisition of political and social power by a great mass of people hitherto silent and passive. That this prospect is not to be welcomed by many in power today is demonstrated by the persistent troubles OEO has had with local political officials across the land. Nevertheless, we are convinced that the principle of participation of the poor in making decisions which affect their lives is essential to an effective War on Poverty. This fact is underscored by the riots that have been raging recently in a number of our cities. Certainly the hopelessness of poverty is a major ingredient in such explosions. But people are not likely to destroy programs in the planning and implementation of which they have had a part.

We urge that you express your concerns now on these and other issues with regard to the War on Poverty. Write or talk to your own Congressman; and write to the members of the House Education and Labor Committee, a list of whom is enclosed in this mailing.

HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE, AND
MAJOR CITIES IN THEIR DISTRICTS
DEMOCRAT

Carl D. Perkins (7-Ky; Ashland).
Edith Green (3-Ore; Portland).

Frank Thompson (4-N.J.; Ewing, Hamilton, New Hanover, Phillipsburg, Princeton, Trenton).

Elmer J. Holland (20-Pa; Braddock, Clairton, Duquesne, Munhall, North Braddock, North Versailles, Pittsburgh, West Mifflin).

John H. Dent (21-Pa; Greensburg, Hemp-

field, Jeannette, Monessen, New Kensington).

Roman Pucinski (11-Ill; Chicago, Norridge, Park Ridge).

Dominick V. Daniels (14-N.J.; Harrison, Hoboken, Jersey City, Kearny, North Bergen, Union City, West New York).

John Brademas (3-Ind; LaPorte, Michigan City, Mishawaka, South Bend).

James G. O'Hara (12-Mich; Detroit, Lynwood, South Gate, Willow Brook).

Hugh L. Carey (15-N.Y.; Brooklyn).

Sam M. Gibbons (6-Fla; Tampa).

William D. Ford (15-Michigan; Allen Park, Garden City, Lincoln Park).

William D. Hathaway (2-Maine; Auburn, Bangor, Lewiston).

Patsy T. Mink (A.L.; Hawaii).

James H. Scheuer (21-N.Y.; Bronx).

Lloyd Meeds (2-Wash; Bellingham, Everett).

Philip Burton (5-Calif; San Francisco).

Augustus Hawkins (21-Calif; Los Angeles).

Carl Albert (3-Okla; Ardmore).

REPUBLICAN

William H. Ayres (13-O; Akron, Barberton, Cuyahoga Falls).

Albert H. Quile (1-Minn; Austin, Rochester, South St. Paul, W. St. Paul).

Charles E. Goodell (38-N.Y.; Corning, Dunkirk, Jamestown).

Alphonzo Bell (28-Calif; Burbank, Los Angeles, Manhattan Beach).

Ogden R. Reid (26-N.Y.; Harrison, Mamaroneck, Mt. Vernon, New Rochelle, Port Chester, Rye).

Edward J. Gurney (5-Fla; Orlando, Winter Park).

John N. Erlenborn (14-Ill; Addison, Downer's Grove, Elmhurst, Glen Ellyn, Joliet, Lombard, Naperville, Villa Park, Wheaton).

William J. Scherle (7-Iowa; Council Bluffs).

John R. Dellenbach (4-Ore; Eugene, Medford, Springfield).

Marvin L. Esch (2-Mich; Adrian, Ann Arbor, Eastlawn, Monroe).

Edwin D. Eschleman (16-Pa; Lancaster).

James C. Gardner (4-N.C.; Raleigh).

William A. Steiger (6-Wisc; Appleton, Fond du Lac, Neenah, Oshkosh, Sheboygan).

OKLAHOMA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,

Oklahoma City, Okla., July 28, 1967.

To Members of the House Education and Labor Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

We the undersigned, having had a long standing concern for and involvement with persons in poverty, especially agricultural migrants, wish to share with you our deep concern over proposed amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act.

We have been heartened in the past two years by the vigorous beginning on the part of the federal government toward meeting its responsibility to eradicate poverty among its citizens. We concur wholeheartedly with the goal of the preamble of the Economic Opportunity Act: "to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty in this nation by opening to everyone the opportunity to live in decency and dignity". We have been impressed not only by the stated goal, but by the initial steps taken toward the achievement of that goal. A multiplicity of programs, reaching all age groups and a vast diversity of needs among the poor, have been not only conceived but rapidly put into action. While we have not, of course, always been completely in accord with OEO programs and approaches, we must commend that office for its excellent overall performance in a frontier program.

However remarkable the achievements of OEO, we are always painfully aware of the need for even greater effort and often grow impatient with the progress of OEO. We can therefore understand and sympathize with those Congressmen who also show signs of impatience. We are concerned, however, that

the results of this understandable impatience be constructive, leading to greater progress, rather than destructive, leading to a slowdown of effort. We are concerned to hear talk of diminishing needed appropriations precisely at the time when appropriations must be kept adequate. We are concerned to see a bill introduced which would do away with OEO, scattering its work throughout different sections of the Government, precisely at the time when greater coordination and authority are needed.

We are a nation accustomed to rapid tangible progress. And progress toward the elimination of poverty is often neither swift nor tangible, due to the peculiar characteristics of poverty. People in poverty are the victims of years and sometimes generations of hopelessness, dependency and isolation from the mainstream of the nation's steps forward. Such an inheritance has had its negative impact not only on the immediate economic situation of the poverty person, but upon his respect for himself, his perception of his resources, and therefore his resolve and ability to take advantage of opportunities. Eradicating poverty does not consist merely of providing the impoverished person with a house, a job, or food on the table; these are necessary but not sufficient.

The true eradication of poverty lies in the eradication of this hopelessness, dependency and isolation. Such changes occur inwardly, and like all inner transfer actions, occur not only invisibly, but awkwardly, stressfully, and very, very slowly. Unfortunately, we can see only a few of the outward manifestations of such changes in statistical charts in two years.

Past legislation on anti-poverty has shown that Congress understands the problems of poverty quite well. We are sure, therefore, that reason and good judgment will prevail over any destructive effects of impatience. We have observed in the past the capacity of Congress for patience. We have seen Congress patiently wait years to see the completion of a dam or a system of highways. We have seen Congress postulate decades to reach the moon. We are confident, therefore, that members of Congress will resist any hasty action which will be detrimental to the integrity and forward progress of the nation's war on poverty.

Respectfully submitted,

Members of Commission on Migrant and Related Ministries, Oklahoma Council of Churches; Dr. Roderick E. Gray, Superintendent, Oklahoma-Texas Conference, Evangelical United Brethren Church, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Mrs. Harold Nordman, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Rev. Kenneth Forshee, Chairman of the Commission, Oklahoma City; Mr. Maurice Mahan, President, Associated Christian Ministries, Inc., Altus, Okla.; Rev. Don English, Pastor, Grace Methodist Church, Altus, Okla.; Rt. Rev. Frederick Putman, Suffragan Bishop, Diocese of Oklahoma, Protestant Episcopal Church, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Rev. Earl N. Kragnes, Executive Director, Oklahoma Council of Churches, Oklahoma City, Okla.

UNITED CHURCH WOMEN, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A.,

New York, N.Y., July 28, 1967.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: On July 14, 1967, as Vice President of the Church Women United, I appeared before the House Committee on Education and Labor in support of H.R. 8311.

While the Hearings were in progress, the Church Women United were holding their Triennial Ecumenical Assembly at Purdue University. Represented at the Assembly were state organizations of the Church Women

United and National women's denominational organizations representing 26 major Protestant and Orthodox Churches.

On July 16, 1967, the Assembly passed the attached Resolution supporting the Job Corps and Office of Economic Opportunity. I should appreciate the inclusion of the Resolution in the record of the House Hearings on H.R. 8311 immediately following my testimony.

Sincerely,

EDNA SINCLAIR,
(For Mrs. George B. Martin,
Church Women United).

TRIENNIAL ECUMENICAL ASSEMBLY OF CHURCH WOMEN UNITED RESOLUTION

Since it is now possible for the first time in history to eliminate poverty, as Christians we have a clear and compelling mandate to support even stronger efforts than have yet been made towards this end.

Our experience with thousands of girls in poverty throughout the country leads us to the conviction that the Job Corps program is absolutely essential if this generation of disadvantaged girls is to receive adequate assistance.

Believing that the essential coordination of all services for the poor and the continuing necessary innovations in these programs and services can be accomplished only through a single administrative agency, we support the Office of Economic Opportunity as that agency.

Therefore, Church Women United, Assembled in Lafayette, Indiana, July 16, 1967, urge members of our Congress to support the Economic Opportunity Bill and further urge our members as individuals and as groups to make known their support of this Bill.

Approved unanimously by the 2,000

Delegates to the Triennial Ecumenical Assembly of Church Women United, Assembled on July 16, 1967.

FOSTORIA CORP.,

Fostoria, Ohio, July 26, 1967.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. MINK: As both a fellow citizen and a businessman, I feel compelled to write you expressing my growing concern about the current House debate concerning the War on Poverty.

I personally have followed closely for some three years the formation and operation of this program. I believe it is one of the truly significant contributions of our generation to meet one of the oldest and most difficult problems that has always plagued mankind.

I am gratified today to see most of the OEO's pioneering programs now showing both tangible results and increasing public acceptance. The question today does not seem to be whether these programs should be continued, but rather could they not be done better or more economically by dispersal of the OEO functions to other agencies?

This is an entirely reasonable question deserving careful analysis. In this regard, the following related questions are pertinent:

1. Will better planning and coordination result?

Poverty is a tremendously complex problem with many interrelated efforts required to deal with its causes. The overall planning and coordination of these many programs clearly requires a special effort such as the OEO.

2. Will better programs result?

The OEO with its singleness of purpose and sole responsibility has come up with some novel and effective approaches to reach the causes of poverty—these transcend the specific areas of responsibility of the various departments. Although the OEO has had its shortcomings, its "batting average" has been very high on creative and worthwhile pro-

grams, particularly in view of the uncharted seas in which it is navigating.

3. Will lower costs result?

In my judgment, the sense of purpose plus the management and coordination functions of the OEO are worth many times the modest administrative overhead involved. Without the overall direction provided by the OEO, the monies expended by various departments each going their own way would result in far greater confusion, duplication, and less effective use of public funds. To me, the OEO performs the most important function of analyzing the "cost effectiveness" of various potential programs and allocating the limited funds authorized by Congress to the most promising activities.

In our manufacturing business we estimate it takes three years for a new product to reach the profitable stage. Certainly a complex pioneering program such as the War on Poverty, now showing tangible results, can be expected to take much longer to reach maximum effectiveness.

It does seem likely that with the passage of years after the pioneering period is largely concluded, the function of the OEO can be reduced or eliminated. But I must conclude that elimination of the OEO function now would be a major and likely fatal blow to our chances of succeeding in this great endeavor.

My plea to you is therefore to support the continuance of the OEO for at least several more years. I do believe its activities should be constructively evaluated and modified by Congress where necessary for greater effectiveness. But to strike it down today just as it is showing real results would in my view be a tragedy to our country.

I will welcome your reaction to the above thoughts.

Respectfully,

R. H. CARTER.

THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC
ILLUMINATING CO.,
June 22, 1967.

HON. PATSY MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: As you know, a large number of businessmen are serving on the local councils of the Community Action Programs throughout the country.

The members of the Business Leadership Advisory Council to the Office of Economic Opportunity have felt for some time that these businessman participants in the Community Action Programs should be called together to exchange ideas, reflect constructive criticism and present their views to the staff of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

This was done last week and I had the pleasure of chairing a meeting of more than 50 such businessmen in an all-day session in Washington. I enclose the list of those who attended.

At the close of the session several of those present suggested that the group should reflect its views on the pending legislation in the Congress affecting the Office of Economic Opportunity. As a result of this discussion in which many people participated, the enclosed resolution was presented and unanimously adopted.

I thought you would be vitally interested in the views of businessmen who are closest to the Community Action Program attack on poverty.

Cordially yours,

RALPH M. BESSE.

A RESOLUTION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE COMMUNITY ACTION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE BUSINESS LEADERSHIP ADVISORY COUNCIL CHAIRED BY RALPH M. BESSE, CHAIRMAN, CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING CO.

Whereas those in attendance at this meeting are representatives of a variety of business interests throughout the Nation;

And whereas we are actively engaged in the War on Poverty through service on Community Action boards and through private efforts to alleviate poverty in our own communities;

And whereas we are vitally interested in the continued success of the Community Action Program;

We therefore strongly recommend:

(1) that the Office of Economic Opportunity, whose work is really just beginning, remain intact and that it be the central organization to lead the efforts in the War on Poverty.

(2) that the funds recommended in the President's message to Congress for the Office of Economic Opportunity effort for the coming year be passed by Congress.

(3) that this include the maximum amount of versatile funds for Community Action.

PITNEY-BOWES, INC.,

Stamford, Conn., July 19, 1967.

STATEMENT OF W. H. WHEELER, JR., CHAIRMAN, PITNEY-BOWES, INC., STAMFORD, CONN., RE WAR ON POVERTY

I should like to go on record as a strong supporter of the War on Poverty and, in particular, OEO. I have taken quite an active interest in it over a period of time, starting primarily with my activities as Chairman of the National Corporations Participation Committee of the United Funds and Councils of America. I am a member of our local OEO Committee here in Stamford as well as the OEO Advisory Committee.

I hope the total amount of funds will not be reduced, regardless of whether the local contribution is to be ten or twenty per cent. I do favor the former because local funds are extremely hard to come by and yet I think the War on Poverty itself is certainly of equal importance or more to the war in Vietnam. This is a job which we have simply got to lick if we are going to make this country what it is supposed to be.

Furthermore, I think rather than decrease the control of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the control should be strengthened. There is nothing more confusing to a local community than to have several different agencies of the Federal Government tackling the same sort of a problem in different ways. It causes confusion and plays directly into the hands of those who say, "Well what can you expect of the Federal Government? They ought to be out of it entirely." There is great need for coordination at the local level.

I have been pleasantly surprised to see how efficient our own local operation has been, and despite the fact that this is blazing an entirely new trail, and there is very little past experience to go on. I don't question but what mistakes have been made, but I think we are learning fast.

A NEW TWIST IN POLL TAKING

Mr. MONTGOMERY. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, as a former broadcaster, I have been most impressed by Television Instant Poll, an intriguing new method for sampling the national pulse on key issues.

The poll, begun last February on a local basis by station WFIL-TV in Philadelphia, has now been implemented by 35 stations under WFIL's guidance, with more joining every week. In Washington,

the feature is carried by WMAL-TV, Channel 7.

The basic formula is quite simple: Audiences are questioned on the early evening news show, and the results are announced on the late evening news show.

What makes this poll different from others is the huge volume of votes that can be recorded within 3 hours because of special telephone equipment that does not jam a switchboard. Votes are cast by dialing a number, and can be recorded at the rate of 12,000 ballots per hour for every phone unit installed.

Realizing the value of turning this local opinion device into a national instrument, WFIL-TV secured agreement from 14 stations to ask the same question on the same night.

On October 9, audiences in Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Utah were asked: Should the bombing of North Vietnam be stopped immediately? The result was 38 percent in favor of halting the bombing and 62 percent opposed.

WFIL-TV, which coordinated the balloting and distributed the results to all participating stations, is now underwriting this national vote once a month. At least 30 major markets will participate in the November question. With an average of 75,000 votes per station, this means that 2 million people will express their opinion on some vital topic.

The WFIL management has performed a true public service, both in developing the instant poll technique and in then putting it to such wide and valuable use.

MAKING JOB PROGRAMS WORK

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the sentiments expressed in a recent Los Angeles Times editorial that:

The most urgent target in the poverty war is unemployment, for no slum dweller can achieve the objectives of independence and dignity so long as he must rely upon welfare payments.

I am also in agreement, Mr. Speaker, with the work of my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. HAWKINS] who is endeavoring to insure effective coordination between the various job-training programs. It is encouraging to note that the Los Angeles Times has devoted itself to consideration of this important subject in the following editorial:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Oct. 17, 1967]

MAKING JOB PROGRAMS WORK

Surely the most urgent target in the Poverty War is unemployment, for no slum dweller can achieve the objectives of independence and dignity so long as he must rely upon welfare payments.

Yet far too many job training programs

are missing the mark—or failing to make maximum use of available money and opportunities.

Congress already has expressed its dismay and disapproval at the situation. A House subcommittee will hold hearings in Los Angeles next week to determine how local efforts can be made more effective.

One member of the subcommittee, Rep. Augustus Hawkins (D-Los Angeles), who represents much of the local poverty area, believes that too many funds are spent on experimental programs, as opposed to proven projects.

Hawkins, according to his special assistant, Charles Knox, also objects to what he considers an excessive emphasis upon recreational programs. He is extremely critical of the failure of the various participating agencies to coordinate their plans and programs more effectively.

The Times has not always agreed with Rep. Hawkins' comments upon anti-poverty efforts. But his criticisms in this instance appear to have great validity.

An example he cited is the so-called Concentrated Employment Program (CEP), a new experiment in Los Angeles County intended to provide training "slots" for 2,000 persons in poverty areas. The Labor Department was sufficiently impressed by the CEP concept to combine pieces of existing programs to form a "package" totaling \$8,635,417.

As of Oct. 11, however, only a small fraction were employed under the program, according to Supervisor Kenneth Hahn. "Red tape and bureaucratic buck-passing" were blamed by Hahn for the hang-ups in the program. He warned that the appropriation "will be used up in administrative costs rather than helping the poor."

The CEP will be one of the items on the House subcommittee's agenda, along with other programs that members feel have not yet measured up to their potential.

The subcommittee, however, will also find that one highly controversial antipoverty program—the Teen Posts—has taken a new tack toward job training.

"We've found out that just getting the kids in off the streets to shoot pool isn't enough," said William Elkins, new director of the Teen Post program.

The change in emphasis from recreation to employment results from a shift among the Teen Post members themselves. These teen-agers, Elkins explained, have "begun to think in terms of jobs and training."

Their new attitude is encouraging indeed. But it will lead to even greater frustration and bitterness if the community is not able to provide meaningful programs of job preparation and training.

The objectives of the War on Poverty are far too important and the price of failure far too great to tolerate inefficiency and jurisdictional disputes in employment programs for the poor.

DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL PROJECT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. TIERNAN] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable continuing debate on the Dickey-Lincoln School project for which the House of Representatives denied further planning funds 2 weeks ago.

I have had considerable mail from my

district indicating a great interest in this project and expressing a desire that Congress assist to bring about lower electric power rates in New England. Mr. Paul Boghossian, president of the Concordia Manufacturing Co., a textile plant in Coventry, R.I., writes—and I quote:

Our company made a comprehensive review of power rates recently and we found that Rhode Island power costs in Rhode Island are running about 66% more than comparable investor-owned power charges elsewhere. There is no question that the tremendous premiums industry has had to pay for power has been one of the reasons the New England economy has not grown at the rate that other areas have grown.

