simply a device to further stabilize and manipulate the price farmers receive for their commodities. Had the administration and some Democrat members of the committee been willing to insulate the stocks acquired under the provisions of the reserve bill, it would have passed without difficulty. In my opinion, the 6 to 6 vote on the amendment offered by Congressman John Zwach of Minnesota indicated the administration was not interested in a true reserve proposal. The Zwach amendment would have prevented the release of any reserve stocks at less than 100 percent of parity. This amendment would insulate the stocks from the market, resulting in significant increases in the market prices. Six Republicans voted for the Zwach amendment, and significantly, six Democrats opposed it. This should leave no doubt as to which party is interested in improving farm income.

TIDE OF PROTECTION

As we look ahead to the future, the wheat producer will be adversely affected by the rising tide of protectionism. We are witness to an increase by foreign countries in efforts to set aside the conventional rules in international trade in order to solve domestic problems.

The European Economic Community's variable levy on cereal imports effectively protects indigenous production from competition. Concurrently, other portions of the *EEC* farm policy are providing financial incentives to its farmers to increase production.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has recognized the danger inherent in *EEC's* common agricultural policy. In April, 1966, he said:

"The consequences for a liberal trade policy generally will be very serious if we cannot negotiate in the Kennedy Round some limitations on the trade restrictive effects of the Common Market's common agriculture policy. All of us, therefore, have a vital stake in the successful outcome of the Kennedy Round."

The variable levy system, while one of our original targets in the Kennedy Round, *was one of our negotiation failures.*

INCREASED PRODUCTION

Another factor adversely affecting our wheat position is the increasing production all over the world. We suffer from a complete lack of cooperation from other exporting nations in managing production and stocks. Argentina, Australia, and France continue to produce on an unlimited basis and get rid of their supplies on a year-to-year basis. Canada has no production limitations. The United States has taken on the role of supply manager for the world, and in this role has become the residual supplier to the commercial markets. *It is time that we let the world know that we are going to be competitive, every hour of every day.*

Another negotiation failure in the Kennedy Round was our efforts to get effective access guarantees. The United States proposed that importing countries purchase a fixed percentage from all exporting countries of their total needs. Secretary Freeman stated:

"The number one key to sustained expansion of U.S. agricultural exports is access to markets."

The Under Secretary in testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee stated:

"The opportunity to compete for traditional import markets is one of the cornerstones of our position."

These negotiating failures are costing wheat growers dearly. They will continue to do so for many years.

STEPS TO IMPROVE INCOME

Time and time again, I have outlined constructive steps to improve wheat growers' income. But time and time again the *Administration has ignored the recommendations.* Let me restate them.

(1) Raise the loan rate for wheat from $1.25 to $1.40 per bushel.

(2) Announce that no wheat stocks owned or to be owned for the next 2 years by *CCC* will be resold at less than parity.

(3) Announce that *CCC* will pay the first year storage costs for wheat under loan.

(4) Expand exports under P.L. 480 to the maximum consistent with the self-help provisions.

(5) Price wheat competitively for export, and take down the umbrella over the world commercial market. Under this price umbrella, Australia, Argentina, and France sell their crops and make the United States less competitive.

The American farmer is in serious trouble because of present "stop and go" policies. In my opinion, strong new leadership and new direction is needed.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross daily and follow Me.—Luke 9: 23.

O God of grace and goodness, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, out need of Thy mercy and our desire for Thy guidance. We beseech Thee to make us more and more aware of Thy presence, give us to know that Thou art ever with us and that with Thee we can face the day with confidence, do our work with fidelity, and be calm in the midst of trying experiences.

We do not pray for freedom from disappointment or defeat but we do pray that Thou wouldst give us the faith and fortitude we need for these hours and such strength, as will enable us to do the work we are called upon to do and to do it honorably and well.

Renewing our strength, reinvigorating our minds, and restoring our souls, send us out into this day to do what we can for others, to keep our Nation great, and to make the world a better place where men can learn to live together in peace. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Bradley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 480) entitled "An act to amend the act of October 4, 1961, relating to the acquisition of wetlands for conservation of migratory waterfowl, to extend for an additional 8 years the period during which funds may be appropriated under that act, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 830) entitled: "An act to prohibit age discrimination in employment," with amendments in which concurrence of the House is requested to the foregoing bill.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2388, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967, UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW NIGHT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tomorrow night to file the conference report on S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967.

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

There was no objection.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the question of privilege.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the District Court of the First Judicial District of the State of Idaho, Kootenai County, to testify on Thursday, December 7, 1967, in the action of John Heine against School District 271, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, and others.

Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send the subpena to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

JOHN HEINE, PLAINTIFF *v.* SCHOOL DISTRICT 271, COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO, AND STATE OF IDAHO, ACTING BY AND THROUGH ITS DULY ELECTED SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, D. F. ENGELKING, LEO REINAN, COEUR D'ALENE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, IDAHO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION AND NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, DEFENDANT—SUBPOENA

[In the District Court of the First Judicial District of the State of Idaho, Kootenai County]

The people of the State of Idaho, to: George V. Hansen, Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

You are hereby commanded that, laying aside all excuses, you appear at the Court Room of the District Court of the First Judicial District of the State of Idaho, in and for the County of Kootenai, at Coeur d'Alene on the 7th day of December, 1967, at ---- o'clock --M. of said day, as a Witness in the above entitled action on the part of the plaintiff.

Given under my hand this 24th day of November 1967.

HAROLD E. PETERSON,
Clerk.

By JASPER FITZGERALD,
Deputy Clerk.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

A CALL TO AMERICAN CONSUMERS TO ABSTAIN FROM PURCHASING FRENCH-MADE PRODUCTS THIS CHRISTMAS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, we are entering the height of the holiday season in which Americans have the pleasure of buying gifts and sharing the holidays with their families and friends.

Yet we approach the holidays in difficult days. Hundreds of thousands of young Americans are fighting overseas and the American economy is being challenged by a French-directed raid on our gold reserves.

Thus at Christmastime 1967, I call upon American consumers to abstain from purchasing French-made products, such as apparel, wine, and perfume. By refusing to buy French goods the strong voice of the American consumer will carry to French President de Gaulle our rejection of his attempt to undermine the dollar. Such a refusal to buy French products would also be an important and powerful way of telling De Gaulle to immediately begin payment on his country's $6.8 billion World War I debt to this country.

France must learn that international trusts and agreements cannot be discarded like idle promises.

INDIANA'S PONT WINS COACH OF YEAR AWARD

Mr. ROUSH. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, throughout the State of Indiana bumper stickers are appearing which have on them "Pont for President." This shows the high regard of the people for the Presidency of the United States.

John Pont is the coach of the Indiana football team which will be playing in the Rose Bowl this year. It has just been announced that he was a runaway winner in the balloting for college coach of the year by members of the Football Writers Association of America. This year Coach Pont directed the Indiana squad to eight straight victories before they lost to Minnesota, and in the last game of the year, of course, Indiana beat Purdue to win the Rose Bowl berth. This 39-year-old head coach is a graduate of the University of Miami of Ohio where he played halfback and wore No. 42, the only number retired by that school. He became head coach there in 1956 and finally moved to Yale and then on to Indiana. Indiana is proud of its coach and we are proud of the fact that he is at this time receiving this high honor.

ISRAEL NEEDS ALLIES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that a "good will" flight of 16 Russian jet bombers over Cairo took place early this week. Evidently, the Soviets want Israel to understand that Russian airpower is available to Egypt should the U.S.S.R. decide to take the Arab side in the event of renewal of the Mideast conflict. Further, that facilities are present for Egypt should the U.S.S.R. decide to take an apparently neutral stand on the side of Egypt.

The Middle East is important to the West both as the crossroads of the world and because of the substantial investments in that area by Western Europe and the United States.

Israel has repeatedly stated that it does not expect any nation to send its soldiers to help defend that embattled nation. All it seeks is the means to help it defend itself.

France, the traditional supplier of arms, because of President de Gaulle, refused to sell Israel any airplanes or airplane parts at the outbreak of the 6-day war between Israel and the Arab States. De Gaulle has recently made evident his anti-Semitic and anti-Israel position. If there is to be peace in the area, another nation must be depended upon to sell Israel military supplies.