If public power were introduced into the New England area, this might tend to offer a rate structure which the investor-owned utilities would be required to follow and enable industry and consumers alike to enjoy competitive power rates in line with the national average and with other sections of this country.

Mr. Boghossian eloquently points out the dilemma of many New England industrial concerns. He is obviously most concerned about the future development of New England. Unfortunately, the action of the House with respect to Dickey-Lincoln gives little comfort and encouragement for the expansion of business in New England and also gives little hope to the millions of New Englanders who use electric power and heat in their homes.

I am hopeful that the House will reconsider its position with respect to this project so that we in New England will some day be the beneficiary of reasonable electric power rates.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, I include three editorials from the Providence Journal as part of my remarks:

[From the Providence (R.I.) Evening Bulletin, Oct. 14, 1967]

PUBLIC UTILITY RATES

The fact that over the last 25 years many champions of the public interest have sought regional utility rate control helps to underscore a point made before the New England Regional Commission, namely, that regional control remains a valid, much-needed goal from the public's point of view.

New England citizens take comfort in assurances that public utility administrators and consumer protection councils adequately can defend public interest in, say, the region's electric power rate structure. These assurances cannot be firmly supported. Congressional testimony has confirmed misgivings that state public utility divisions in the region have neither the staff nor the expertise competently to analyze whether rate structures are unjustly high. In a word, the public relies on a weak state-by-state protection of its interests, while the utility interests rely on a highly efficient regional arrangement of holding companies and interlocking directorships.

Time and again, Rhode Island consumers have seen how impressively the utility interests can mobilize its economists, engineers, and accountants in a massive presentation of data to support a rate case. Too frequently, the public utilities administrator has all he can do simply to understand a case, let alone to act as arbiter between company and public interests. Too frequently, state administrators, knowing that company versions of its investment, income, depreciation, and expenses as rate base elements, should be items of controversy, simply must pass over these items for lack of experts who can challenge the company.

Rates are changed, and consumers ask, as they have done many times over the years in New England, why is it that the consumer who buys electric power from one company—power which it bought from a second company—pays less than the consumer who buys power directly from the producing company. Occasionally the Federal Power Commission has stepped into situations of this kind and ordered that the costs to consumers be allotted more equitably.

Public utility corporate structure, financing and methods of rate setting are highly intricate, and the companies understandably are completely up to the minute on these intricacies in order to provide the greatest possible return to investors.

New England regional representatives have been told again—and forcibly—that basic readjustments are essential if consumers are to be protected adequately and if the region is not to discourage new industry by high electric power costs.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, Oct. 21, 1967]

DICKEY-LINCOLN PLEA

The three Northern New England governors have joined in a plea to congressmen from this region urging that they reverse their votes and go along with approval of planning funds for the Dickey-Lincoln School Dam. It was disappointing not to see the other three New England governors join in this plea.

The hydro-electric dam on the upper St. John River in Northern Maine is a project that will benefit nearly all of New England. While its huge reservoir of power would be intended mostly for the Boston metropolitan area, this reserve would ease demands on other facilities throughout the southern half of the region.

A project involving a dam 300 feet high and producing about 700,000 kilowatts of power, Dickey-Lincoln School is truly a New England project. It is discouraging to promoters of New England regional cooperation to see the region badly split on the issue of public power—the first big public power project the region has ever come near to getting. As an example of the value of the project in terms of measuring private power company performance, Maine power companies this fall have announced rate reductions totaling one million dollars a year; Maine public officials are sure this is a direct benefit of the Dickey-Lincoln School project, even before its construction is assured.

Fourteen New England congressmen voted against planning funds for the dam when the huge public works bill came before the House earlier this year. Now that the Senate has restored the funds, another vote will be necessary. We hope the congressmen will give the project a chance, even if three governors, for reasons of their own, have not seen fit to plead for approval.

[From the Providence Journal, Oct. 28, 1967]

DICKEY-LINCOLN FUNDS

The strangest part of the repeated House vote against funds for planning the Dickey-Lincoln School hydro power project in Northern Maine is that the opposing congressmen have made no attempt to vote against public power projects in other regions of the country. The House vote to kill the Senate-House compromise appropriation of only 875 thousand dollars was 236 to 162, a fairly decisive margin. Yet many other projects in the 4.6 billion dollar public works (and Atomic Energy Commission) bill sailed through without any challenge at all.

Senator Muskie of Maine cannot be blamed for voting to hold up the entire bill, with its myriad of projects for virtually every one of the state, until the House relents on the Dickey Dam. But the fact is that he has been undercut right in his own New England re-

gion. While all the senators and congressmen of traditionally conservative Maine, both Democrats and Republicans, have fought for the huge, 700,000 kilowatt power project, a majority of the congressmen in the other New England states, Democrats and Republicans alike, have consistently voted in opposition.

There is no question that New England's first big public power project has been fought relentlessly by the private power companies. Senator Muskie went even further. He said that several members of House and Senate had told him lobbying against the project by private power companies nationwide was "the most vicious they have ever experienced." The nation has been treated to the ironic spectacle of legislators from other parts of the country voting for a New England project that New Englanders themselves sought to kill. Had New England been united, others would have had less excuse for a negative vote.

The Dickey-Lincoln School dams and power stations would not be cheap at perhaps 380 million dollars. But they would provide needed power at heavy-load periods of the day and, more particularly, they would provide the public power yardstick for measuring the cost of private power installations in the region that has the highest power rates in the country. Nobody has denied this. Moreover, in their fear of the Dickey project, or in their zeal to head it off, the private companies have been finding ways to grant rate reductions worth millions of dollars. The reductions always seem to come when the project is up for another modest allotment of planning funds.

The only heartening factor in the setback of the Dickey project Wednesday was the vote of both Rhode Island congressmen for it. Congressman Tiernan felt some of the information put out by the private utilities was "misleading and harmful" to New England's interests. It is too bad that all of the region's 25 congressmen could not have been as solicitous of the interests of New England's people.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, last Friday Defense Secretary McNamara announced that Russia was testing a new weapon which could bomb the United States from outer space as early as next year. Our esteemed Secretary of Defense is also reported as saying:

I am not concerned about the new development.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps Mr. McNamara is not concerned, but I want you to know that I am concerned—quite concerned—and so are millions of people in this country.

Mr. McNamara tells us that a new radar going into operation would not be accurate enough to destroy the U.S. Minuteman ICBM bases. Therefore, Mr. McNamara points out, the U.S. deterrence is not reduced.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could say I have complete confidence in the views stated by our Secretary of Defense. But I cannot. How can anyone have confidence in this man, under whose guiding hand this great Nation of ours is becoming the

second most powerful nation of the world?

In January of 1961, the United States held a strategic superiority of 10 to 1 over the Soviet Union. At the start of this year, our missile and bomber lead shrank to less than 4 to 1 and overall, our lead in total megatonnage was cut to 2 to 1. Now the experts tell us that by 1971, Russia will have nearly 50,000 megatons of strategic delivery capability while the United States will drop to 15,000 megatons.

On December 7 of last year, Mr. McNamara admitted that the United States had underestimated the growth of the Soviet Union's ICBM's. But did that worry our Secretary of Defense? No. He scuttled plans for a new long-range bomber—dismantled the Army Reserve, cut our bomber fleet down to 600, while more than 1,000 bombers were scrapped and not replaced. He abandoned our missile bases on the borders of the Soviet Union and gave the Russians a commanding lead in antimissile defenses by postponing a start on our own antimissile defense.

How much confidence can you have in a man who said on January 26 that his studies show that the Russians, by building more and more missiles, could overcome Nike X defenses in an all-out attack and kill 120 million Americans? And then blithely adds:

I have grave doubts on the advisability of our deploying the Nike-X system for the protection of our cities.

His stand is, of course, contrary to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who argue that millions of Americans could be saved, and that it is far better to try than to give up.

And, Mr. Speaker, that is seemingly the direction that our Secretary of Defense is taking—giving up and in to the Soviet Union.

This feeling of passiveness has even seeped down to the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Cyrus R. Vance, who gave this reply to a question by Charles W. Cordry, Jr., of the Baltimore Sun on the "Meet the Press" program of May 28, 1967:

Mr. CORDRY. Mr. Secretary, did your answer to Mr. Evans mean that you are unalterably opposed ever to building an anti-ballistic missile system designed against the Russian threat?

Mr. VANCE. Yes. Insofar as I personally am concerned, I think it makes absolutely no sense.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, are these the kind of men who should be in charge of our national security?

During his tenure as Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara has made many public statements that are eyebrow raising, to say the least, for a man in his position. Who can forget his intelligent remark in 1963 when he said:

I have no evidence that Cuba is being used as a base for subversion against other Latin American countries.

Three months later, the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee reported:

The evidence is overwhelming that Castro is supporting, aiding and abetting Communist revolutionary and subversive movements throughout the Western Hemisphere.

But Mr. McNamara came up with his alltime high eyebrow raising statement when he said the Soviet Union did not violate the space treaty because the space weapons would be fired "in a fractional orbit, not a full orbit."

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is this the kind of statement for the Secretary of Defense for the United States to be making?

Is Mr. McNamara actually that naive to believe that the Soviet Union would ever live up to the exact wording of any treaty or pact? Has not Mr. McNamara ever looked into the past history of our agreements with the Soviet Union?

It is my understanding that the treaty does not define the meaning of the term "orbit." It simply forbids signatory nations from placing "in orbit around the earth any objects carrying nuclear weapons of mass destruction."

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, if, when and ever the Soviet Union places one of their orbital bombs into the sky, I will rely on the comforting words of Mr. McNamara that the Soviet Union isn't breaking any treaty while—heaven forbid—our cities are destroyed.

And I am sure it will be a comforting thought to the victims, too, that the Soviet Union is not fudging on the treaty.

As Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara has made one blunder after another: the TFX fiasco; the aircraft carrier *John F. Kennedy* where McNamara overruled the Navy, the Atomic Energy Commission, and others because his cost effectiveness studies convinced him that the *John F. Kennedy* would be a better buy as a conventional oil-burning carrier than nuclear powered.

As Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara has refused to listen to the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the Vietnam war and it has proved costly to this Nation in the matter of lives and money.

His computerized theories and decisions have cost this country greatly.

I wonder today how Mr. McNamara can justify his statement which was made in San Francisco on September 18, 1967.

Is the Soviet Union seriously attempting to acquire a first-strike capability against the United States?

Although this is a question we cannot answer with absolute certainty, we believe the answer is no.

Yet 46 days later, the Secretary of Defense announces that the Soviet Union is testing a weapon which could bomb the United States in 1968.

Mr. Speaker, the American public has been asked too long to accept any more judgment decisions of Mr. McNamara. I have stated many times in my monthly newsletters to my constituents and in my weekly news releases to the newspapers in my State of Nevada, that McNamara must go.

I repeat it again today. The President should rid himself of McNamara.

Last week, the President urged the people of this country to write their Congressman urging their voting for a surcharge tax.

Today, I am urging the people of this great Nation to write the President demanding that he fire our Secretary of Defense, Robert Strange McNamara.

EXAMPLES OF IMPROVED MAN-POWER MANAGEMENT IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government have reported to the Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee savings in excess of \$41 million for the first 6 months of this year through improved uses of personnel and equipment. Likewise, during this same 6-month period, 11,600 vacant civil service positions were abolished. This, too, represents a sizable savings.

Examples of improved work techniques and overall better management are:

The Army's Anniston Depot has developed new work standards. By applying these standards 41 man-years were saved, over \$300,000 in salaries.

The U.S. Information Agency abolished one of its organizations, the Office of Private Cooperation, and the needed functions were placed in other offices. This action eliminated 12 jobs and will save \$159,000 annually.

The Treasury Department reviewed its paperwork and has eliminated 256 different forms. Actually, 85 of these forms were directly used by the public. Annual savings of over \$440,000 are predicted.

The subcommittee semiannually issues a report reflecting examples of improved management. The report for the period January through June 1967 is being released today. It also reveals employment data.

Comparing June 1966 with June 1967, civilian employment in the Federal Government increased by 243,400 or 8.8 percent. The major employment increases were in the military departments, 163,900, reflecting the war effort in Vietnam and the replacement of combat-qualified military men in support jobs with civil service personnel.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Alliance for Progress is a program dedicated to our realization of hemisphere responsibilities.

We are engaged in this program in our national interest and not principally to win the affection of our friends to the south.

However, our efforts are appreciated in the country of Panama. For the past 3 years President Marco A. Robles has dedicated himself to the principles of the

Alliance, working closely with our AID mission and utilizing its resources most wisely. He has utilized this assistance as it is intended to be used to create increasing social, economic, and political growth. That he is appreciative of our assistance is set forth in the following comments which he made in his state of the Union message before the National Assembly recently.

President Robles said:

My administration has had as one of its main objectives the promotion of economic growth. This explains the growth rate which we have obtained and which represents a highly satisfactory level within the objectives of the Alliance for Progress.

With the cooperation of international organizations we have made considerable progress in many projects. Thanks to the assistance of the Agency for International Development through the Rural Development Program we have promoted many activities which have resulted in effective instruments for improving rural living conditions and at the same time serve to increase production.

I think it is fair to acknowledge in this message my Government's appreciation for the technical and economic assistance received from international organizations, such as, the Alliance for Progress, the Agency for International Development, the United Nations Special Development Fund and the Food and Agriculture Organization. Please permit me to reiterate what I have stated on other occasions in the sense that, in Panama, the Alliance for Progress has achieved the goals and objectives indicated in the Charter of Punta del Este.

Also, as an example of the wonderful cooperation between Panama and ourselves, is the following annual report to the National Assembly by the Minister of Agriculture, Commerce and Industry, Rubén D. Carles, Jr. Minister Carles is an example of the new spirit which has arisen in Latin America. He is one of the growing group of public officials totally dedicated to the Alliance for Progress and fully cognizant to its ability to minister to the problems of his people.

Minister Carles stated:

We have maintained a close relationship with the Alliance for Progress and the Agency for International Development. From these organizations we have received the most dedicated and enthusiastic cooperation not only in the form of technical assistance, but also financial assistance and supplies. In the case of the Ministry of Agriculture, Commerce and Industry, I must say that similar to other Government Agencies and Institutions, the Alliance for Progress has been a reality which has provided the Panamanians the opportunity of working "shoulder to shoulder" with officials of this organization. Together we have achieved some of the objectives outlined and set as goals and we continue to prepare new projects.

At all times the Agency for International Development has given full cooperation to the Ministry of Agriculture and this is evident in the work and results obtained in the development of the rural areas in the country. We should present here our recognition to Messrs. Charles W. Adair, Ambassador of the United States, and James Megellas, U.S. AID Director in Panama.

These are only a few examples as to what is happening in many countries in Latin America. It is my hope that the flame of the spirit of reform which we have helped to light in Latin America through the Alliance for Progress will

continue to be supported by the United States.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON—A GREAT STATESMAN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely interested in an article entitled "Unpolitical Behavior" appearing in the November 3 issue of the Wall Street Journal. This article raised the question as to why President Johnson is staunchly sticking with three very unpopular stands—he refuses to compromise his Vietnam policy, he continues to talk about satisfying the needs and aspirations of slum dwellers and not of repressing the rioters, he continues to push for a tax increase instead of slashing his domestic programs.

The question has so often been asked—Why? The article points out that these stands are contrary to Lyndon Johnson, the so-called compleat politician. Several reasons were offered: First, the President is unaware of the evidence that such stands are unpopular or that he refuses to believe such evidence; second, the President realizes the unpopularity of his actions but can do nothing about them; and third, the President and his advisers are misreading history. Alternatively, it is suggested that President Johnson so firmly believes that his policies are right that he is pursuing them regardless of the consequences at the polls or in the history books. To accept this latter explanation would be to violate the image of Johnson as the "compleat politician."

I suggest to my colleagues that it is time we all discarded the myth of President Johnson as the "compleat politician." It is long overdue. Undoubtedly the President of the United States must be a politician. He must respond to those who, in good faith, placed him in office. At the same time, we, as the electorate, must recognize that a President has a greater responsibility than just responding to the dictates of the polls. A President of integrity must provide leadership and direction for a nation.

Granted, a politician would respond to the dictates of the polls. The "compleat politician" would withdraw immediately from Vietnam—disregarding all the consequences. He would call for repressive measures for rioters and turn his back on the festering and explosive ills of our cities. He would allow this country to continue its perilous path toward inflation by forgetting about a tax increase—leaving the economy in shambles for the next man in office. That, my friends, is what a so-called practical politician would do.

That a statesman would never do—regardless of the unpopularity of his alternatives. A statesman lets polls charter his course only if he believes such polls to be in the best interest of his country.

I, for one, am glad that President Johnson is not the "compleat politician." I say thank God President Lyndon B. Johnson is not the "compleat politician." I say thank God he is a leader and not a drifter. President Johnson is investing in the future of this country. All of us have a stake in the returns on this investment.

So that my colleagues might read this excellent article from the Wall Street Journal, I would like to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 3, 1967]

UNPOLITICAL BEHAVIOR

(By Alan L. Otten)

WASHINGTON.—Everyone knows that Lyndon Johnson is the Compleat Politician. That everything he does is for political gain. That he rarely takes any step likely to cost him votes.

Yet right now the President is staunchly sticking with three major stands that—according to the polls, editorial comment, Congressional reaction and all other commonly accepted measures of voter response—are widely unpopular. He refuses to compromise his Vietnam policy; he still, despite the summer's riots, talks more of satisfying the needs and aspirations of slum dwellers than he does of repressing the rioters; he stubbornly resists efforts to combat inflation with deep cuts in domestic spending and instead insists on a large tax increase.

How come this political animal takes such evidently unpopular positions?

One explanation is simply that the White House either is not aware of the evidence or does not believe it. Increasingly, the President and his top lieutenants on the White House staff and in the Cabinet appear insulated from the rest of the nation. More and more they talk to each other, reassuring themselves of the wisdom and justice of their courses. What they read outside they dismiss as the niggling criticisms of an always-critical press or the petty complaints of frustrated liberals still not resigned to the rough Texan's presence in the White House.

The real America, Administration men assert, speaks through such groups as the one recently organized in support of present Vietnam policy with former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower as leading sponsors. The President and his aides display to White House visitors, and attempt to plant all through the Washington press corps, polls of their own showing LBJ decisively beating all Republican comers in New York, Pennsylvania and a swing county in New Hampshire.

Local Democratic leaders have reassured the White House (whether rightly or wrongly remains to be seen) that loyalists forces will remain firmly in control of state party machinery, and that peace-plank and dump-Johnson moves now being aggressively advanced by Democratic doves will not translate into primary victories or convention delegates—and, in fact, may backfire and create sympathy for the maligned President. The Administration has begun to try to sell itself in interviews and speeches, and LBJ lieutenants think this will raise the President's standing; still further and even more dramatic improvement will come, they are convinced once the Republicans nominate their candidate and the contest narrows to one against one.