Sufficient airpower should be made available by the United States to enable Israel to defend itself in the event of the outbreak of hostilities as a result of the failure of the Arab countries to enter into peace negotiations with Israel. In fact, I am sure that if this will be done there will be no renewal of the conflict.

CYRUS VANCE, CYPRUS PEACEMAKER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Nation and the people of the entire world who yearn for peace owe a great debt of gratitude to a remarkable man from Clarksburg, W. Va., the Honorable Cyrus R. Vance. With only very brief notice, he took off to the Mediterranean at a time when the threat of war hung over Cyprus and when it appeared certain that Greece and Turkey, our great NATO allies, were about to be pitted against each other in a dangerous and disruptive war. He helped to bring peace to that area. As the President so well stated in summarizing Mr. Vance's mission, he carried it out "with the greatest skill and total dedication."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] in complimenting the outstanding job that Cyrus Vance did upon this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, the entire country owes this great American a debt of gratitude for his remarkable performance.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker—

Blessed be the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God.

West Virginia has a special pride in the good works of its native son. I was rather surprised to read in the New York Times this morning the editorial which termed Cyrus Vance a "West Virginian Turned New Yorker." Of course, Mr. Speaker, we can well understand the desire of other States to claim this native West Virginian. Speaking as one who frequently gets labeled as a "New Yorker turned West Virginian" myself, I can say that our State is big enough to recognize that it is a supreme compliment for other States to rush forward and claim our native sons as their own. West Virginia will not begrudge other States this privilege.

We know not what the future holds in store for Mr. Vance. There has been much speculation. Suffice it to say, there have been many distinguished West Virginians who have served in Cabinet positions, including Louis A. Johnson, Secretary of Defense under President Truman; William L. Wilson, Postmaster General under President Cleveland; Howard M. Gore, Secretary of Agriculture under President Coolidge; and Stephen B. Elkins, Secretary of War under President Benjamin Harrison.

Born in Clarksburg, W. Va., on March 27, 1917, Cyrus Roberts Vance has had a distinguished career in the Navy on combat duty during World War II, in the practice of law, in private industry, and Government service. In 1957 and 1958 he served as special counsel to the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee during its inquiry into satellite and missile programs.

As a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I am always proud to recall the fact that in 1958 Mr. Vance served as consulting counsel to the Special Committee on Space and Astronautics of the Senate during hearings on, and the drafting of, the National Space Act of 1958, which created the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

In 1961 he became General Counsel of the Department of Defense, and in 1962 was appointed Secretary of the Army. He was then appointed Deputy Secretary of Defense and resigned in June of this year because of a back ailment.

Under unanimous consent, I include several articles and editorials concerning Mr. Vance's accomplishments in the recent crisis in Cyprus:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 27, 1967]

VANCE PICKED TO MOVE FAST IN CYPRUS RIFT

WASHINGTON.—"Willing to go and able to move fast."

That was the way one official described Cyrus R. Vance when President Johnson was casting about for a troubleshooter in the Greek-Turkish dispute over Cyprus.

It was hardly the compelling factor in Mr. Johnson's selection of the New York lawyer and former Defense Department official, however.

For the President has called on Mr. Vance several times to undertake delicate assignments. Last July he sent Mr. Vance to Detroit to serve as his personal representative during the riots.

Before that President Johnson had sent Mr. Vance on assignments to South Vietnam, to the Dominican Republic during the 1965 civil war, and to Panama during the 1964 Canal Zone riots.

Mr. Vance, tall, handsome and soft spoken, is credited by former Pentagon associates with being unexcitable, objective, and incisive of mind. "He always insists on having all the facts before making a judgment," one said.

Johnson administration leaders decided Nov. 22 on the dispatch of Mr. Vance to Ankara and Athens, although it was reported that there had been talk between Mr. Johnson and Secretary of State Dean Rusk the day before of such a special mission.

FIRST CHOICE

According to one account, Mr. Vance's name came up in those preliminary talks when the President recalled the troubleshooting jobs he had taken earlier.

When the final decision on sending a troubleshooter was reportedly made in a telephone conversation between President Johnson and Secretary Rusk, Mr. Rusk proposed Mr. Vance as his first choice for the assignment, according to knowledgeable officials, because of the latter's past record and his detailed knowledge of NATO affairs in the eastern Mediterranean.