Some State Department and Pentagon officials assure the President that unfolding events in Vietnam give cause for even greater political optimism. By November 1968, they insist it will be obvious to all but the most obtuse or most stubborn that the U.S. has in fact won the war, and that it's only a question of time—perhaps only a question of getting our election over and behind—before Hanoi sues for peace.

Administration urban experts similarly suggest that programs now under way provide at least some hope of getting through next summer without rioting as extensive or caustic as this year's.

And the economic team argues that when, for want of a tax increase, prices soar ever higher next fall, the President will at least be able to remind the country "I told you so."

Another possible explanation of the President's current courses is that he realizes their unpopularity but sees little he can do about it. Alternatives are difficult to devise and could turn out to be even riskier politically.

The ballot-box backlash might be even greater, for instance, if he sharply escalated military action in Vietnam and still failed to end the war. Or if he softened his negotiating stance too much and then the bargaining dragged on or, even worse, produced a settlement that quickly soured and permitted a Communist takeover. Republicans would have a field day attacking Mr. Johnson for letting Ho Chi Minh put one over on him, and demanding why so many American lives had to be sacrificed for so little result.

A get-tough-with-the-demonstrators line would risk loss of support among Negroes and sympathetic whites—and militant whites still prefer Alabama's George Wallace.

Deep spending cutbacks might help stem inflation, but might also produce political fallout among voters affected by the retrenchment; yet any runaway inflation, without at least some prior Administration effort to erect a barrier, would also be politically perilous.

Still a third possible explanation of the President's apparently atypical behavior is that he and his advisors are misreading history. They frequently note that the Presidents most commonly rated by historians as great or near-great, from Washington and Jefferson to Roosevelt and Truman, were constantly criticized and attacked by contemporaries—and they seem to draw from this the conclusion that sharp criticism and attack is almost a guarantee of the greatness of the man and the wisdom of his policies. The troubles and difficulties the President must endure now, these Johnsonians seem to suggest, merely ensure his glory niche in the history books.

Administration speechmakers bear down heavily on the theme that the intellectuals and the press have always fought with Presidents who seek to fulfill "national commitments"; this was the sole burden of Texas Governor John Connally's lengthy, impassioned defense of the President's Vietnamese policy at the recent governors' conference.

Certainly Mr. Johnson and his aides spend an incredibly large amount of time and talk these days recalling the trials of previous Presidents now counted among the nation's greatest. Friendly journalists reflect this White House line, with columns suggesting the parallel with Lincoln or Roosevelt or Truman. All this, of course, can be construed as an attempt to make the best of a bad lot—to bid for understanding and sympathy from today's voters and tomorrow's historians.

These are all critical explanations, of course. There's one other possible interpretation: That the President so firmly believes his policies are right that he is pursuing them regardless of the consequences at the polls or in the history books. The explanation, to be sure, violates the image of Johnson the Compleat Politician, but it could just conceivably be right.

THOUGHTS OF A WIFE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON] may extend his remarks at this point

in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share the touching, courageous, and prayerful "Thoughts of a Wife"—the wife of a soldier serving in Vietnam—with our colleagues and the readers of the RECORD.

These thoughts published in the Fayetteville Observer, Fayetteville, N.C., are placed in the RECORD at this point:

THOUGHTS OF A WIFE

The following was written by Mrs. Richard Clark of Fayetteville whose husband, Spec. 7 Richard Clark, is serving in Vietnam.

"Lord, don't let me forget—

Our last quick cup of coffee . . .

How handsome he looked—shined shoes, spotless, starched uniform—his boys waiting, forebodingly, by the front door.

Our goodbye kiss—so brave, sprinkled with sad smiles.

How he winked as he left!

"Lord, don't let me forget—

How the tears ran after he was gone.

Emptiness filled our house.

Children looked for daddy—not understanding, only wondering why he had to go. Waiting for his return at suppertime. But he didn't return!

"Lord, don't let me forget—

Looking at the barrenness of our room—now just my room—to cry in, to dream in, to worry in. Alone!

"Lord, don't let me forget—

The endless waiting, day after day, for the mailman.

The letters of love, of loneliness.

My concern when his letters didn't come . . .

His closeness when they did come!

"Lord, please don't let me forget—

The unshared growing up of our children.

The little tears, the little ills, the little smiles he missed.

The days when life was impossible.

The nights so quiet, when loneliness sat next to me, instead of him.

The mornings of breakfast alone and no kiss for him as he started his day. No kiss for me as I started mine.

The Saturdays of no shopping, no rushing, no chasing here and there.

The Sundays with no family ride, no big special dinner with everyone home.

The days when crisp Fall arrived, weary Winter came and sunny Spring passed on to simmering Summer.

The needing him hours.

The wanting him hours.

The loving him hours.

"Lord, please don't let me forget any of it: From the loneliness and despair to the waiting and worry.

And most of all—when he comes through our front door and winks and smiles and it's all over but the cheering—

"Don't let me forget, Lord—

It wasn't very pleasant for him either. Amen."

"THE THOUSAND HOUR DAY"

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the celebration of Poland's millennium as a Christian state in 1966 brought the work of many Polish writers to the attention of the Western World. In my opinion, the best of these is "The Thousand Hour Day" by W. S. Kuniczak, chosen by the Book of the Month Club as their June 1967 selection. This extraordinary historical novel takes place during the first thousand hours of World War II. The thousand hours in which Poland was invaded in the blitzkrieg.

It is a novel about the tragedy of a nation armed with little more than courage, resisting one of the most powerful military machines of modern times; about men and women who struggled through fearful days and nights to preserve the reality they believed in; about conquerors who are arrogant, frightened and destructive; about deliberately uncommitted observers, professional skeptics. In a broader sense it is a novel about conflict of values, conflicts that rage on, no matter who wins on the battlefield.

In "The Thousand Hour Day," W. S. Kuniczak has created a richly textured cast of characters and woven them into hours that spelled disaster for Poland. Here, living and dying in the heroic and often heartbreaking defense of their homeland, we get a very detailed picture of the character and spirit of the Polish people. The spirit to fight for freedom and the determined resistance to alien domination which has manifest itself so many times in Poland's long history.

The breadth of concept is reminiscent of Tolstoy at his best and W. S. Kuniczak is a master storyteller in the same tradition.

"The Thousand Hour Day" is an epic drama of the spirit of man and I commend it to my colleagues for their reading pleasure.

JOB CORPS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Economic Opportunity's Job Corps has been the subject of a great deal of criticism by a not-so-great, but active minority, and I think it is only just that we give equal time to the supporters of this program.

I should like to bring the attention of my colleagues to several letters written to Mr. William P. Kelly, Director of the Job Corps, to Mr. Sargent Shriver of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and to the editor of the New York Times. These letters express the views of two individuals who have personally visited the Acadia and Poland Spring Job Corps Centers in my home district in Maine.

In light of the fact that critics of a

program are more likely to vocalize their opposition than advocates are likely to express concurrence, I am especially proud to draw attention to the efforts and opinions of these public spirited Americans by having these letters printed in the RECORD at this point:

NEW CANAAN, CONN.,
August 1, 1967.

MR. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Antipoverty Program,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SHRIVER: My husband and I read of the idea of some Congressman that job corps people be trained in their immediate area for jobs available there.

Having really "scoured" Poland Spring, Me. Job Corps, we feel the idea repellent. The very mixing of young of all sorts, and from many areas is one of the best in the present plan. The spirit was wonderful, and we feel, as old teachers and social workers that the breadth, confidence, and much happiness prepare them for life and work, and we don't see why anything is lost if they get jobs different from their vocational choice. Please do fight this. We will, too.

(Mrs. T. J.) HELEN T. CRONIN.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
August 24, 1967.

EDITOR, NEW YORK TIMES,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: This letter is in reference to a recent visit I made to a "Job Corps Center" at Bar Harbor, Maine. I am writing this letter to remind you that these Centers exist and are doing, in my opinion, a fantastic job of helping those who "were" potential "news makers." The staff, as well as the corpsmen have taken troubled and/or neglected boys and instilled in them a hope for the future and have transformed them into men.

One could see some projects in various phases of completion, a huge gym, a re-built ambulance and areas being cleared for future projects, and I might add, extremely polite Corpsmen throughout the area.

It is most reassuring to know that there is at least one area where some portion of the tax dollar is being put to good use. However, it seems to me most strange that our Country, rich as it is, is wasting, surely not investing, untold billions in an "undeclared" war instead of investing it in the future by expanding the "Job Corps project," we should build, not kill.

Although the Job Corps may not be a "cure-all" for the prevention of racial strife, it sure is the best start. Buildings can always be repaired to be burned again, stores can be re-stocked to be broken into again. However, a re-built individual helps to build a better society, not destroy it. To re-build these individuals it is necessary to enlarge the present staffs and Centers, and I might also add, more Centers and publicity to inform the general public of the work being done.

Very truly yours,

EFRAIN ROSA.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
August 24, 1967.

MR. WILLIAM P. KELLY,
Director of Job Corps,
Dupont Circle Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: After a recent trip to the Acadia Center I felt that I had to write and thank you, and all involved, for a fantastic program. The Job Corps is, I believe, the best thing that has ever happened to our Country and I am sorry that no one had the foresight to think of this much earlier.

It is very difficult for me to put into words what I feel, so that I can only say, i.e., ask, that the Job Corps be expanded so that more boys can be helped, the present 120 boys at Acadia is far too small.

I would also like to point out that if it

hadn't been for Dr. Goldaber at Brooklyn College, I would have never known the existence of the Job Corps. Please advertise.

Thank you for your kind attention, I am
Very truly yours,

EFRAIN ROSA.

DICKEY-LINCOLN PROJECT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the public works and Atomic Energy Commission appropriation was returned to the Senate on October 25 with funds for further planning of the Dickey-Lincoln School power project deleted. The amount of \$875,000 was a compromise figure representing slightly over one-half of the budgeted amount of \$1,676,000. As yet the Senate has taken no action on the conference report, but presumably action will be taken some time before the end of the session and it is quite possible that the House will again have an opportunity to vote on funds for this worthwhile project.

I would like to call the attention of the Members who opposed the modest appropriation for this worthwhile project to an editorial which appeared in a leading Maine newspaper, the Waterville Sentinel, which points out the false economy of deleting these funds from the bill:

[From the Waterville (Maine) Morning Sentinel, Nov. 1, 1967]

IT COULD BE INCIDENTAL

The Dickey-Lincoln School power project is clinging to life only by the tips of its fingers because of the House of Representatives.

On the grounds of "economy" the House has knocked a modest \$875,000 item for Dickey out of a \$4.7 billion appropriations bill that is loaded with projects with considerable less public merit than Dickey.

The power industry is opposed to Dickey-Lincoln which, if it ever becomes a reality, would serve as a yardstick on power rates in the only region of the country that doesn't have a yardstick.

This is the reason that a majority of New England Congressmen knuckled under, not economy. If they had been interested in economy they would have substantially reduced the appropriations bill by deleting some other projects, projects that have a considerably smaller benefit-to-cost ratio than the Maine proposal.

Perhaps it is only incidental that the region has the highest electric rates in the country.

IN 1967—SOME POSITIVE STEPS TOWARD A BETTER WORLD BY CONGRESSMAN LEE H. HAMILTON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, for most of us in the fall of 1967 American foreign policy means Vietnam. There can be no argument that Vietnam is by far the most important element of American foreign policy today, but we ought not to be blinded because of it to other events of major international significance.

A more peaceful and orderly world will not come in a blinding flash—however fervently we might wish it would. Rather it will come step by agonizing step. Some of these positive steps have been taken in 1967, and I think they are worth calling to the attention of the Congress.

First. The Kennedy round: In the Kennedy round negotiations 53 nations agreed to broad and deep cuts in existing tariffs. This accord represents tariff reductions affecting about 60,000 items and more than \$40 billion annually in the world trade, and represented the most significant liberalization of international trade in history. Its major features included: first, a reduction of about one-third in world industrial tariffs over the 5-year period beginning January 1, 1968; second, liberalization of trade in agriculture; and third, a food aid program for the less developed countries. Through the Kennedy round, the movement toward lower trade barriers would continue, and the thrust toward free trade was increased.

Second. Rio Conference on international liquidity: The agreement in Rio de Janeiro this September 29 creates new international monetary assets. One hundred and six members of the International Monetary Fund unanimously approved a "special drawing rights" or SDR plan, advancing the most significant reform in the history of the organization. When the reform, also known as "paper gold" takes effect, it will create a monetary reserve used to supplement gold and permit for the first time the controlled growth of world monetary reserves. This monetary reform is the result of nearly 4 years of negotiations, primarily in the Group of Ten major trading nations, and represents the most important innovation in monetary reform since Bretton Woods.

This landmark agreement will have a beneficial impact for decades to come. World economic progress is, we hope, almost inevitable and this growth must be funded by assets that increase as the need for them increases. The significance of the agreement is that the international money supply will be managed. Greater international liquidity is essential for expanding the world economy, and the Rio conference has assured that international reserves will not be in short supply.

Third. Rio Conference agreement to increase IDA funds: Another positive development is the agreement in Rio to increase the funds of the International Development Association. The United States advocated a program for increasing the resources of this "easy loan" subsidiary of the International Bank. The Agency had received contributions from member states of \$250 million a year for the past 3 years. These resources have proven inadequate to meet the needs for funding international develop-

ment projects. The United States proposes an ascending scale of member contributions, \$600 million the first year, \$800 million the second, and \$1 billion the third with certain permissible delays in meeting contributory obligations in case of international balance of payments difficulties. Again this increased availability of international liquidity will permit the continued economic growth in those countries most in need.

Mr. Speaker, these foreign policy successes I have discussed thus far represent agreement between ourselves and many other countries. There are, in addition to these broad international agreements, various regional accords of great importance.

Fourth. Punta del Este decision to move toward economic integration in Latin America: On April 14, President Johnson and the chiefs of state of 18 other members of the Organization of American States met and agreed on an action program for achieving economic integration in the Americas. All the conferees, with the exception of the acting President of Ecuador, signed a "Declaration of the Presidents of America." Among the major points of the declaration was that a common market for Latin America would be established in 1970 and would be substantially in operation by 1985. President Johnson also made clear the willingness of the United States to help in this and other endeavors aimed at increased economic and social progress of the Americas. This concert of agreement represents a positive reaffirmation of the Alliance for Progress, an alliance that should result in the economic flowering of the Americas in the not too distant future.

Fifth. Increased development funds for the Inter-American Bank: This year the Congress authorized an additional U.S. contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank. The increase will be a graduated increase for the next 3 years of from \$50 million a year to \$300 million a year.

Sixth. Ratification of the Consular Treaty with the Soviet Union: The U.S. Senate, by a vote of 66 to 28, approved the consular convention with the Soviet Union. The convention, signed in 1964, specified the rules under which each country can establish consulates in the other country. Two provisions, unusual in such treaties, grant consular officials and employees complete diplomatic and criminal immunity and guarantee consular notification within 3 days and access within 4 days to nationals arrested or detained in the other country.

Seventh. Ratification of Space Treaty: The Senate, on April 25 of this year, by a vote of 88 to 0, ratified the Space Treaty, an agreement to ban mass destruction weapons for outer space. This treaty should prevent the nuclear powers from orbiting nuclear vehicles of mass destruction that could be used as tools of international blackmail. This is a significant step forward in securing the understanding and agreement that something must be done to safeguard this planet and its inhabitants from a nuclear holocaust.

Eighth. Draft Treaty on Nuclear Non-proliferation: This step is particularly

significant as the United States and Russia proposed identical texts of the treaty draft. There was common recognition that it is in the world's best interest to allow no more countries to attain nuclear capability. Much work remains to be done before this treaty is implemented, but agreement by the two major nuclear powers is a giant stride forward.

Ninth. Cessation of hostilities in the Mideast without confrontation by the major powers: No one can claim that the Mideast crisis is resolved, but we can count it a major achievement that the major powers were not drawn into the hostilities. The United States through the U.N. Security Council played a significant and successful role in the speedy termination of the Arab-Israeli war of June 5 and 6. The United States and the Soviet Union were sufficiently in accord and in touch with each other to enable the Council to adopt four cease-fires or withdrawal resolutions in the period from June 6 through June 12.

Also the Washington-Moscow hotline was used for the first time on June 5, when Soviet Premier Kosygin sent an urgent message to the President via the Pentagon. The White House reported that the message was given an immediate reply by the President.

President Johnson used the hotline again on June 8, after the Israel attack on the U.S. ship *Liberty*. The White House reported that President Johnson had informed Soviet leaders of the incident, stating that the American 6th Fleet planes then taking to the air were only going to the aid of the stricken ship.

Tenth. Food for India: The U.S. response to the famine in India was a major step. On March 20, the Congress cleared for the President's signature House Joint Resolution 267, supporting emergency food assistance to famine-threatened India. Among other provisions, the resolution approved the participation of the United States in cooperation with other countries and multilateral organizations in international efforts to develop a self-help approach to the war on hunger in assisting India to achieve food self-sufficiency, and to meet future food shortages. The resolution provides up to 3 million additional tons of food grain to India, provided it is matched by others. An agreement was also signed in New Delhi on June 4 bringing the total of agreed food shipments for the current year to 5.1 million tons, some of it to be paid for in Indian rupees.

Mr. Speaker, I have listed only 10 instances where steps toward a saner, safer world were taken in 1967. They are only 10 of hundreds taken in the laborious task of building the peace.

We should not let our preoccupation over Vietnam distort our view of other developments, or stop us from making progress where progress can be made. It is obvious from the foregoing recitation that in spite of all, worthwhile deeds have been done.

UNPAID VISTA'S REMAIN ON THE JOB

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentle-

man from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the last few days have seen one of the most remarkable tributes it has ever been my privilege to witness to the value of a public program.

The program is the VISTA program of OEO. This program, like others in OEO's war on poverty, has been hard hit by the economy wave that has surged through this Congress. Because of the failure of the Congress to approve even a continuing resolution to cover the activities of this program until the Congress can get around to enacting the authorizing legislation and appropriating funds for the coming year, the VISTA volunteers, who perform a host of invaluable functions for the poverty-stricken communities in which they have volunteered to live, and who, under the best of conditions, are given only a subsistence allowance, have been advised that they will not even receive their subsistence allowance on their next pay day. It seems highly unlikely that the Congress will altogether refuse to pay these volunteers for services already performed, but for the time being, the volunteers are in hard straits.

In St. Albans, Vt., for example, four VISTA volunteers are actually living in the local jail, as guests of the sheriff, on, I hasten to assure my colleagues, an open-door basis.

But the value of the VISTA program to the very people it is designed to help has been movingly demonstrated by the spontaneous reaction to this crisis. The poor themselves in community after community have offered of what little they have to the VISTA volunteers—to see them fed and housed until affluent America can find the funds to fulfill its obligations to these volunteers.

The second moving aspect of the entire situation is that the volunteers themselves have spontaneously agreed to stay on the job, even in the absence of any assurances that they will ever be paid for their out-of-pocket expenses.

The VISTA volunteers and the poor themselves are willing to sacrifice to help this entire country meet a problem that affects us all—the problem of poverty. I hope the Congress will be as generous.

I ask unanimous consent that two articles from the Washington Post be printed at this point in the RECORD.

CITIZENS PITCH IN TO HELP—UNPAID VISTA STAFF TO STAY

Washington Vista volunteers are prepared to stay on their jobs and community members are prepared to feed and shelter them, while Congress decides whether to continue their program, a survey here indicated yesterday.

Francis Luzzatto, an assistant director of the Capital Head Start program, to which 14 volunteers are assigned, said parents of students in the program, teachers and teachers' aides have agreed to help tide the volunteers over.

Lillian Wright, of 1103 Stephens rd. se., one of whose children was in the program last year, has been providing meals for Vista volunteer Lynn Severance.

"She ate just like my family," said Mrs. Wright. "They do a wonderful job in the community."

Luzzatto said that most of the volunteers had last been paid two weeks ago. So far, they had not yet faced severe financial hardship, he said, adding, however, that many would be in trouble if they are not paid soon. "When funds really run out," he said, "then the neighbors will have to put them up and feed them three meals a day. Right now it's just beginning."

Isabelle Wiener of 719 E. st. se., one of the Vista Volunteers, said, "We're going to stick to our jobs. This means a lot to us. As long as we can manage, we'll stay."

Two other volunteers who have no money for their rent are now living in the apartment shared by Miss Wiener and volunteer Marian Sternat.

"We've been very upset," said volunteer Larry Holcomb, "because it looks like Vista is down the drain."

"It's heartening to know there are people who will help us get along," he said, "But I don't relish taking things from people who have very little for themselves."

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 5, 1967]

JAILER IS HOST TO FOUR VISTA GIRLS

ST. ALBANS, Vt., November 4.—Four girl antipoverty workers went to jail here today rather than give up their jobs, which have been removed from the Federal payroll.

Sheriff John Finn explained that they're his guests on a strictly open door policy intended to provide them with food and lodging. The girls are Vista Volunteers and the funds for the program have not yet been renewed by Congress. Consequently, the girls are off the payroll and can't support themselves.

THE RUSSIAN BOLSHEVIK "50TH" AND A SPECIAL HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the 50th anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik revolution is not the only "50th" at this time. Free Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Byelorussians, Georgians, Armenians, and many other non-Russians will be observing their 50th anniversaries of independence and freedom, which Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism snuffed out. Their free voices will be raised in behalf of captive Ukrainians and other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.—yes, equally, and also in behalf of the freedom and open opportunities of the long enslaved Russian nation.

A REAL OCCASION FOR A SPECIAL COMMITTEE

In every sense, this oncoming period is a real occasion for us to establish finally a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. Such a committee in this House would symbolize our free answer to the basic fraudulence of the Russian Bolshevik Revolution and the tragedy of this 50th anniversary of that deceptive revolution. The creation of the special committee would also pay shining tribute to the non-Russian "50th's," for the non-Russian revolutions in the years of 1917-23 were of the same essence and

nature as our own American Revolution. This, indeed, is an excellent occasion for Congress to seize the initiative in recognizing the realities of the Soviet Union and proceeding to open up the whole matter of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism within the U.S.S.R.

Mr. Speaker, this theme was sounded throughout this country during the 1967 Captive Nations Week Observance. Much illustrative material on this score has appeared in the RECORD these past few months. By way of further examples, I include the following as parts of my remarks: The Captive Nations Week statement by Gov. Robert E. McNair of South Carolina; the resolution prepared by Dr. Lev. E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, and unanimously adopted by the First Conference of the World Anti-Communist League in Taipei, China, concerning the 50th anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik Revolution; the address of Mr. Lee N. Vogel, executive director of the South Florida Captive Nations Committee; the address of Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut; an editorial from the Miami Herald, "Bull's-Eye, Mr. Kosygin, on Soviets' Glass House," dated June 21, 1967; editorials of the Miami News, "Nations Captive, Too," dated July 20, 1967, and the Miami Herald, "Focus on Cuba," dated July 21, 1967.

STATEMENT BY GOV. ROBERT E. MCNAIR, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, ON CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 16-22, 1967

Americans cherish freedom. We in South Carolina place the utmost priority upon our abilities to live, work, speak, worship and move without limitation or undue restriction. South Carolina is a part of the great heritage of freedom, promulgated by our founding fathers almost two hundred years ago. For this reason we encourage our citizens to participate meaningfully in the observance of Captive Nations Week, July 16-22.

For the oppressed in our world we would offer hope. For those who desire freedom we would offer encouragement. Because we in South Carolina and America love freedom, we would wish it for all the world and as rapidly as possible. It is fitting that Captive Nations Week be observed to impress those around us that we have not abandoned captive peoples nor will we cease to work for their liberation and freedom.

RESOLUTION ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION

(By the First Conference of the World Anti-Communist League)

(Recommended by committee I, Chairman, Korea; cochairman, Malaysia, Vietnam; Rapporteur, Sweden.)

The World Anti-Communist League—
Recalling that the Russian Bolshevik Revolution was the source and incubator of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, enslaving over a dozen non-Russian nations in 1918-22 and thus laying the groundwork for further conquests in the 40's and constituting a formidable threat to the rest of the world in the 50's and 60's;

Recalling that the tragic revolution produced another fraud in Lenin's promise of "land, bread, and peace", which in the course of 50 years has not been realized according to civilized standards either for the 115 million Russians or the 120 million non-Russians held captive in the Soviet Union;

Considering that the fraudulent revolution also conjured up Lenin's "peaceful coexistence" policy with immediate reference to the neighboring and newly independent non-

Russian states, such as Armenia, Georgia, Ukraine, Byelorussia and others, a deceptive policy of indirect aggression that led to the captivity of these countries and is now being applied by imperio-colonialist Moscow to the West; and

Considering that the sinister forces of that revolution have over these past fifty years led to the creation of an unprecedented Red Empire, extending from the Danube to the Pacific and into Cuba, and created ultimately by the imperio-colonialist power of the USSR and Red China; therefore,

Resolves at its First Conference that:

1. Each of the League member organizations and observer groups devote its energies in the weeks ahead, up to and even beyond November 7, to exposing the myths and frauds of the Russian Bolshevik revolution and to directing world attention to the ravages and threats of Soviet Russia imperio-colonialism, within the Soviet Union itself and elsewhere; and

2. On the occasion of the Communist commemoration, the League should issue a manifesto directed to the youth and workers of the whole world as follows:

"We want to set the record straight regarding the past 50 years of Communism.

"1. Since 1917, 85 million innocent non-combatants lost their lives at the hands of Communism's minions, often after atrocious tortures in Nazi type concentration camps. This is 25 times higher than the death toll of both World Wars I and II combined.

"2. While the most extreme excesses of the Stalinist era have been eliminated—although they still survive in Red China—the freedom and dignity of the individual remain crushed by a totalitarian dictatorship working through an almighty secret police. The absolute and exclusive supremacy of a single party, monolithically directed from a self-perpetuating top, does not give us even the semblance of a hint that democracy in public life exists in Communist countries. Culture and justice remain choked and degraded by strict subservience to party orthodoxy. All religious faiths are severely persecuted.

"3. All the peoples that have been enslaved by Communism are cut off the outer world by an iron curtain, never seen before in human history and a tight censorship and persistent radio jamming.

"4. Heavy and armament industries have been greatly developed, but light industry and agriculture continues to trail in chronic crises, plunging the people in a state of permanent scarcity of food and consumer goods. Whatever industrial progress has been achieved was at the sacrifice of unprecedented stress, want and submission imposed on the masses.

"5. The factors of production have not been given to the workers but appropriated collectively by a new ruling and privileged class of bureaucrats and demagogues who have dominated workers' unions, forbidden strikes under the death penalty and reduced peasants to the condition of proletarians in open-sky factories.

"6. Since its inception, Communism has plagued the globe with trouble and violence, in search of a global hegemony which it cannot renounce because if it does not destroy freedom outside, freedom will destroy it inside.

"7. Apart from the yoke it imposes on its own peoples inside the USSR and Red China, Communism has subjugated, and maintains in bondage against the sacred right of self-determination, 27 formerly independent countries covering 3 million square miles and populated by 250 million inhabitants.

"8. The international Communist movement, which had promised to advance only through the enhancement of political consciousness, was turned into a sheer but colossal apparatus to conduct fraudulent political warfare, run by 500,000 overt or covert professional activists spending 5 billion dollars per year.

"To sum up, the political movement which had claimed the boldest aims ever set to human progress, has generated the darkest mixture ever seen of oppression, inefficiency and deceit. Its failure is therefore total and entirely gloomy.

"We invite all free men to hold 7th November as a day of mourning for the fiftieth anniversary of the Communist revolution and to unite, above all, divisions of races, nations, parties, and creeds to prevent the evil already done from spreading further."

SPEECH BY LEE N. VOGEL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SOUTH FLORIDA CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE SOUTH FLORIDA OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, MIAMI, FLA., JULY 21, 1967

Many of you may not really know why you are here . . . so let me begin by explaining that this group you join tonight is convinced that a war which was declared fifty years ago against the United States, and every other free nation in the world, should be won . . . and we in the free world should win it . . . That's why we are here tonight.

This war which was declared by the International Communist Conspiracy has never changed its goals . . . the domination of the population, the means of production, and the natural resources of every country on earth. They told us how and where it would be fought, and against whom . . . It has been the same war for fifty years . . . no matter what we call it, or how we may react to the various personalities involved . . . or when we wishfully think that it doesn't really exist . . . It has been, it is, and it will continue to be the same war . . . and we are not winning it . . . That's why we are here tonight.

The evil and vile machine which declared and continues to fight this war represents itself as the Soviet Union . . . but we know it for what it is really is . . . the Soviet Empire . . . a Prison House of Nations and Races . . . built and maintained by lies, deceit, genocide, and abuse of power . . . We also know that long before the coming to power of the Bolsheviks, Czarist Russia was a multinational concentration camp, consisting of hundreds of ethnic groups, speaking hundreds of languages and dialects, and according to figures from the Library of Congress, barely half of the over 200 million population of the U.S.S.R. is Great Russian ! ! ! And this does not take into account those millions enslaved behind the Iron Curtain!

In November of 1917, we were put on notice by the new leadership that the proletariat's promise "to champion the right of nations to self determination" was about to be fulfilled, and the "struggle against imperialism by the working class" was about to begin. We were told of "colonial revolutions", and "movements for national liberation" which we could expect.

And so they came as promised . . . the movements and the revolutions . . . and a brand of psychological and political warfare which has been operating since 1917:

Agitation and propaganda enflaming national or racial feelings;

Efforts to penetrate and control through trained personnel, economic and military aid, treaties, red carpet treatment to celebrities of the target groups;

Exploitation of every suitable occasion until national or racial feelings are built up to the boiling point, and acts of violence and rebellion are committed against governments of the free world and their allies;

Having severed their previous ties and having become politically, economically and militarily dependent upon the Soviet Empire, the given national or racial group falls like the proverbial "ripe plum" into the arms of the Soviets as either a Soviet Republic, or a satellite state;

And the final stage is one of complete Soviet domination in which the victorious

dictators clearly demonstrate in blood and tears the complete insincerity of their glowing promises.

We saw this operation executed to its completion most recently in Cuba under Castro . . . another attempt in the Dominican . . . and now we see the early stages operating within certain segments of the Negro community right here in this country. . . .

Why has this plan . . . with its clear definition of purpose . . . with its easily recognizable and entirely predictable modus operandi been so successful? Simply because the freeworld has refused to recognize it for what it is . . . and therefore has been unable to direct a defense against it.

On one hand, the machinations of the Soviet Empire have been described by the opologists in terms of "agrarian reform . . . social and cultural revolution . . . relief from capitalist exploitation."

On the other hand, some of the defenders of democracy in this country fight Communism by attacking the U.S. Government, and the Constitution . . . various minority groups . . . and many of their fellow Americans whose opinion does not agree with theirs. . . .

In 1959, a group of Americans led by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Professor of Economics at Georgetown University, created and caused to be sent through both Houses of Congress and signed by President Eisenhower, Public Law 86-90, or what is now known as the Captive Nations Resolution. This American Declaration of International Independence was and still remains the most clear cut, unequivocal statement of U.S. position regarding the Soviet Empire since World War 2. It recognized the Red Regime for what it is and what it has done, and declared for all the world to know . . . that the United States would never accept the enslavement of the peoples of the captive nations as a permanent condition . . . but rather shared with these peoples their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom . . . and further, that we will not coexist with international butchers and criminals.

The Captive Nations Resolution and the nationwide observance of Captive Nations Week not only spotlight the fact that the Soviet Empire has imposed Communism by force of arms on people who possess their own histories, traditions of freedom, and unique nationalistic origins, but also that the captive peoples, despite Communist regimentation and persecution, maintain their own languages, traditions, cultures and religious beliefs. . . . And these virtues keep alive their independent spirit and hopes for restoration of their own, free national governments . . . and their desire to live as free human beings in an open society of their own choosing.

Despite every effort of the Soviet masters to draw our attention away from this situation, and despite what seems to be ignorance of it or indifference to it by our own leaders, this national spirit is a powerful human force which cannot be snuffed out by the Communist rulers . . . and whenever the opportunity presents itself, this smoldering force breaks out into open flame of rebellion. . . .

Crushing and immediate response is then brought to bear by the Communist masters who know apparently better than we that this great internal weakness of the Soviet Colonial Empire might well do from the inside what only total war could do from the outside . . . and that is to split the Empire wide open . . . and break the hated chains of Sino-Soviet enslavement.

By joining us here tonight, you join thousands of other freedom loving peoples across the Free World who want to see an end to this fifty year nightmare . . . freedom restored to those enslaved millions . . . and a treatment for this International cancer which does not involve a nuclear holocaust,

but which takes advantage of the very conditions which I just outlined.

Captive Nations Week is sponsored by the National Captive Nations Committee with headquarters in Washington, D.C. The chairman is the author of the Resolution, Dr. Dobriansky. The Honorable Herbert C. Hoover was Honorary Chairman from 1960 to 1964. Mr. George Meany, President of the AFL-CIO has occupied this position from 1965.

Over one-third of the House of Representatives and nearly one-third of the Senate are members of the NCNC, and these men represent every conceivable political persuasion.

Each year, over half the Governors of the United States issue state proclamations. Hundreds of county and city administrations make public recognition of the Week.

In Florida, Governor Claude Kirk has issued the first Captive Nations Proclamation in the history of the State, and both Houses of the Florida Legislature have issued a joint resolution, "expressing concern and compassion for the plight of refugees from nations subjugated by Communism who are now residing in the United States and in the state of Florida."

The movement supporting this American Declaration of International Independence has now spread overseas, and Captive Nations Week is now observed in Britain, France, Australia, Turkey, Korea, Sweden, and West Germany. The largest observance in the world is held in Free China for the entire week with rallies and parades involving thousands of participants.

Each year, thousands more join in support of the principles endorsed by the Captive Nations Movement as an important contribution to the practical solution of the worldwide menace of Communism.

And what are these principles?

1. Promote a clear understanding of the nature, purpose, and methods of the Communist apparatus.

2. Continuing exploration of the conditions behind the Iron, Bamboo, and Sugar Cane Curtains and the information used to promote the advantage of the Free World.

3. Continuing exploration of the opportunities for para-military, psychological, and political cold war operations.

The goals for this year of 1967, which operate within the context of the above principles are as follows:

1. Peace with justice and freedom, stressing the tremendous deterrence represented by all the captive nations against Soviet Russian and Red Chinese aggression.

2. Full support for victory in Viet Nam.

3. A Pol-Trade policy toward the Red Empire, wherein trade must be used as a political weapon to gain concessions as a price for that trade.

4. The focus of free world opinion on Sino-Soviet Russian Imperio-Colonialism, such as a complete disclosure of the role played by Russia in the Middle East crisis.

5. Creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations to gather and then transmit up-to-date information on conditions behind the Iron Curtain, the Bamboo and Sugar Cane curtains, using this information in a constant review of legislation relating to U.S. Foreign Policy.

6. U.S. support for the new Greek Government, which saved Greece from a Red takeover.

7. A complete overhaul of U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union, in light of information gathered from behind the Iron Curtain.

8. Opposition to the operation of Russian Consulates in this country.

9. The use of the so-called "50th Anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik Revolution" as an opportunity to expose the Soviet Empire for what it is.

10. Public support for greater use of psychological and propaganda pressure to be

brought to bear against the Communists in the United Nations, and other forums of world opinion . . . where their stone throwing has been so constant as to make the world almost forget that they live in a glass house which could shatter at several points if they themselves were put on the defensive.

I hope I have made it clear why we are here . . . and what our business is. If we do not have all the answers, these, at least, are some which want to correct the same mistakes being made year after year . . . which mistakes have allowed the International Communist Cancer to invade and destroy the national existence of one country after another. The time is long since past when we must recognize this challenge to our very existence, formulate a plan of action . . . and above all, commit ourselves to a positive victory over Communism . . . For without that total commitment, as a nation and a people, we are bound to see this fifty year horror continue . . . perhaps to our very doorstep . . . Therefore we in the Captive Nations Movement ask your blessing and your help . . . because there is nothing on earth more powerful than a concept whose time has come . . . and this, we are convinced, above all, will turn back the Red Tide . . . the concept is Victory . . . the time is now . . . will you join us?

[News release, July 22, 1967]

SENATOR DODD ASSAILS "MYTH OF THE DETENTE"—SAYS CUBA LOGICAL PLACE TO START WITH LIBERATION OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

MIAMI, FLA., July 21, 1967.—Senator Thomas J. Dodd (D-Conn.) in a speech before the South Florida Chapter of the National Captive Nations Committee assailed what he described as the "myth of the detente". He said that, instead of a reduction of tension, "the past five years have witnessed a terrifying intensification of Communist subversion and aggression in every continent." He urged that the Free World look upon the liberation of the captive nations as a practical measure of self-defense. "Morality and common sense and self-interest all dictate", he said, "that we dedicate ourselves to the early achievement of this goal."

In challenging the myth of the detente, Senator Dodd pointed to the Soviet Union's key role in the recent mid-East crisis, to its role in last year's Tri-Continental Conference in Havana, and to the conference of the so-called Latin-American Solidarity Organization which will convene on July 28 in Havana. He said this conference points to a vast expansion of the Soviet-Castro war of aggression against the freedom of the Americas.