"He was already briefed," one official put it.

Admirers in the administration say that Mr. Vance has developed a kind of standing for dealing with military-political problems somewhat like the positions held in earlier postwar years by John J. McCloy and Gen. Lucius Clay.

Mr. Vance, a native of Clarksburg, W.V., is a former naval officer and Yale-educated Wall Street lawyer. He entered government work in 1957 as special counsel to the Senate preparedness subcommittee, then headed by Mr. Johnson.

President Kennedy named Mr. Vance general counsel of the Defense Department in 1961, and a year and a half later made him Secretary of the Army. President Johnson elevated him to Deputy Secretary of Defense, the No. 2 civilian post in the defense establishment, on Jan. 28, 1964. He resigned last June 20.

When he has a rare chance to pursue outside interests he enjoys tennis and squash and is an avid reader.

His wife is the former Grace Elsie Sloane, whom he married 20 years ago. They have five children.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 6, 1967]

WELL DONE

Cyrus R. Vance is back from the war that almost was between Turkey and Greece and it is in very large part his doing that there has not been a war. It was a near thing, by all accounts, and the danger will not completely die away until some sort of permanent Cyprus settlement is reached. But the sparks of a potentially bloody conflict have been stamped out, at least for now.

Others from President Johnson on down, played important roles, and considerable credit is due to Ambassador Goldberg at the United Nations, who worked tirelessly, almost around the clock, as coordinator of the American peace-keeping effort with those of the U.N. and its members. But it was Mr. Vance, who left his job as Deputy Secretary of Defense earlier this year to rest an ailing back, who carried the big burden. It was his readings of the temper and intentions of the conflicting parties that were crucial to the shaky understanding that was reached. He was thrown into the crisis with no particular expertise to help him and little time to do his homework. Yet he came quickly to the heart of it: Turkey was in no mood for half-baked solutions; if no major concessions were forthcoming from Greece, the Turks were ready for war. The necessary concessions were worked out, all around, though it remains to be seen just how reasonable President Makarios of Cyprus is going to be.

In any case, the threat of war between two NATO partners—with all that this would mean—has been put off once more. History warns us not to expect that the threat may not recur another day. But this does not subtract from Mr. Vance's job well done. This is his second major contribution to the country since his "retirement" early this year; during the summer he answered the President's call to help damp down the rioting in Detroit. He deserves the country's thanks.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 24, 1967]

CYPRUS TROUBLESHOOTER: CYRUS ROBERTS VANCE

WASHINGTON, November 23.—The urgent White House telephone call that sent Cyrus R. Vance off to Ankara and Athens to cool off the Cyprus dispute has added to his growing role as a Presidential troubleshooter.

The 50-year-old New York lawyer, who resigned as Deputy Secretary of Defense last July 1, was tapped by President Johnson on three occasions to visit hot spots during his six and a half years at the Pentagon.

The President dispatched Mr. Vance to Panama in 1964 during the Canal Zone riots and to the Dominican Republic during the 1965 civil war there. He also went to South Vietnam last year.

Even after Mr. Vance had left the Pentagon, he was called upon last July to serve as the President's representative in Detroit during the rioting.

Those close to Mr. Vance believe he is an ideal man for sensitive assignments because he combines emotional stability with precision of mind and an understanding of people. He has also earned a reputation for candor.

TREMENDOUS COMPASSION

"He's totally unflappable," says one Pentagon associate. "In the second place, he is a brilliant man with a keen, logical lawyer's mind. In the third place, he is the most human person I've ever met. He's a tremendous diplomat because he's got tremendous compassion."

Cyrus Roberts Vance is a handsome man with graying dark hair and a lanky frame that earned him the nickname Spider during his college hockey days. He dresses in dark, conservative suits that somehow have a slightly rumpled look. He is never caught with his black shoes unpolished.

Mr. Vance peers out at visitors over half-glasses that slip down on his nose. He looks steadily into the visitors' eyes, speaking in a clipped manner and puffing on a cigarette.

The Presidential envoy is a tennis and squash enthusiast who also enjoys hunting and reads widely. He is not much of a party-goer, preferring to relax at home with a Scotch on the rocks.