Senator Dodd said that there are some people who oppose captive nations week because they believe there are no captive nations. In reply to them, the Senator said the following: "The differences that exist between the Soviet government on the one hand and the Cuban, Rumanian, and other satellite governments on the other hand, are of secondary importance. Cuba is a captive nation, Rumania is a captive nation, and all the other satellites are captive nations, in the basic sense that their governments are obedient to Soviet desires on all major issues and that they are completely dependent on the Soviet Union for their continued existence."

"How long would Fidel Castro last without Soviet support? In my opinion he wouldn't last a month. And the same thing goes for all the captive nations of Europe. If the peoples of these countries felt they could revolt against Communism without fear that the Red Army would intervene against them, they would do so tomorrow."

"We have been too prone to write off the captive peoples, too willing to accept the position that Communist rule, once established, must never be challenged by the West. But the East German uprising, the Poznan uprising in Poland, the Hungarian

Revolution, the great rebellion in the Vorkuta slave labor complex in Siberia, the Tibetan rebellion, the ousting of the Arbenz regime in Guatemala, and the overthrow of the Nkrumah regime in Ghana—all of these should be sufficient to prove that Communist regimes are neither unshakeable nor invincible."

Senator Dodd said that Cuba was the logical place to start with the policy of liberation. He says there is a "growing recognition throughout the Americas that the Soviet-Castro campaign of subversion can no longer be ignored and that united action is necessary to deal with it." And he said it is "possible to think of the liberation of Cuba in practical terms" because "the Red Army cannot intervene in Cuba as it did in Hungary when the Cuban people, with or without our assistance, rise up against the Castro tyranny."

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS AND THE SECURITY OF THE FREE WORLD

(Speech by Senator THOMAS J. DODD before the National Captive Nations Week Committee, South Florida Chapter, Miami, Fla., July 21, 1967)

I am honored to join my friends of the South Florida Chapter, National Captive Nations Week Committee in this ninth observance of National Captive Nations Week.

The resolution calling upon the President to designate the third week in July every year as Captive Nations Week was passed unanimously by both houses of Congress in the summer of 1959. The purpose of this observance, in the words of the resolution, was to demonstrate to the peoples of the Captive Nations "that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence."

There are some who criticize the observance of Captive Nations Week because they say that it is untrue that Hungary and Poland and Cuba are subjects of satellites of Moscow. They point to the fact that Castro and the other satellite leaders have differences with Moscow as proof of their contentment.

I am sure there are certain differences. I am sure, for example, that Fidel Castro tries to drive as hard a bargain as he can with his Soviet masters.

But the differences that exist between the Soviet government on the one hand and the Cuban, Rumanian, and other satellite governments on the other hand, are of secondary importance.

Cuba is a captive nation, Rumania is a captive nation, and all the other satellites are captive nations, in the basic sense that their governments are obedient to Soviet desires on all major issues and that they are completely dependent on the Soviet Union for their continued existence.

How long would Fidel Castro last without Soviet support? In my opinion he wouldn't last a month.

And the same thing goes for all the captive nations of Europe. If the peoples of these countries felt they could revolt against Communism without fear that the Red Army would intervene against them, they would do so tomorrow.

There are others who criticize the observance of Captive Nations Week because in their opinion the danger of nuclear war makes it necessary to abandon all hope for the liberation of the Captive Nations. The world cannot afford a war, they tell us. And, since liberation cannot be achieved without war, we have to accept the Captive Nations as an unalterable fact of political life. True, they feel sorry for the captive peoples who have been subjugated by Communist imperialism. But their sorrow is not strong enough to prevent them from relegating the captive nations to perpetual slavery.

In their more tolerant moments, the critics

of Captive Nations Week will say that its observance is harmless because nothing is going to be done about the Captive Nations anyway.

But let me say to you that I have not come here to participate in a requiem for the dead, or in the observance of a just cause for which there can be no real hope.

I am convinced that the Captive Nations can be liberated.

And I believe they *must* be liberated.

The free world, in the interest of its own survival, must find the wisdom and the means to assist the captive peoples of Europe and Asia and Africa and America to liberate themselves from the tyranny which now oppresses them.

At no time in our history was a statement of rededication to the goal of freedom more necessary than it is today. For today almost one-half of mankind is governed by the blackest, the most ruthless, the most amoral dictatorship the world has ever known, while the free world fights desperately to prevent further encroachments on its territory by communist aggression and subversion.

We have been too prone to write off the captive peoples, too willing to accept the position that Communist rule, once established, must never be challenged by the West. But the East German uprising, the Poznan uprising in Poland, the Hungarian Revolution, the great rebellion in the Vorkuta slave labor complex in Siberia, the Tibetan rebellion, the ousting of the Arbenz regime in Guatemala, and the overthrow of the Nkrumah regime in Ghana—all of these should be sufficient to prove that Communist regimes are neither unshakeable nor invincible.

It is something to think about that, despite the manifest superiority of free societies in every sphere, and despite the weaknesses and contradictions of Communism, it is the free world today that is on the defensive, while the Communist world continues its non-stop offensive against freedom in every continent.

Now I know that there are people who tell us that communist subversion is a thing of the past or that it is rapidly becoming a thing of the past.

They assure us that Moscow in particular has moderated its ways—that is, in fact, seeking to discourage subversion rather than encourage it.

They have for several years now been telling us that there is a growing *detente*, or accommodation, between Soviet Europe and the free world.

They are not quite so sure that Fidel Castro has accepted the Spirit of *detente*; but on the other hand they seem to believe that the Kremlin has been using its considerable influence with Castro to dissuade him from engaging in revolutionary adventures or supporting guerrilla movements in the Americas.

The belief in this mythical *detente*, in my opinion, has done more to befuddle and frustrate the conduct of our foreign policy than any other single factor.

It is a tribute to the capacity of the Communists for confusion that so many intelligent people, both in government and out of government, have talked about the *detente* as though it were a fact of history.

In reality, instead of witnessing a growing *detente* between the Communist world and the free world, the past five years have witnessed a terrifying intensification of Communist subversion and aggression in every continent.

With Soviet support—even more than Chinese support—the North Vietnamese Communist regime has been able to step up its campaign of aggression against South Vietnam to the point where we have had to send some 450,000 men to South Vietnam to help cope with this so-called War of National Liberation, and it has been indicated that

further reinforcements will soon be under way.

The myth of the *detente* was seriously shaken, but not destroyed, by the Mid-East war. The Soviet role in arming the Arab states and in inciting them to action against Israel was too blatant to be ignored even by the most addicted dreamer. But before the fighting actually erupted, those who believe in the *detente* apparently found no difficulty in reconciling their belief with the massive build-up of Soviet arms throughout the Middle East; with the Soviet supported invasion of Yemen by Nasser's forces; with the Soviet supported campaign of terror in Southern Arabia; and with the Syrian coup of last year which brought to power in that country an openly pro-Soviet regime.

In January of last year the Soviet Union played a role of prime importance in the organization and conduct of the Tri-Continental Conference of Anglican, Asian, and Latin American People, as it was called, in Havana.

At this conference all pretense of non-intervention in the affairs of other nations was dropped and the delegate, under Moscow leadership, openly committed themselves to the overthrow by violence of all those governments which did not meet with their approval.

The Conference established a Communist dominated general headquarters to support, direct, intensify and coordinate guerrilla operations in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

The chief of the Soviet delegation, Mr. Rashidov, told the Conference that it was the aim of his government to give—I quote—"all round assistance to the unification of the anti-imperialist forces of the three continents in order to provide greater impetus to our common struggle against imperialism, colonialism, and neo-colonialism, led by the U.S. capitalists."

The Tri-Continental Conference, unfortunately, was played down by the American press and virtually ignored in official statements on Latin American policy. And despite the Tri-Continental Conference it still remained fashionable in certain circles to talk about the existence of a "growing *detente*," marred only by the war in Vietnam.

More recently we have been told by the New York Times and others that Moscow strongly disapproves of Castro's guerrilla activities and has been endeavoring to restrain him. But once again, all the facts point in the contrary direction.

One week from today, on July 28, the so-called Latin American Solidarity Organization, which was set up in the wake of last year's Tri-Continental Conference, will convene in Havana. Against the background of the intensified guerrilla activity in Venezuela and Colombia, and Guatemala and Peru, as well as the recent landing of Cuban guerrillas on the Venezuelan Coast, it is clear that the July 28 conference does not point to any *detente* in the Americas. On the contrary, it points to a vast expansion of the Soviet-Castro war of aggression against the freedom of the Americas.

It is terrifying to realize that some thousands of Communists and a few hundred guerrillas have been able to impair the security of the Americas to the point where countries like Bolivia and Colombia have to spend a substantial portion of their budget to combat the guerrillas, while frightened capital continues to flee from the Americas at a much faster rate than the Alliance for Progress can pump in new capital.

In my opening remarks I said that the Captive Nations must be liberated in the interests of our own survival. Cuba is a prime example of what I meant by this remark. So long as Cuba remains Communist, there will be no peace in the Americas and no security and no meaningful social progress—because Castro is determined to prevent all of these things.

Instead, the future will probably witness the emergence of a whole series of Vietnam situations in the countries of the Americas. In fact, Castro has frankly described this as his objective.

And if Cuba is ever joined by several other communist states in Central and South America then, short of a colossal military effort by the United States, the fate of all of Latin America would have been sealed.

And so, I say again, as I have said several times in recent years, that *Castro must go and the Cuban people must be liberated.*

Morality and common sense and self-interest all dictate that we dedicate ourselves to the early achievement of this goal.

I am not suggesting a policy confined to Cuba. What I am suggesting, rather, is an over-all policy—a practical policy—designed to promote the liberation of the Captive Nations in every part of the world.

The logical place to start with the policy of liberation is Cuba—not only because of the immediate threat Castro poses to the freedom of the Americas, but also because geographic and strategic and historical and political circumstances make the liberation of Cuba a highly practical possibility.

The first factor that makes it possible to think of liberation in practical terms is the fierce love of freedom which the Cuban people have always displayed, and their seething hatred for the bearded monster who today oppresses them.

The second factor is their traditional friendship for America—which the Castro tyranny has only reinforced.

The third factor is the growing recognition throughout the Americas that the Soviet-Castro campaign of subversion can no longer be ignored and that united action is necessary to deal with it.

The fourth factor is that we have it in our power, if we wish to use this power, to enforce an embargo on all trade with Cuba, at least by the free world nations. All we would have to do is announce that ships engaged in Cuban commerce would be barred from American ports for a period of one year.

The fifth factor is the existence in this country and elsewhere in the Americas of a community of hundreds of thousands of Cuban exiles. Many of these admittedly are too old to fight. But there are among them scores of thousands of younger men who would gladly give their lives to help bring about the liberation of their beloved motherland.

The sixth factor is the remarkable persistence of armed resistance to Castro, despite his resort to Stalinist methods of terror to stamp it out.

The seventh and final factor that makes it possible to think of the liberation of Cuba in practical terms is the fact that the Red Army cannot intervene in Cuba as it did in Hungary when the Cuban people—with or without our assistance—rose up against the Castro tyranny.

The liberation of Cuba would have the most profound impact throughout the Communist empire. Indeed, I think it is no exaggeration to say that it would start a process throughout the captive nations which Moscow would not be able to control.

The observance of Captive Nations Week, is not merely an expression of sympathy with the captive peoples in their present agony. If it were simply this, it would be an act of cheap and pious hypocrisy.

If Captive Nations Week has any significance, it means that we, as a nation, are dedicated to the liberation of the captive nations from the cruel tyranny that oppresses them.

It means that we must make this issue a cardinal objective of our foreign policy, that we must raise it at the UN and at diplomatic conferences at every opportunity, that we must mobilize world support for the containment and ultimate abolition of Communist imperialism.

In thus dedicating ourselves to the restoration of man's God-given rights to all the peoples of the Captive Nations, we are rededicating ourselves to the principles which gave birth to our own nation.

[From the Miami Herald, June 21, 1967]
BULL'S-EYE, MR. KOSYGIN, ON SOVIETS'
GLASS HOUSE

A housewife in New York made the point yesterday about the same time the ceremonial chief of the Soviet Union was flying to Cairo.

Mrs. Esther Prager of the Bronx strolled nonchalantly past police barricades outside the Soviet mission to the United Nations. She reached into her raincoat and drew out a sign saying: "Kosygin, we demand the Soviet withdrawal from their illegally annexed territories."

Her message scored a bull's-eye on the glass house of Communist expansionism. Many an ancient, independent nation has been snatched behind the Iron Curtain by force or guile. Yet Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin stands deadpan before the U.N. General Assembly to insist that Israeli forces must withdraw from terrain which they captured during the four-day war June 5-9.

What about Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, thrust under the Red yoke as "Soviet Socialist Republics" against their will in a conquest never recognized by the United States?

Or what about Communist East Germany and all the other captive nations of Eastern Europe, enslaved by Moscow despite solemn promises of free elections?

Indeed, what of the Ukraine and other components of the Soviet Union itself which vainly resisted annexation by Russia?

A government guilty of such grabbing needs a lot of gall to suggest that another nation should hand back territory taken in war. Bolsheviks, of course, have that kind of brazenness. The flight of Soviet President Nikolai V. Podgorny to Cairo obviously is intended to back up Kosygin's posturing at the U.N. as the champion of the Arabs.

With such defenders, Egypt and its allies hardly require enemies. For the Red glass house has been cracking at the edges for the past three years. Its reverses should hearten free men everywhere.

Brazil, as we said at the time, slipped out of the clutches of communism April 1, 1964. Had the Reds been able to seize that largest and most populous nation of South America, the rest of the New World would have been under their guns. But they lost, thanks to an upwelling of patriotism among Brazilian businessmen, women and the armed forces. Brazil has been firmly anti-Communist for more than three years.

The vast archipelago of Indonesia decamped from the Red empire Sept. 30, 1965. The pro-Peking Indonesian Communist Party started a coup which backfired, and up to 400,000 Reds there were executed.

Reds overreached themselves again in Ghana Feb. 24, 1966. That young nation's self-styled "redeemer," Kwame Nkrumah, was visiting chums in Peking when he was deposed. His downfall shattered a network of Communist subversion in Africa.

Two billion dollars' worth of Soviet weapons proved worthless to Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser and his buddies when they moved in on little Israel, only to suffer shattering defeat.

The Soviets didn't lift a finger to rescue their Arab proteges.

They're talking a good game now in the U.N. and Cairo, but perhaps even the Arabs, along with the rest of the world, will wonder, like the Bronx housewife, when the Soviets will withdraw from their "illegally annexed territories."

[From the Miami Herald, July 21, 1967]
FOCUS ON CUBA

It is fitting that the focus of tonight's climax to Captive Nations Week will be on Captive Cuba.

The island so close to our shores is the first in this hemisphere to slide behind the iron curtain. The cost is high to Cubans deprived of freedom, initiative and even the necessities of life. The daily flight of desperate refugees on the Freedom Airlift is the terrible indictment of what goes on under Red rule.

That Cuba is on the tragic list including Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary and other seized lands brings the Communist threat close to home. Tonight at the Miami High School Auditorium, the meaning will be explained as the roll of imprisoned nations is called. All those of good will are asked to express sympathy for the captives and renew the hope that they will be freed to live in peace and dignity.

This is no remote condition but one whose effects are felt every day in this community. The thousands among us who know the tragedy from a personal experience give the occasion deep significance.

[From the Miami News, July 20, 1967]
NATIONS CAPTIVE, TOO

In Albania, a military tribunal has jurisdiction over civilian crimes "impairing the security of the state," i.e., hostility to the Communist regime.

In Czechoslovakia, the court of last resort is the police.

In Hungary, some 50,000 political prisoners still languish in Soviet-forced labor camps, an aftermath of the 1956 revolt.

In Rumania, forced labor camps in the Danube Delta and in the Brad region of Transylvania operate for political foes of the Communist government.

Captive Nations Week, now being observed by nations of the free world, eloquently reminds that these imprisoned subjects of communism are denied the privileges of free speech, religion and choice in determining government.

America is a great nation because, through the democratic process, we are also a free society. Submerged countries look to us as a citadel of freedom and for leadership in bringing about their liberation. It is appropriate that we express our sympathy to these subjugated peoples.

IMPORTATION OF COTTONSEED OIL FROM RUSSIA

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NICHOLS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly disturbed by the reports some of our colleagues have made here on the floor of the House concerning the importation of cottonseed oil from Russia by U.S. companies. These reports disturb me for several reasons. First, this importation comes at a time when our own cotton industry here at home is facing its worst year in recent history. Our cotton farmers are suffering because of both poor quality and poor quantity in this year's cotton crop.

Despite my own efforts and the efforts of my colleagues from cotton-producing States, the administration is preventing

passage of legislation which would give some relief by limiting imports.

I am disturbed, too, Mr. Speaker, by news reports that President Johnson has threatened to veto any import limitation bills the Congress might pass. This is a proper function for the Congress to decide, and I hope the leadership will give us the opportunity to debate the issue and to vote on it soon.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed that the Hunt-Wesson Co. has chosen the Soviet Union to purchase this huge shipment of cottonseed oil from. Today, our country is at war in Southeast Asia. American fightingmen are dying there to prevent the spread of communism to other parts of the world. Yet, here is an American company which has paid the Soviet Union a huge sum of money for oil. This money, in turn, may be used to ship more arms and ammunition to the Communists in North Vietnam, and from there, they will find their way down the Ho Ch Minh Trail to the Vietcong for use against American men.

How do we explain this to the families of our soldiers? How do we say, "Yes, we are trading with the enemy that is providing the weapons to shoot at your sons"? There is no way to explain it. I will not try to explain it, but from now on, here is one Congressman who will do everything possible to prevent any further trade with any enemy of our country, or with any country that trades with our enemies.

I also intend to see that the people of my State know what companies in this country sell products which come from Russia or any other Communist country.

THE U.S.S. "ROSS F. GRAY"

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NICHOLS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday, November 3, the Navy launched a new destroyer escort at Seattle, Wash. The U.S.S. *Ross F. Gray* was named for a gallant Alabamian who gave his life for his country on Iwo Jima a quarter of a century ago. Marine Sergeant Gray won this country's highest honor, the Congressional Medal of Honor, for his actions on Iwo Jima. The sponsor of the U.S.S. *Ross F. Gray* is Sergeant Gray's sister, Mrs. E. B. Armel, of Pinson, Ala. The principal speaker at the christening ceremonies was my good friend and colleague ARMISTEAD SELDEN, of Alabama's Fifth Congressional District, Sergeant Gray's home district.