Mr. Vance was born in Clarksburg, W. Va., on March 27, 1917. His father died when the boy was 5 years old. His mother died last July.

After majoring in economics at Yale, Mr. Vance was graduated from the Yale Law School in 1942. He served on destroyers in the Navy during World War II.

In 1947, he joined the New York law firm of Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett, where he specialized in the preparation of civil cases.

President Johnson has been an admirer of Mr. Vance since 1957, when the young lawyer came to Washington to help set up an inquiry by the Senate Preparedness subcommittee into military and space programs. Mr. Johnson, then majority leader, was in charge of the hearings, and he prevailed upon Mr. Vance to stay on into 1958 as committee counsel.

When President Kennedy came into office in 1961, he named Mr. Vance as the Defense Department's General Counsel. During his first years in the Pentagon, Mr. Vance played a major role in reorganizing the department's operations, earning the respect of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara.

NAMED BY TWO PRESIDENTS

Mr. Vance was named Secretary of the Army by President Kennedy in 1962, and two years later President Johnson elevated him to Deputy Secretary of Defense, in the Pentagon's second-ranking civilian job.

The demands of 12-hour days at the Pentagon began to tell on Mr. Vance, who was bothered by a painful back injury. The trouble was aggravated when he hurt his knee last year while examining a flat automobile tire, and it eventually forced him to resign.

Mr. Vance put his $115,000, seven-bedroom house here up for sale and moved to Manhattan with his wife, the former Grace Sloane, and five children. He has rejoined his old New York law firm. But his current journey for President Johnson indicates that he still can expect to see a good deal of the nation's capital.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 6, 1967]

SUCCESS OF A MISSION

When President Johnson tapped Cyrus R. Vance two weeks ago to be his troubleshooter in the Greek-Turkish dispute over Cyprus, it was recalled that the former Deputy Secretary of Defense had served with distinction on similar emergency missions to Panama, the Dominican Republic, South Vietnam and Detroit. He was described by some of his old Pentagon associates as precise, candid, fair and "unflappable."

Having returned with another successful mission under his belt, Mr. Vance has lived up in every respect to this impressive billing. Even the Turks, who first received him as a "nondescript lawyer," now hail him as "an experienced and qualified statesman."

There is just one thing to be added. This West Virginian turned New Yorker must be just about as close as a human can get to being the indestructible man. During nearly two weeks of continuous shuttling back and forth between Athens and Ankara, with side trips to Nicosia, and endless sessions of patient negotiation through anxious nights, Mr. Vance got practically no sleep, wore out his entourage and yet always was able to summon energy for just one more effort for peace.

The nation, and the world, owe Mr. Vance a vote of admiration and thanks, plus a bow to President Johnson for having sent him on this successful mission.

THE FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House are now asking me when the conference report on the foreign aid appropriation bill will be called up for action.

Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time so as to inform the House Members that the Senate—or should I say "the other body"—has not yet taken up the foreign aid appropriation bill.

Until they do, there can be no conference or conference report.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to be the policy almost every year to wait until the very closing hours of the session before final action is taken on the foreign aid appropriation bill. There seems to be a tendency on the part of those who could expedite the handling of this bill to hold it up until the dying hours of a session of the Congress. The spenders seem to think that by delaying final action on the conference report on the foreign aid appropriation bill, they can get an excessive amount of money, whether it has been justified or not. However, I wish to assure the membership of the House that it will be my personal desire to see the Congress remain in session until Christmas Eve as we did once before rather than capitulate to the other body on an amount that has not been justified other than by the hordes of spenders in the executive branch.

To my way of thinking, the American people are sick and tired of the way we are handling their business. This applies not only to the Congress, but also to the executive branch. We are spending money we do not have for things we do not need, trying to be everything to everybody everywhere, and a lot of it on borrowed money.