Congressman SELDEN is himself a former Naval officer, and served aboard a destroyer escort during World War II. His address not only paid tribute to Sergeant Gray and the fine ship which bears his name, but in it he has given us a vivid picture of the war we are fighting today in Southeast Asia. I would like very much for each Member of this House to read

Congressman SELDEN's remarks on the occasion of the launching of the U.S.S. *Ross F. Gray*.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert Mr. SELDEN's remarks in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE ARMISTEAD SELDEN, DEDICATION OF U.S.S. "GRAY," SEATTLE, WASH., NOVEMBER 3, 1967

It is both a privilege and an honor for me to be here today to participate in the launching of the USS GRAY (DE-1054)—a valuable addition to our nation's Navy.

From John Paul Jones and Stephen Decatur to the present, the United States Navy has a proud history. Several years ago in an edition of *All Hands Magazine* it was written that "Tradition, valor, and victory are the Navy's heritage from the past." We stand here today in the presence of this heritage because the launching and christening of ship constitute the birth of that ship's tradition.

The proud name of the ship launched here today vividly reflects the Navy's heritage of valor. The 438-foot USS GRAY is named for Sgt. Ross Franklin Gray, United States Marine Corps, who was awarded the highest military decoration that can be bestowed by our nation—the Congressional Medal of Honor. Sgt. Gray was a native of Bibb Co., Alabama, located in the District I have the privilege to represent in the United States Congress. The USS GRAY's sponsor is Sgt. Gray's eldest sister, Mrs. E. B. Arnel of Pinson, Alabama.

The coveted Medal of Honor was awarded posthumously to Sgt. Gray for "great personal valor, daring tactics, and tenacious perseverance in the face of extreme peril." The place was Iwo Jima, that volcanic island of only eight square miles where 4,590 men were killed in a month-long campaign to rout the Japanese garrison. The time was February, 1945. Sgt. Gray's platoon was pinned down by a barrage of Japanese grenades. After surveying the area, the sergeant discovered a strong network of enemy fortifications protected by an extensive minefield.

Under extremely heavy fire, the Alabama Marine cleared a path through the minefield. Then, he made six or eight trips back and forth carrying explosives which he used to destroy the Japanese position. The enemy fire was intense and, at one point, a grenade exploded near enough to blow off Sgt. Gray's helmet. Nevertheless, he traveled unarmed in order to more easily handle and set off his explosives.

Still he persisted. Even after he had destroyed the enemy fortifications, he did not return to his platoon until he once again entered the minefield to completely disarm it.

A count showed that this brave Leatherneck from Bibb Co., Alabama, had killed over 25 Japanese soldiers and destroyed a machine gun, a field weapon and an ammunition dump.

Although Sgt. Ross Franklin Gray emerged unscathed from this ordeal, he was killed only six days later by an enemy shell on Iwo Jima. He was posthumously awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor—the medal that President Truman said he would rather have than be President.

Just as the proud name of this ship reflects the merging of tradition and valor, the long history of the United States Navy speaks of victory. Such victory includes bringing the Barbary pirates to terms as far back as the 1800's and backing the Soviets down as recently as the October 1962 Cuban missile crisis.

This, however, is not the early 1880's nor is it 1962. Yet, the importance of sea power continues unabated. We cannot discuss hot war, cold war, limited war, or for that matter

any threat to the United States, without discussing sea power.

I challenge anyone to analyze the fall of Carthage without discussing sea power; or the history of Britain, Spain and France. I challenge anyone to discuss the defeat of Germany in World War I, or of Germany and Japan in World War II, or the Korean conflict, or the 1958 Lebanon crisis, or the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, or Vietnam today—without discussing sea power.

The question perhaps arises at this point: since this is true, why belabor the obvious? My answer is that I am not sure how obvious is the importance of a strong U.S. Navy. We live in a technological age, and this is accompanied by a constant reevaluation of the role of different weaponry. Needless to say, obsolescence comes with bewildering rapidity, and one of the greatest dangers of a technological age exists when reevaluation loses its perspective. With the obsolescence of weapons and equipment oftentimes comes the generalization that certain services themselves are obsolete, or at least should be downgraded.

A cursory review of United States Naval history reveals this danger. With the advent of rail communications there were those who maintained that sea power had lost its vitality. With the advent of the Blitzkrieg there were those who maintained that sea power had lost its vitality. With the advent and ascendancy of air power there were those who maintained that sea power had lost its vitality.

But from time immemorial the primary task of navies has been to gain and maintain control of the seas. Is it perfectly clear that technology has made certain goals of sea power obsolete. Yet, the challenges of science and technology necessitate more than ever a strong Navy. Indeed, the strategic importance of the Arctic Ocean results from this very advance of science and technology.

Therefore, it is vital that everyone associated with the Navy—indeed all Americans—be aware of the importance and function of the United States Navy in today's world. Such maxims as that of Capt. John Paul Jones' "Without a Navy, alas America" is as true today as it ever was. But we must go beyond the maxims to a definition of exactly why the United States Navy is so important.

To answer this question, why a strong United States Navy is so important today, may I quote the following statement written in 1964 by Hanson Baldwin, military affairs analyst of the *New York Times*:

"To the United States, a continental island in a world of global conflict, control of the seas is vital. The arterial highways of alliance cross the world's oceans. Cut them and the alliance dies. Cold wars and brushfire conflicts lie across the seas, and sea power in all its forms—on, under, and above the sea—is the most flexible, the most mobile, and the most discreet form of limited-war power available. For the seas are free, and the political and psychological limitations of land bases are avoided by those who can use the sea."

"To the United States, the ability to use the broad oceans for our own purposes and to deny that use to any enemy, the ability to project our power inland from the sea, has been our greatest single strategic advantage in limited war and in the world struggle against Communism."

Mr. Baldwin has referred to the importance of the Navy's role in limited warfare. One of the first missions of the Navy under such conditions is the hampering of the enemy and the control of arms traffic to prevent the escalation of a land campaign. For example, during the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, naval power was used to prevent an additional Communist buildup in Cuba. We witnessed at that time nothing less than

what can be called the first full-fledged showdown between the United States and the Soviet Union in the nuclear age. It is particularly constructive to note that this confrontation took place on the seas, and a naval quarantine was employed to control the nature and scope of a Communist buildup of military power in an area that directly affects the security of our nation. Commenting on the importance of sea power during the Cuban crisis the late President Kennedy said:

"Events of October 1962 indicate as they have all through history that control of the seas means security, control of the seas means peace, control of the seas can mean victory. The United States must control the seas if it is to protect our security."

Another important function of the Navy in a limited war environment is the use of naval forces to supply, support, and protect an overseas land campaign and to deny the enemy access to the sea and land areas under contention. This, of course, is one of the functions being employed in Vietnam today by our naval forces.

In our battle to draw the line against Communist aggression in Southeast Asia, United States Navy pilots are bombing economic infrastructures, infiltration corridors and military bases in North Vietnam. Their efforts are supported by naval shore bombardments and, in some instances, invasion or landings of U.S. military personnel.

U.S. Marines this autumn broke the new Communist offensive by their valiant stand at Con Thien. Leatherneck battalions in I Corps daily face Red bombardments and hold off North Vietnamese regulars poised to infiltrate into South Vietnam through the Demilitarized Zone.

Navy Seabee and Marine units are engaged in what we have termed "the other war", the unprecedented effort to move a nation forward economically, politically and socially in the midst of a war. While resisting Communist aggression on the one hand, U.S. naval personnel at the same time are helping an embattled nation lift itself into the 20th Century.

My only regret today as we dedicate this fighting vessel named for such a valiant Marine is that there are some in this nation who seem to be losing the strength and spirit to see the battle in Vietnam through. In doing so, they are giving aid and comfort to Hanoi's policymakers because our adversaries are counting on a war-weary America, a nation which no longer has the patience, prudence and perseverance to stand by their commitments and aid Southeast Asia nations maintain their independence.

This policy won the war for the Viet Minh 13 years ago, when defeatism and fatigue caused the French to pull out of Indochina after Dienbienphu. In fact, Ho Chi Minh's only chance for victory lies not on the battlefield but in defeating the will and resolve of his adversary at home.

To abandon the South Vietnamese would weaken and undermine many nations, and lead the insatiable appetites of Communist aggressors toward even further aggression. If the name of the battlefield were not Vietnam, perhaps it would be Thailand, or India, or Venezuela. Modern history should teach us that if we do not live up to our commitments and responsibilities, we could find ourselves fighting for freedom not in distant lands but here in our own hemisphere.

I recall having read the following true anecdote in a 1961 issue of *US Naval Institute Proceedings*:

"A young naval lieutenant was commanding his first ship during recent NATO maneuvers when he collided with another vessel. Although the damage was slight, there was considerable confusion in the deployment of the fleet. The Admiral commanding

the operation signaled, "What do you propose to do now?"

The lieutenant's answering signal was, "Buy a small farm, sir."

There probably isn't a man alive who hasn't at some point dreamed of buying a small farm somewhere, far from the direct demands of today's civilization. For that matter, the United States itself oftentimes seems to yearn for what we recall as the placid, agrarian days of yesterday. But the United States must continue to provide freedom and security for its citizens within the framework of this dangerous nuclear age. And our Navy, of which the Marine Corps is an integral part, along with the Army and Air Force continues to serve as the guarantor of this freedom and our nation's security.

In my opening remarks I quoted the following sentence from a 1963 issue of *All Hands Magazine*: "Tradition, valor, and victory are the Navy's heritage from the past." The rest of the quotation is as follows: "To these may be added dedication, discipline, and vigilance as the watchwords of the present and future."

May I say that I am very proud to have served in the US Navy, and I am honored to be present at the launching of this splendid addition to our fleet which bears the name of that gallant Marine—Sgt. Ross Franklin Gray.

AMENDMENT TO S. 2388 OFFERED

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, equal justice for every American is one of the great ideals of our society. It is for this reason that I plan to propose an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act when this body considers S. 2388 later this week. My amendment would direct the Office of Economic Opportunity to foster and stimulate the adoption of those legal services programs which permit an indigent to freely choose his own attorney from those participating in the program. My amendment would not make the judicare program mandatory across the entire Nation, but rather it would encourage judicare programs whenever the local communities involved preferred such a method in contrast to the present OEO setup which provides that a salaried government lawyer handle the indigent's case. My amendment provides that the fees of the attorneys would conform to criteria based upon the regional fee schedules prescribed by the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Essentially the program I propose would permit each eligible person to choose his own attorney from among those participating in the program. The attorney would provide the services requested and would then be reimbursed from Federal funds provided by an OEO grant according to a prescribed fee schedule. Although the method of financing judicare would be different from that of the medicare program, the operation

of the two programs would be similar. They will both be based upon the principle that each eligible individual should have the right to services, whether medical or legal, and to the right of the choice of doctor or lawyer.

A major reason why I favor this approach to the provision of legal services to the poor is that I feel, without question, it is more consistent with our free enterprise system than the alternative of hiring "government salaried" lawyers to serve one segment of our population. In our system we believe that each American should have the right to shop at any store, to avail himself of any service and not be restricted to certain facilities and services just because he is poor. Rich or poor, each is entitled to some freedom of choice.

I point out that my amendment would encourage judicare programs whenever the local community preferred such a system instead of the type now eligible under the Economic Opportunity Act. It may be that the existing program of neighborhood legal services is more suited to certain populations and locations. In such event, my amendment would make no change. On the other hand, judicare may well be a unique and preferable program in small communities and rural areas where a full-time attorney for the poor is not needed.

The type of program I support has been tried and found to be successful. A similar system has been operating effectively in England for the past 20 years. It has been operating on a demonstration basis in Wisconsin and proved to be a workable successful program. I hope you will agree with me that local option should prevail in the choice of legal services provided by the Economic Opportunity Act.

AMENDMENT TO S. 2388 OFFERED BY MR. MORRIS OF NEW MEXICO

On page 188, at the end of line 18, insert the following:

"In carrying out this paragraph, the Director shall encourage, foster, and stimulate the adoption of legal services programs which (1) permit each user of the program to choose his attorney from among those participating in the program, and (2) provide that the fees of participating attorneys will conform to criteria prescribed by the Director."

ONE AGENCY ON SOUND FINANCIAL FOOTING

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHIPLEY] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly remarkable programs carried on by the Federal Government is that operated by the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture. This agency effectively provides supervised credit for farmers and other rural citizens whose opportunities to reach their goals and achieve their aspirations are

often frustrated by their inability to obtain necessary financing.

As my colleagues know, the law clearly provides that Farmers Home Administration may make loans only to those who cannot obtain credit from usual commercial sources, including the Federal land banks. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I was particularly interested to learn this week that the write-off rate on current USDA-FHA programs is a miniscule seventy-nine one-hundredths of 1 percent, and that interest collections are 13 times the writeoffs. This record clearly demonstrates the agency's adherence to sound principles of business management and efficient operation.

Through June 30, 1967, Farmers Home Administration has collected more than \$6 billion in principal and interest on \$9 billion advanced through current programs, most of which are long-term farm, housing, and community facilities loans. Interest collections passed the \$950 million mark during fiscal 1967 and are fast approaching \$1 billion.

In these days of mounting Federal expenses and requests for tax increases, it is refreshing to know that one agency is on such a sound financial footing.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and Farmers Home Administrator Howard Bertsch for their successful efforts to make USDA-FHA effective in its role of helping to revitalize rural America, while at the same time maintaining the highest standards of fiscal prudence and integrity.

CONGRESSIONAL ATTITUDES ON ROLE PLAYED BY THE PRESS, RADIO, AND TV MEDIA IN COVERING CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITIES AND NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include charts, tables, and extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I recently concluded a poll of Members of the House and Senate to discover congressional attitudes on the role played by the press, radio, and TV media in covering congressional activities and national affairs.

Five hundred and thirty-three questionnaires were sent out, there being two vacancies in the House. One hundred and fifty replies were received by the stated deadline, November 1. Signatures were not required but 24 Members did sign. Comments were invited and 22 Members availed themselves of this opportunity.

I thank my colleagues for their time and courtesy in making these responses, which I hope will prove helpful, both to the press and to the Congress, in our constant evaluation of our mutual responsibilities toward the people of the United States.

I insert the results of the poll in the RECORD at this point:

CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

[Please check 1]

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No opinion
1. In general, what kind of rating would you give radio on its coverage of national issues?.....	7	58	62	20	3
2. In general, what kind of rating would you give TV on its coverage of national issues?.....	12	47	58	32	0
3. In general, what kind of rating would you give newspapers on their coverage of national issues?.....	18	56	41	29	0

	Highly accurate	Reasonably accurate	Occasionally accurate	Seldom accurate	Rarely accurate
4. Do you think the television reports on congressional activities are generally.....	2	77	51	10	7
5. Do you think the newspaper reports on congressional activities are generally.....	4	79	48	9	6
6. Do you think radio reports on congressional activities are generally.....	3	92	44	1	5
7. Do you think that Huntley and Brinkley's TV reports on congressional activities are generally.....	8	67	33	21	8
8. Do you think Drew Pearson's newspaper reports on congressional activities are generally.....	1	17	51	27	52
9. Do you think Paul Harvey's radio reports on congressional activities are generally.....	5	33	43	24	19

	Yes	No	No opinion
10. Would you favor a code of ethics to be adopted for application to all radio, TV, and newspaper personnel accredited to House and Senate galleries?..	91	43	11

11. If you could only receive 1 weekly magazine to keep yourself accurately informed on the activities of Congress, which of the following would you prefer to receive?		12. Please list the news columnist you read most regularly (regardless of your opinion of reliability or the area covered).	
Time.....	13	Evans and Novak.....	29
Newsweek.....	33	David Lawrence.....	20
Life.....	2	Drew Pearson.....	17
U.S. News & World Report.....	82	James Reston.....	13
Congressional Quarterly.....	5	Art Buchwald.....	10
The National Observer.....	2	(Several others from William Buckley to Ann Landers also ran.)	
(Numerous others 1 each.)			

There were many comments included in the replies. Some samples follow:

Four Members thought it impossible to generalize on newspaper coverage since, as one said, it "depends on the newspaper—varying from rotten to excellent."

One thought:

"Some control should be put on radio, TV, and newspaper editorializing. Take for example, I ride to work every morning and hear Radio WMAL have an editorial everyday—they couldn't have that good a research department to know everything."

Two thought Paul Harvey was reasonably accurate but hedged their comments, one saying "Accurate in substance more often than not, but hardly ever accurate in perspective."

Comments on Drew Pearson were perhaps the most enthusiastic and ranged from one Member who considered him highly accurate to comments such as, "Only accidentally accurate" and "A paid purveyor of hatchets."

Two found Huntley and Brinkley TV reports "slanted," and one stated "These are performers—not newsmen," while another commented, "Their 30-minute program often seems stretched for content," and found radio programing pathetic.

Other samples included:

It is my opinion that most reporters covering Congress rely on prepared handouts rather than investigation—and that almost all tend to use the same one or two Members (Members varying for each reporter) for all their news bits and opinions. With a few exceptions, they are lazy, pompous, prejudiced, egotists. . . .

The press is a business. At times its interests as a business are not entirely consistent with the responsibilities it bears as a free system with Constitutional privileges and sanctions. In other words, "freedom of the press" is not a one-way street.

There are certain columnists, such as Drew Pearson, who consistently distort the news. While their columns may bring public attention to certain issues which could not otherwise be focused so dramatically, they have done much to hamper the tradition of "privileged communications" with members

of their profession. Drew Pearson has never reported any item accurately in which I was involved, which makes me doubt his veracity in regard to other Members.

Another Member commented in depth on the congressional questionnaire:

In general, I think all of the news media do a good job in covering the Congress within the limits of each medium. The newspapers over-all are the best because they can devote the space to the subject on a daily basis. I say this with respect to the major papers—The New York Times, The Washington Post and The Washington Star.

Television and radio news coverage are less comprehensive and many of the major newsmen in the electrical media acknowledge this. On certain subjects, however, television news exceeds the newspapers. This happens with the so-called "in depth" pieces the three networks will utilize frequently. Radio news is rarely more than the headlines and should not be expected to be much more than that.

I would add that the intelligent reader (if he wishes to remain that way) must read and listen to more than one source for the sake of accuracy. This presents a time problem but there is no other solution.

I oppose a "code of ethics" for Congressional reporters because I do not think this is a practicable idea. In fact, I am not even sure what is intended in such a code. The press plays a more significant role in our society than most citizens realize. Rather than restrictions, it needs to attract the best possible people to become its practitioners, a problem gaining wider recognition than heretofore.

Two other comments of interest were: "News of activities in Congress is too sketchy for average Americans to realize what is really happening," and "I try not to be confused by reading any—never do I read an editorial."

SOVIET USE OF SPACE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 3, Secretary Robert McNamara revealed to the American public that the Soviet Union has begun testing in orbit the carrier of a nuclear weapon, posing a new class of threat to the defense of the United States. Since September 1966, 11 flights have been recorded as reaching earth orbit in the Soviet pursuit of this system, and the Secretary estimates it could attain initial operational capability in 1968.

In the legal sense, the Soviet action does not yet constitute a violation of the recent treaty on peaceful use of outer space. Like an ICBM, the payload has been recovered in less than one orbit, but barely so. Like most other weapons tests in peacetime, it is highly unlikely that a nuclear weapon has been carried in the warhead.

But to say the least, the development of a new terror weapon, whatever its total military effectiveness, is a disappointment to all men of good will who hoped for an easing of tensions between the two great space powers.

The Secretary has indicated that in anticipation of this threat, protective steps have been undertaken. This underscores the urgency of both the very small antisatellite system we now possess in the mid-Pacific, and the proposed antiballistic missile system which is still only a research and development concept today.

So far, these Soviet weapons flights have not passed over the United States because their single fractional orbit carries them over the Pacific, Argentina, the South Atlantic, and Africa back to the U.S.S.R. In time of war they might come from any direction, scooting so low compared with an ICBM that our radars would have but limited warning. Fortunately, the preponderant logic is that these weapons in net balance are not as effective as the same resources put into the kind of weapons mix which both the United States and the Soviet Union al-

ready possess and which would destroy the main fabric of both societies in an all-out exchange.

Nonetheless, the Russians must have their military reasons for creating this new system, and we cannot ignore its uncertain potentials. Careful study, prompt study, will indicate what measures we should take to adjust to this new reality.

I think it is entirely appropriate for me to remind this body that some of us have been trying for years to explain how our involvement in the complex business of space technology has broad consequences for American life and American survival. Our space efforts keep us successful on the forefront of science, and can bring marked economic dividends to our daily life. But also unspoken in many decisions about space is the key importance of buying technological insurance against military surprise. I am not sure that we can be entirely happy about the state of our present defenses against an orbital bombardment attack. But our situation would be even more bleak if we had not made the broad effort in space technology which has been conducted by the Space Administration and the Department of Defense.

In the next year or two, I predict, on the basis of careful consideration, the Soviet Union is going to unveil further space capabilities which will not be to the advantage of the United States. Those of us who passed over as inconsequential in priority our space budget requests this year will feel a fresh concern as these events unfold.

This is not a time for panic, but it is a time for sober reflection on the realities of the technical revolution which is upon the world, whether the United States assumes a role of leadership in this regard or not.

OEO RECORD SET STRAIGHT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, among all of the unfair, inaccurate, and blatantly partisan charges that have been leveled against Sargent Shriver and OEO in the past 3 years, few if any have been so totally specious and ill founded as the charge that the OEO staff receives exorbitant salaries, and is somehow in a class by itself among Federal agencies as far as salary is concerned. Nothing could be further from the truth, Mr. Speaker, and I want to take a few moments at this time to try to set the record straight on this score, because the OEO salary issue is a phony issue if I ever heard of one.

The salaries and civil service grades of OEO employees are not set by Sargent Shriver. They are set by some mysterious cable of Democratic politicians or bureaucrats. They are established by the Civil Service Commission in consultation

with the Bureau of the Budget, and in accordance with the same Federal laws which govern salary levels in all Federal departments and agencies. There is nothing special about OEO. It has never received preferential treatment of any kind in this area, and there is absolutely no reason to attack the agency on the basis of the salaries earned by its employees.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the facts. In the President's budget for fiscal year 1968, 2,870 permanent positions are allocated to OEO. The average salary of these 2,870 employees, including Sargent Shriver and his top staff in OEO headquarters and seven regional offices, is at the level of GS grade 9.2, or about \$7,957, and this is down from an average pay level of GS grade 9.5 during OEO's first year of operation, in 1965. How does this compare with other Federal agencies? Well, the average grade in fiscal 1968 for the Bureau of the Budget is 11.6; for the Office of Emergency Planning it is 11.3; for NASA it is 10.4; for the Civil Aeronautics Board, it is 10.2; for the Rural Electrification Administration, it is 10; and for the NLRB, it is 9.5—all in excess of the OEO average, and these are only some of the Washington agencies whose employees, on the average, make more money than do the employees of OEO.

Some critics have alleged that OEO has an unduly large number of "supergrades," or positions at the level of GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18. In light of the facts, such a charge is ludicrous. Of the 2,870 OEO positions allocated in the President's fiscal 1968 budget, there are 24 GS-16's, 16 GS-17's, and 13 GS-18's. In addition, there are seven special positions, six of which are provided for in the Economic Opportunity Act, with compensation in excess of the GS-18 level. These seven positions are filled by Mr. Shriver; his deputy, Mr. Harding; the Directors of CAP, Job Corps, and VISTA; the Assistant Director for the elderly, Miss Genevieve Blatt; and the Assistant Director for research, plans, programs, and evaluation, Dr. Robert Levine. In all, these "supergrade" and special positions account for 60 out of the 2,870 OEO positions, or about 2.1 percent of the total. In other words, for each one of these OEO positions at grade GS-16 or higher, there are 47 positions at grade GS-15 or lower.

Again, the comparison with other Federal agencies is instructive. In contrast with the OEO ratio of 1 to 47, the ratio at NASA is about 1 to 43; at the Farm Credit Administration, it is about 1 to 40; at the NLRB, it is 1 to 17.4; at the ICC, it is 1 to 16.2; at the CAB, it is 1 to 15.8; at OEP, it is 1 to 13.4; and at the Budget Bureau, it is 1 to 8.9. Perhaps the most useful comparison, Mr. Speaker, can be made with the Peace Corps, which, like OEO, was organized and established under Sargent Shriver, and which is generally considered to be a model of administrative excellence. The ratio at the Peace Corps is 1 to 15.5; with 1,200 fewer employees than OEO, the Peace Corps has 48 more positions at the "supergrade" level—Foreign Service Reserve Officer, classes 1 and 2—above than OEO. And never, to my

knowledge, has a question been raised about the appropriateness of such positions at the Peace Corps—so why is it that there should be an issue with respect to OEO, the top-level headquarters of the war on poverty?

Those who seek to make political capital by assailing OEO are fond of trying to put OEO in a bad light by the most specious and irrelevant salary comparisons. The classic example is the charge that there are 25 OEO employees with salaries in excess of the base pay of General Westmoreland, the commander of our troops in Vietnam. The very clever hitch is the use of the words "base pay," which is only part of military compensation, instead of simply "pay," or "salary." By using this cute phraseology, the idea gets across to receptive minds—such as that of Henry J. Taylor, the eminent 18th-century columnist—that 25 OEO officials make more than General Westmoreland does. As has been repeatedly pointed out by OEO spokesmen, no one at OEO, including Sargent Shriver, is paid as much as General Westmoreland, who earns in excess of \$30,000 per year. Besides making more than Sargent Shriver, about one-third of the general's total compensation is tax free, and he enjoys free medical care for himself and his family, more generous retirement benefits than civil servants, and commissary and PX privileges. No one at OEO enjoys such advantages. So there is simply no excuse for any Member of this body who has the slightest regard for truth to invoke General Westmoreland's hallowed name in derogation of OEO employees. Not even the Director of the war on poverty is so audacious as to earn as much as the general, and we can put this question to rest once and for all. Of course, if there is any Member of this body who feels that the general is not getting paid enough, he is perfectly free to introduce legislation to correct the situation.

In any event, only the cynics and hypocrites will continue to affect shock that the general's base pay should not be more than the total pay of all OEO officials. A rough check of the President's budget for the Department of Agriculture reveals at least 78 positions compensated in excess of General Westmoreland's base pay, and I am sure that similar checks on the budgets of other agencies often favored by OEO's detractors would show equally shocking results. So let us leave General Westmoreland and his salary out of the debate on the pending bill, because nothing could be less relevant to the business at hand.

Another comparison OEO's enemies are fond of drawing is between OEO and the Office of Education. It is breathlessly revealed that the Office of Education has more employees but fewer supergrades and a lower average salary level than OEO, and the conclusion is drawn that a scandal has been uncovered. In fact, the same sort of ostensibly damaging comparison could be drawn between OEO and any number of Federal agencies, for the simple fact that different agencies do different jobs and have different responsibilities and functions, and the structure appropriate to any given

agency is dependent upon the job it is supposed to do. There is no standard staffing pattern for Federal agencies. The Bureau of the Budget therefore has a much higher ratio of highly paid staff to total staff than OEO, while the Office of Education has a lower ratio. Of the Bureau's 546 permanent staff positions in this fiscal year, 171 are at GS-15 and above: This is a ratio of 1 to 3.2. At OEO, 215 of 2,870 positions are at GS-15 or above, for a ratio of 1 to 13.3, while at the Office of Education 194 of 3,256 positions are at GS-15 or above, for a ratio of 1 to 16.7. This is because the three agencies have different jobs to do. The Office of Education, for instance, depends upon State and local education agencies to actually operate and administer the programs it funds, while OEO is responsible for national administration of CAP, Job Corps, and VISTA, as well as for overall coordination and planning of the war on poverty. So there is nothing magical about any staff ratio at the Office of Education, and if OEO has a higher ratio than the Office of Education, so does the Office of Education have a much higher ratio than dozens of other Federal agencies and bureaus. At the FBI, for instance, there were 4,643 GS-3's and GS-4's alone in fiscal 1967, about twice the number of OEO's total staff last year. It is thus totally irrelevant to single out OEO for comparison with agencies which have completely different responsibilities and functions. Chairman Macy of the Civil Service Commission has, on several occasions, specifically rejected the use of such comparisons, and of any arbitrary ratio or formula as a method of determining the number of positions at any grade appropriate to any Federal agency.

Based on the President's budget for fiscal 1968, only 2.33 percent of the funds requested to continue the war on poverty would go for salaries of all OEO employees—a figure which few, if any, other Federal agencies can beat. If funds allocated by OEO to other agencies are included, the figure becomes 3.8 percent. Of every \$100 obligated by OEO in fiscal 1967, only \$2.57 went for personnel compensation and benefits to OEO employees; if the total war on poverty budget for fiscal 1967 is used and programs of OEO's delegate agencies are included, for every \$100 obligated, \$4.21 went for personnel compensation and benefits. This is an entirely reasonable and modest ratio of personnel costs to total program costs, and compares favorably with most other Federal agencies with similar top-level responsibilities. For instance, 4.15 percent of HEW funds are allocated to salaries and personnel benefits, and at labor, the figure is 7.5 percent.

Mr. Speaker, there is a curious irony in the argument of those who on the one hand criticize OEO administration, and on the other hand seek to make it even more difficult than it already is for OEO to attract and retain the top-quality personnel so desperately needed to carry out the immense responsibilities borne by this gallant little agency. The notion that OEO can be improved by lowering the caliber of its staff is a strange one, to say the least, but the conclusion is incapable that to deprive OEO of the staff

structure which it needs to do its job—and which the Civil Service Commission, the Budget Bureau, and responsible congressional committees know it needs to do its job—will inexorably lead to a far less competent, less effective, and less dedicated group of OEO employees.

Of course, that is precisely what certain people would like to see happen, and so I do not hesitate to categorize amendments directed against OEO staff salaries as in fact being deliberate attempts to cripple or kill OEO itself. To knowingly deprive a top-level agency like OEO of the caliber of staff it needs is more than being penny wise and pound foolish—especially in light of the meager "savings" involved. Last year's amendment to limit OEO to one "supergrade" per 100 employees, for instance, would have saved the Government about \$56,000, at the cost of about half of OEO's top staff. Such a move can only be motivated by the desire to undermine OEO itself, and indeed to emasculate the war on poverty.

Mr. Speaker, as a final confirmation of my views on this subject, I would like to offer for insertion at this point in the Record a very excellent letter, from Civil Service Commission Chairman John W. Macy, Jr., to Senator Joseph S. Clark, which was written 13 months ago when House and Senate conferees were considering a final poverty bill. Chairman Macy discussed the so-called Ashbrook amendment in last year's House-passed bill, and successfully urged the conferees to omit such a provision from the conference bill. Chairman Macy's letter follows:

OCTOBER 7, 1966.

Hon. Joseph S. Clark,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: In the course of the conference discussion on the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1966, consideration will undoubtedly be given to the provisions of the so-called Ashbrook amendment added to the bill in the House of Representatives on September 30. This amendment provides that the Office of Economic Opportunity and its field offices shall not have more than one position in the Classification Act grades of GS-16, 17 and 18 for every 100 employees on its rolls.

It may be of assistance to you and the other conferees to have background from the Civil Service Commission concerning the allocation and distribution of positions in these grades at the Office of Economic Opportunity. I am forwarding a similar letter to Chairman Powell.

Unless a specific exception is provided in Title V of the United States Code, any position placed in grades GS-16, 17 and 18 of the general schedule in an executive agency of the Government must be approved by a majority of the three Civil Service Commissioners. Such approval action was taken by the Commission in the allocation of positions to these grade levels in the Office of Economic Opportunity. In every instance the Civil Service Commissioners themselves reviewed the recommendations for placement of these positions in one of the top three grades of the general schedule. Not every one so recommended was allocated to one of these three grades. The ones which the Commissioners did place in these grade levels were believed to be thoroughly justified on the basis of sound classification principles and in comparison with other similar type positions placed in those grade levels in other agencies of Government.

In addition, the Commission carefully checked with the Bureau of the Budget before taking approval action to make sure that the proposed organizational structure in which the positions were being established followed sound organizational principle and they were required to carry out the agency's important mission. The Commission received Budget Bureau assurance that the organizational structure was sound and that the positions proposed were required to staff the leadership posts in that organization.

The Commission's position has always been that in the allocating of top level positions, there is no validity to considerations of ratio of numbers of top positions to total employee population within an agency. A new organization needs a higher ratio when it is in initial stages of development. This ratio will go down as the new agency grows.

A central staff agency with top professional personnel will need a higher proportion of top positions than an operating agency with a large volume of day-to-day work operations and a large number of clerical or semi-skilled employees.

The large departments will have a relatively low proportion of top positions to employee population even though they may have the largest number of top jobs. Conversely, the smaller agencies will have much higher ratios since their total employee populations are smaller, since they have the same need for top professional and managerial staff and since their missions usually require a larger proportion of professional type personnel.

It follows that the agencies in the Executive Office of the President would fall into the latter category. For example, the Bureau of the Budget, the Office of Emergency Planning, the Office of Science and Technology, and the Office of Economic Opportunity are all agencies that are concerned with planning, directing, coordinating, and integrating the work done by many other agencies of Government or, in some instances, by parts of the private sector outside of Government. Their work is much less operational than most of the other agencies of Government. Their ratios of top general schedule positions to the total number of employees will be much higher than in the larger Government departments.

The Commission has consistently held that the top level positions in these agencies, as in all other executive branch agencies, should be based on the worth of each individual position and not an arbitrary numbers unrelated to the specific positions in a needed organizational structure.

There would be a serious impact on vital work done by the Office of Economic Opportunity if the Congress finally places a ratio on the number of positions in the top three grade levels in relationship to the total number of employees. The Civil Service Commission has allocated to the Office of Economic Opportunity 52 of the relatively scarce spaces available for distribution to departments and agencies. As of July 31, there were approximately 2,900 employees in the Office of Economic Opportunity. If the Ashbrook amendment were adopted, it would mean that the agency would have to manage its programs with only 29 positions in the top three grades. This drastic reduction would certainly have a severe detrimental impact on the agency's capability to meet its statutory obligations.

The Civil Service Commission urges that the conferees thoroughly assess the impact of this restriction and consider the elimination of such an arbitrary restraint on the ability of the agency to do its job. The Commission can assure the Congress that it will continue to review with great care every position recommended for allocation to the top three grades.

The Commission will review periodically the grade structure in the Office of Economic

Opportunity to assure itself that the positions already allocated to that agency are needed and are operating at the levels contemplated when they were originally placed in their present grades. The Commission will also continue its close scrutiny of the persons proposed for appointment to these positions since the law also requires that we approve the qualifications of persons placed in these grades.

Please let me know if there is any further information which I can provide you to assist in your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, JR.,
Chairman.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S DECISION TO SELL SUPERSONIC JET WARPLANES TO LATIN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a month ago the press reported that the State Department, contrary to what had been our understanding, proposed to approve the sale of the American supersonic jet F-5 warplanes to Latin American countries. Peru, Brazil, Chile, the Argentine, and other countries were mentioned as possible recipients.

A number of my colleagues and I were disturbed. These planes are relevant neither for antiguerrilla warfare, nor for continental air defense. Their sole effect appears to be to enhance the prestige of the Latin American military, to generate an arms race, and to subtract valuable resources, particularly foreign exchange, from the vitally necessary economic development of these countries. All of the countries concerned have grievous problems of economic development and are close to the limit of their foreign exchange resources.

The case against the State Department's position is well put in a recent editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

BACK IN THE ARMS TRADE

The State Department is being somewhat coy about whether it has changed policy in allowing sales of supersonic jet warplanes to Latin America. Whether the policy has been changed or not, it seems wrong.

For at least a year the United States has appeared to resist Latin American efforts to buy such "sophisticated" weapons, because such military expenditures could better be used for domestic development. However, in recent weeks Peru and Brazil have been talking with the French firm of Marcel Dassault about buying Mirage fighter-bombers. The State Department's brief announcement that American Northrop F-5 jet fighters would be made available amounts to saying that the United States might as well get the business as the French.

Washington officials content that, actually, the arms sales policy has not been changed, and that the only reason the Latin republics could not buy F-5s until now was that they were not ready for delivery. Does it matter? The arguments against United States involvement in a Latin arms race are as sound now as in the past, and provide no excuse for spurring that race just because the French did.

Supersonic planes and other advanced equipment are totally irrelevant in Latin America. Peru wants them in fear of Chile and Chile wants them out of suspicion of Argentina and the Argentine and Brazilian

governments want them for no apparent reason, unless it is to hold their unpopular clamps on their peoples. But all of these nations depend ultimately on United States protection against outside aggression and for that purpose a few jet fighters would do them no good.

To the contrary, such arms purchases would be a distinct disservice to countries struggling with regressive economies and backward social conditions. As with other underdeveloped nations, they need dollars for more important purposes than gilding creaking military machines.

In offering to add to Latin armaments, the United States is doing its neighbors no service and its own diplomatic pretensions of peaceful goals no good. What is the purpose?

No doubt it will be argued that it is better for Latins to fly American warplanes than French, but why? Since World War II this country has helped to arm both sides in the Middle East, both sides in the Pakistan-India dispute and both sides in the Greek-Turkish argument over Cyprus, as well as practically any side anywhere that met the solitary consideration of being anti-Communist.

In 17 years we have sent abroad, in gifts and sales, more than 37 billion dollars in armaments—including more than 20,000 tanks and 10,000 planes. But where on earth has this arsenal diplomacy won America any lasting friends, or political influence, or military power? And where has it helped to promote freedom and democracy?