With this country facing a deficit of approximately $35 billion for the current fiscal year, with the President hollering for a tax increase and with inflation frighteningly high, it is going to be extremely interesting to hear the conferees of the other body justify the $500 million increase over what the House approved only a few days ago.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana for yielding. I thoroughly understand the problem that the gentleman and the Committee on Appropriations is now involved in resolving with the other body. However, I would like to emphasize the fact that had the Committee on Appropriations followed the same policy in the committee, it is my opinion that the matter could have been brought before the House before this late date.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] that so far as I know all appropriation bills have been passed by the Congress and signed into law with the exception of the foreign aid and supplemental appropriations. I was ready to report the foreign aid appropriation bill in June, but the authorizing committee did not give us an authorization bill until November, and even then we had to bring the bill to the floor with a rule because certain items had not been authorized.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. Of course, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It is apparently becoming customary and, perhaps, appropriate that the foreign giveaway bill come out on Christmas Eve?

Mr. PASSMAN. Well, it is true that we disposed of the foreign giveaway bill on Christmas Eve in 1963. If I have the power, and the support of a majority of the House conferees on the Foreign Aid Committee on Appropriations and the membership of the House, I would prefer to see us stay in session until Christmas Eve this year rather than to capitulate to the other body on an increase of over one-half million dollars in title I only of the foreign aid appropriation bill.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON CONGRATULATES EAST AFRICAN COMMUNITY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Presidents Kenyatta, of Kenya, Nyerere, of Tanzania, and Obote, of Uganda, met December 1 to inaugurate the coming into effect of the East African Community. They assembled at Arusha, in northern Tanzania, where the headquarters of the new organization will be located. Earlier, on June 6, the three Presidents had signed the Treaty for East African Cooperation establishing the organization. For the first time it brings together all aspects of regional economic cooperation in one basic legal document.

We here in the United States join with our African friends in saluting the birth of the East African Community. The new organization provides for the maintenance and strengthening of the common market through a common market council, as well as for continuation of common services which include railways and harbors, an airline, and posts and telegraphs. It also creates an East African Development Bank.

The strength of the desire for African unity was very much in evidence on this occasion. Not only does the organization formally join these neighbors and friends, but provision is made in the treaty for membership of or association with the Community by neighboring states. Several of them were represented at the inaugural ceremony. Included were President Kaunda, of Zambia, Emperor Haile Selassie, of Ethiopia, and President Abdirascid, of Somalia. President Kaunda has already publicly expressed Zambia's desire to be a member of the Community. There are also indications that several other nations are considering how they might become associated.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson sent a message of congratulations to the three heads of state at Arusha which I include with these remarks in the RECORD:

His Excellency JOMO KENYATTA,
President of the Republic of Kenya.
His Excellency JULIUS NYERERE,
President of the United Republic of Tanzania.
His Excellency A. MILTON OBOTE,
President of the Republic of Uganda.

EXCELLENCIES: Your American friends join you and your peoples in celebrating the inauguration of the East African community. The birth of the community provides dramatic evidence to the world that the Governments of Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda are determined not only to maintain but to strengthen the regional economic cooperation which has linked your countries in the past. By your statesmanship, you, the Presidents of these East African nations, have made a far-reaching contribution to the momentum as a unit which is a vital force in the new Africa. At a time when there is much divisiveness in the world, your decision to join hands to promote the common welfare is a heartening example to nations everywhere. In common with the representatives of your neighbors, who are gathered with you on this historic occasion, I offer you the heartfelt congratulations of the American Government and people.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

HOOSIER HYSTERIA

Mr. MYERS. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, my home State of Indiana has long been known for what we respectively refer to as Hoosier Hysteria, or called basketball elsewhere in the Nation. But a new epidemic has spread across Indiana which has been diagnosed as Rose Bowl fever which I feel compelled to bring to the attention of my colleagues.

The Cinderella football team from Indiana University at Bloomington, in my district, has completed one of the most exciting seasons in the school's history. They won nine of their 10 games, a share of the Big 10 title, and earned a berth in the Rose Bowl game at Pasadena, Calif., on January 1. I have had the honor of watching this group of men in action and consider them to be one of the finest examples of the younger generation which we hear so much about these days. Their desire and determination on the football field, I am certain, will stay with them as they make their way in life.

Added to the team's honors was the announcement today that their 39-year-old coach John Pont has been named Coach of the Year by the football writers of America. Pont must be credited as author of this fantastic rags to riches story which saw the Hoosiers climb from a 1–8–1 season in 1966 to a 9–1 mark this year.