With negative answers preponderant, the Pentagon turned a year or so ago to the argument that the United States needed arms trading because of its balance of payments deficit. In truth, this is big business for what President Eisenhower once termed the military-industrial complex. Since 1961 arms exports abroad have averaged about two billion dollars a year. That is close to half the value of all exports of manufactured goods.

The defense complex may profit from this but the nation does not. The profit in balance of payments is not worth the ultimate cost of cynical diplomacy—of preaching peace while contributing to arms races, of advocating international development while burdening it with guns, of blaming others for being merchants of death while taking second place to no one in that respect.

Let France, or the Soviet Union, or somebody else foul up the small nations with their military hardware. That is no excuse for the United States. Its security is not affected by restraint, and its prestige and principles are contaminated by the arms trade.

Thus, we wrote on October 25, 1967, to Secretary of State Dean Rusk asking that the State Department reconsider its apparent decision to sell F-5's. Particularly, we pointed out that this decision seriously compromised our foreign aid program; that inevitably U.S. foreign aid would be used to repair the holes in the foreign exchange position of these countries left by the U.S. moral approval of their improvident expenditures on unnecessary warplanes; and that this compelled us to reevaluate our support of foreign aid programs.

I have today received the reply of Secretary of State Rusk to our letter of October 25:

NOVEMBER 4, 1967.

DEAR MR. REUSS: I am writing in reply to the letter which you and a number of your colleagues sent to me on October 25 about the sale of U.S. military aircraft to developing countries, particularly those in Latin America. I understand that Under Secretary Katzenbach and Assistant Secretary Oliver have discussed this matter with you and reviewed the reasons for our decision to authorize discussions on the sale

of F-5 aircraft to certain Latin American countries.

I want to make clear how strongly I share your concern that we do not encourage developing countries to use their resources for the purchase of unnecessary military equipment. We pressed strongly, prior to the Summit Meeting in April 1967, to encourage an agreement among the Latin American nations to forgo permanently certain types of heavy military equipment and to postpone the acquisition of advanced aircraft until 1970. We were unable to secure a comprehensive agreement because no Latin American country was willing to assume the initiative at that time. However, Brazil did introduce the "unnecessary military expenditures" paragraph in the Declaration of the Presidents of the Americas.

We have had even less success persuading European governments to forgo the sale of unnecessary military equipment to Latin American countries. The attitude of the European governments is public knowledge; they have resisted, even resented, our efforts to limit sales of military equipment. They do not see the sales of arms as a moral issue but as a commercial effort to improve their export earnings.

At the same time, we must understand—even if we do not fully share—the very strongly felt and not unreasonable concern of Latin American governments that their military forces have access to advanced military technology in order to modernize and replace worn-out or obsolescent equipment. This applies particularly to their desire for limited replacement of tactical aircraft as these aircraft become technologically obsolescent and beyond reasonable repair. Comparative statistics show that the Latin American countries have not in fact modernized at the rate and pace common in other parts of the world. But it is a fact of life that these countries believe they should participate in some reasonable way adapted to Latin American conditions, in the progress of a technology which has both military and, actually or potentially, civilian use; and that they consider their Armed Forces a vital expression of their nationhood and sovereignty. We cannot reasonably ask these countries to deny themselves all access to advanced military equipment, and it would be impossible for us to prevent them from acquiring this equipment in view of the attitude of European governments.

Our ability to exercise influence in, and cooperate with, Latin America in the direction of reduced arms expenditures depends essentially on the good will we enjoy in these countries, and on our willingness to take an understanding and flexible attitude towards what they consider as minimal but essential defense needs. If we try to dictate military programs without regard to national sensitivities and outlooks, we will lose our good will while failing to prevent the acquisition of arms. And going beyond this immediate issue, an overly rigid posture in this highly sensitive area would affect adversely our working relationships with these governments in other areas as well and thereby reduce our ability to encourage social and economic progress under the Alliance.

You may be interested in just how Latin American air forces have evolved since World War II under the influence of U.S. (and European) policy. In the late 1940's, these air forces acquired mainly lend-lease World War II aircraft such as the P-47, P-51 and F-4U. By the 1950s this equipment had worn out: Latin American countries began to acquire surplus fighter aircraft, by now jet, first in Europe and then in the United States, at relatively low cost. Replacement of these aircraft, in turn, became necessary in the late 1950s: the early jet models were replaced with more modern jets from both Europe and the United States. These planes are now also wearing out after ten years of

use. We have suggested interim solutions, such as the sale of A-4B aircraft to Argentina, but several Latin American countries have insisted that by the end of the 1960s they want to move to a more advanced aircraft that can be maintained for at least ten years.

The F-5 was developed under the military assistance program and is a technically simple, low-cost but modern aircraft. It is the only practical alternative to far more advanced and costly aircraft, such as later models in the A-4 series, the U.S. Century series, the British Lightning or the French Mirage. In other words, the F-5 while incorporating the advanced technology which these governments seek is adapted to the needs of developing countries; there is a sharp step-up in cost and complexity in going from the F-5 to these other aircraft.

Accordingly, when concern mounted in Latin America about replacement of aging equipment, we told the Latin American nations in 1965 that we would be prepared to see limited deliveries of F-5s in 1969/1970. Our recent decision to authorize discussions between the U.S. manufacturer and the Latin American Governments meets this time frame because a 20-month lead time is required on the average from the start of such discussions to actual deliveries.

In view of our reluctance to make available more advanced equipment and our persistent efforts to persuade the Latin American governments to go slow in acquiring them, I can understand that you considered our announcement as reflecting a change in policy. In fact it is not. In the months past we have pushed our policy of restraint harder than ever before. Over the years it has helped in promoting a 50 per cent reduction in Latin American military budgets. In the months to come we plan to continue to use our influence in favor of restraint wherever we can.

One factor in maintaining restraint is our decision to insist on strictly commercial sales arrangements between the U.S. manufacturer and the Latin American governments. It will be up to these governments to weigh the priority of these aircraft relative to other pressing demands upon their budgets. The United States Government will authorize the sales but it will not support them with credits.

Another important fact to remember is that the F-5s to be sold will replace existing aircraft. Thus, our decision will not result in an enlargement of Latin American air forces. In fact, the number of fighter squadrons operating in Latin America has declined since 1961 by 30 per cent.

Taking all these factors into consideration, it seems clear to me that the sale of F-5s is not only consistent with the Punta del Este Declaration but in fact essential to our ability to press for its implementation. In reaching our decision we are fully cognizant of the objective of an arms limitation agreement in Latin America, such as was called for by President Frei on October 31, 1967. We believe that our refusal to make F-5s available would almost eliminate the chance for such an agreement in the foreseeable future because it would ensure that Latin American countries would proceed to acquire far more advanced and sophisticated fighter aircraft in Western Europe.

You and your colleagues state that our decision on F-5s compels you to reevaluate your previous support for our foreign aid authorization. I fully appreciate and share your concern that the limited resources of Latin America, and for that matter all developing countries, go to the fullest possible extent for the welfare and improvement of human life. But I am equally convinced that the position you and your colleagues propose to take on the sale of these aircraft would be considered in Latin America as an attempt to force the will of sovereign countries on

matters of their own defense, in violation of Articles 15 and 17 of the OAS Charter.

I hope that you and your colleagues will agree that, under the circumstances, the course we have chosen, in close consultations with the Latin American countries themselves, is a reasonable one.

I am also persuaded that a majority of the Congress supports both the objective we seek and our specific decision. I would welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter with you further. I would regret if you do not share our view that this is the best course to follow and am hopeful that you and your colleagues, after further review, will continue your support for the great developmental tasks in the less-developed world, and particularly in this Hemisphere.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

In short, the State Department proposes to go ahead with its plans to sell F-5's to Latin American countries. Among other things, this decision seems at variance with the conference report, agreed to by both the Senate and House conferees on November 3, 1967, on section 620(s) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967. This conference report will be before the House within the next few days. That language follows:

In furnishing assistance under this Act, and in making sales under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, the President shall take into account (1) the percentage of the recipient or purchasing country's budget which is devoted to military purposes, and (2) the degree to which the recipient or purchasing country is using its foreign exchange resources to acquire military equipment. When the President finds that development assistance under this Act or sales under P.L. 480 are being diverted to military expenditures or a recipient or purchasing country is diverting its own resources to increasing military expenditures to a degree which would materially interfere with its development, the President shall terminate such assistance and sales until he is assured that such diversion will no longer take place. No other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provision of this sub-section.

The above language is substantially identical with the language passed by the Senate on August 15, 1967. Senate Report No. 499 of August 9, 1967, on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967 says of the language, page 36:

The committee's objective is very simple—to try to be of some influence in dissuading recipients of U.S. aid from spending their scant resources for military purposes and in insuring that U.S. aid does not help them pay for unnecessary arms. In too many countries U.S. economic aid goes in one pocket and comes out the other pocket in the form of useless military expenditures.

The amendment is aimed not only at aid recipients who buy arms from third countries, but at those who buy from the United States—and at U.S. officials who sell to them. U.S. military aid and sales policy leaves much to be desired in this respect. The amendment, in no small measure, is directed at controlling our own bureaucracy where the right hand in AID, concerned with economic development, often does not seem to know what the left hand in the Defense Department, busy building foreign armies, is doing. This amendment, and other changes made by the committee in revamping military aid and sales policy, should make U.S. assistance far more effective in accomplishing the development objectives intended by the Congress. The committee expects that this

amendment will be implemented when necessary and that it will not be permitted to become an idle paper threat through nonuse.

The language, as clearly stated in the Senate report "is aimed not only at aid recipients who buy arms from third countries, but at those who buy from the United States—and at U.S. officials who sell to them."

Yet here we have the State Department, the day after the conference report was adopted, telling the Congress that no matter how much a Latin American country's use of foreign exchange resources to buy unnecessary military hardware interferes with its development, U.S. officials intend to go ahead and approve the sale of F-5's.

I once again call upon the State Department to reconsider its decision to permit the sale of F-5's to Latin American countries where it would consume foreign exchange needed for the economic development.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for an indefinite period, on account of his attendance at the 22d General Assembly of the United Nations as an official member of the U.S. delegation to the U.N.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. ARENDT), for today, on account of illness in family.

Mr. HOSMER, for November 7 and 8, on account of official business of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. CORMAN, for Monday, November 6, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FASCELL, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. VANDER JAGT) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BRAY, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. POFF, for 20 minutes, on November 7.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. KUFFERMAN, for 15 minutes, on November 7.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 30 minutes, November 7.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. REUSS to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter in special order today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. VANDER JAGT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. ROBISON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. WRIGHT.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. REES.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. GILBERT.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 391. An act to amend the act of March 1, 1933 (47 Stat. 1418), entitled "An act to permanently set aside certain lands in Utah as an addition to the Navajo Indian Reservation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 561. An act to authorize the appropriation of funds for Cape Hatteras National Seashore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1321. An act to establish the North Cascades National Park and Ross Lake and Lake Chelan National Recreation Areas, to designate the Pasayten Wilderness and to modify the Glacier Peak Wilderness, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5091. An act to amend Public Law 87-752 (76 Stat. 749) to eliminate the requirement of a reservation of certain mineral rights to the United States; and

H.R. 11627. An act to amend the act of June 16, 1948, to authorize the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate certain additional bridges and tunnels in the State of Maryland.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 7, 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:

1202. A letter from the national commander, Civil Air Patrol, transmitting the Annual Report of the Civil Air Patrol for the calendar year 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 79-476; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1203. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July-August 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 10085. A bill to amend section 211 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administration of General Services to prescribe regulations for the use by executive agencies of airconditioning units in Government-owned passenger motor vehicles, and for other purposes with amendment (Rept. No. 889). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 12510. A bill to establish a Commission on Government Procurement; with amendment (Rept. No. 890). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PASSMAN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 13893. A bill making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 891). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 13880. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 13881. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.R. 13882. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 13883. A bill to provide for orderly trade in footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 13884. A bill to prohibit federally insured banks from voting their own stock and to provide for cumulative voting in federally insured banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 13885. A bill to authorize an appropriation of \$10,000 toward the cost of erecting a monument in the Spanish War Memorial Park, Tampa, Fla., commemorating the patriotic services of the American forces in the war with Spain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 13886. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of special pay for sea duty, and provide the entitlement for officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 13887. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to prohibit discrimination against small newspapers as borrowers from the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13888. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to provide that the amount of ground fish imported into the United States shall not exceed the average annual amount thereof imported during 1963 and 1964; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma:

H.R. 13889. A bill to require the Bureau of the Budget to submit to the Congress certain monthly estimates concerning national income and expenditures; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 13890. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 13891. A bill to provide for an annual conference between representatives of the dairy industry, the Secretary of Agriculture, and representatives of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government to consider problems relating to the import and export of dairy products to and from the United States, to interstate commerce in dairy products within the United States and related problems in international trade and interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 13892. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.R. 13893. A bill making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GOODELL (for himself, Mr. QUIE, Mr. ERLBORN, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ESCH, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, and Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN):

H.R. 13894. A bill to mesh the combined efforts of government at all levels with private endeavors to provide jobs and dignity for the poor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.J. Res. 920. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a survey of the coastal and freshwater commercial and recreational fishery resources adjacent to the United States, including the resources within the territorial waters of the Great Lakes, the territories and possessions of the United States, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and to make available to the public and Congress information gained from such survey; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H. Con. Res. 572. Concurrent resolution providing that it is the sense of Congress that the President should accord preeminence to safety in the operation of all Federal airway and air travel undertakings along with the maintenance of the standards of safety intended by Congress in all Federal programs relating to all phases of air travel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MINISH:

H. Con. Res. 573. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the incorporation of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia into the Union of Soviet

Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mrs. BOLTON, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. HALLECK, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HAYS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LATTI, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROUDEBUSH, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. RUMSFELD, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, and Mr. VIGORITO):

H. Con. Res. 574. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the Great Lakes Basin compact and the Great Lakes Commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma:

H. Res. 967. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide that each public bill or resolution introduced in the House of Representatives shall contain an estimate of the cost to the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 13895. A bill for the relief of Ugo Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 13896. A bill for the relief of John R. Olson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 13897. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Saverio Florino and their son, Francesco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13898. A bill for the relief of Maria Carcione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 13899. A bill for the relief of Pietro Addamo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 13900. A bill for the relief of Norma Esther Barrosa and daughter Andrea Claudia Cotelini; 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:

197. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Robert B. Murphy, Leavenworth, Kans., and Elizabeth Murphy, Alderson, W. Va., relative to compensation from the Treasury of the United States for a sustained loss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

198. Also, petition of the City Council, City of Pacifica, Calif., relative to Federal tax rebates, unrestricted block grants and a shift of sources of revenue from the Federal to local government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

199. Also, petition of city of Stockton, Calif., relative to the principle of tax sharing in order to make additional revenues available to the State and local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

200. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to a war profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

World's Largest Airline Personnel Training Center To Be Built by American Near Fort Worth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 6, 1967

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, another great step in the program by our Nation's airlines to keep this country the leader in air transportation has just been taken by American Airlines.

This is American's announcement that it will build a multimillion-dollar Academy of Flight to be located on an 80-acre campus adjacent to the new supersonic airport being constructed between the Texas cities of Fort Worth and Dallas.

In this new academy, when completed in 1969, will be the focal point of an educational complex for flight crews and it will be the largest airline personnel training center in the world.

American, in this new jet-age and supersonic-age academy, will give its professional pilots graduate level training for both the supersonic and the other highly advanced transports due in the 1970's.

William T. Seawell, American senior vice president, has stated that while the center will be primarily for training American's pilots, his company is studying the possibility of admitting crews from smaller airlines, both foreign and domestic.

The new academy will comprise an administration building and student service center; cafeteria and medical facilities; safety research center, classroom building, and a simulator building. The academy will be completed in 1969 on acreage now containing American's Stewardess College, which will be tripled in size.

We are delighted to have this new academy located in the Fort Worth-Dallas area and congratulate American Airlines on this fine project.

National Eye Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 6, 1967

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, with permission, I wish to insert in the RECORD my recent statement before the Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, on my bill and related bills, to establish a National Eye Institute:

TESTIMONY OF HON. JACOB H. GILBERT, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE, HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, NOVEMBER 1, 1967

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend this committee for its forward-looking stand in conducting hearings on the proposal to establish a National Eye Institute. I am one of the sponsors of this proposal, my bill being H.R. 4331, but Congressman Fred B. Rooney of Pennsylvania, author of the bill, deserves our particular thanks. This is a progressive measure, one that is worthy of Congress' tradition as a leader in the field of health care and research. All of us here in Congress depending so heavily as we do on our eyes, understand its meaning. I urge favorable consideration of this bill and the establishment, without delay, of a National Eye Institute.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, we know that by 1975, unless there is a dramatic breakthrough in eye research and treatment, there will be some 16 million blind persons in the world. Even today, in the United States alone, there are three and a half million men, women and children suffering from permanent and serious eye defects. It is estimated that nearly 90 million Americans suffer from some sort of eye trouble. At

this moment, there are more than 10 million in the world who are blind.

It is difficult to believe that with all the effort and money that has been put into medical research, most diseases of the eye remain a mystery to doctors. Eighty percent of all loss of vision in the United States results from diseases of which the causes are unknown. Surely that alone is testimony to the importance of this legislation.

In economic terms, the burden of eye diseases is staggering. Mr. Chairman. Public assistance is extended to more than 100,000 blind persons. Society pays for special facilities, books, teachers and materials for no less than 20,000 blind children attending elementary and secondary schools. The upkeep is tremendous for vocational rehabilitation centers and other facilities to restore the productivity of the blind. I have no figure of how much society pays for this grievous debility but it is enormous, and we obviously cannot measure blindness in monetary terms alone.

But, as an example, let me point out to you the story recently brought to my attention of one blinding disease. In 1953, doctors made the discovery that too much oxygen administered to premature infants resulted in retrolental fibroplasia, a cause of blindness. As a result of the discovery, the incidence of this disease fell from 1900 cases in 1952 to only 28 in 1958. Happily, this terrible condition is today a rarity. But if this discovery had come only a year later, the lifetime cost of care for the additional blind persons would have amounted to more than \$120 million. If the discovery had come 10 years later, the cost would have exceeded one billion dollars.

So you see, Mr. Chairman, you are not being asked to undertake a project that is merely humane, as if humaneness alone were not sufficient reason for passage of the bill. This measure will pay for itself over and over again in the years to come. The National Eye Institute would conduct research on blinding eye diseases, blindness and other visual defects. Its work will be of benefit not only to the thousands, perhaps millions, who will be saved from blindness. It will be of benefit to society, both at home and abroad.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Subcommittee, the American people will be grateful to you for positive consideration of this bill. A recent Gallup Poll disclosed that Americans fear blindness only second to cancer as a debilitating disease. I urge you to act quickly, for each day means more persons