Pont's impressive coaching career at his alma mater of Miami of Ohio, later at Yale and now Indiana University can only reflect on the genuine ability and

determination of the man himself. His record of inspiring the young people around him to excel is one which should serve as an example for student and faculty alike across the land.

I plan to be on hand at Pasadena on January 1 when Coach Pont and the Hoosiers will take on the Nation's No. 2 team from the University of Southern California. If you cannot be with us at the Rose Bowl, I urge you to join the many IU fans across the country who will cheer them on from their armchairs on New Year's Day.

FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. 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. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as has been my policy for the past year or so, I wish to take this occasion to share with my colleagues of the House the information contained in a report I have just received from the Department of Defense indicating that during this November there were five free world ships that delivered cargoes to North Vietnam. It is of particular interest to note that all of these ships were flying the British flag. With these added five British-flag vessels, there have now been a total of 68 free world ship arrivals in North Vietnam so far during 1967. The breakdown of these 68 vessels by country is as follows: British, 58; Cyprus, five; Malta, three; and Italy, two.

The British may well be in a financial crisis, and they no doubt need to maintain their foreign trade, but so long as the British law will permit the British flag to fly on vessels chartered to Communist interests, they should be held accountable for this trade. Let us make no mistake about it: Every ship flying the British flag, or any other free world ship, that puts its cargo on the docks of North Vietnam is helping the enemies of our country. Simply stated, the British are renting their flag to the Communists, and so long as the British flag continues to fly on ships that are going to North Vietnam, as they have been doing month after month to supply the sinews of war to the Hanoi regime, I cannot get sympathetic with the British over the predicament in which they now find themselves.

Mr. Speaker, some means should be found to stop this immoral trade.

LIBERALIZATION OF VETERANS' PENSIONS NEEDED

Mr. WAMPLER. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would liberalize the income limitations for a veteran or widow of a veteran so that no beneficiaries of veterans' pensions would realize a cut in benefits because of an increase in social security.

It would also change the present system of pensions so that the amount of pension paid would be on a graduated scale, according to income, and not a set amount according to an income bracket.

I know that the Veterans' Affairs Committee is aware that the need for the enactment of such a measure is vital, and I urge that this realistic approach to the VA pension system be reported to the House for consideration, with appropriate amendments in accordance with the social security bill, just as soon as that measure is finally acted upon by both Houses of the Congress.

CONGRESSMAN McCARTHY SUPPORTS LYNDON B. JOHNSON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, since my name is McCARTHY and I am a Member of Congress, many people, to my surprise, have assumed that I am supporting the candidacy of my kinsman from Minnesota for the office of President of the United States. I take this time to state that I am not.

I am supporting President Lyndon B. Johnson, before the nomination, and after the nomination.

I do not believe the gentleman from Minnesota has offered anything constructive on the war. Nobody wants to end this war more than Lyndon B. Johnson.

Aside from the war, I feel he is one of our best Presidents in the fields of education, conservation, consumer affairs, and so many other areas. President Johnson is not only a good President. He is also a great President, and this is one McCARTHY in Congress who is supporting Lyndon B. Johnson.

PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT THURSDAY TO FILE A CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4765, INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISTRIBUTIONS PURSUANT TO THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1956, AS AMENDED

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House may have until midnight, Thursday, December 7, 1967, to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 4765, relating to the income tax treatment of certain distributions pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

PROHIBITING AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 830) with Senate amendments to the House amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments to the House amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments to the House amendment, as follows:

Page 8, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out all after line 20 over to and including line 2 one page 9 and insert:

"(d) No civil action may be commenced by any individual under this section until the individual has given the Secretary not less than sixty days' notice of an intent to file such action. Such notice shall be filed—

"(1) within one hundred and eighty days after the alleged unlawful practice occurred, or

"(2) in a case to which section 14(b) applies, within three hundred days after the alleged unlawful practice occurred or within thirty days after receipt by the individual of notice of termination of proceedings under State law, whichever is earlier.

Upon receiving a notice of intent to sue, the Secretary shall promptly notify all persons named therein as prospective defendants in the action and shall promptly seek to eliminate any alleged unlawful practice by informal methods of conciliation, conference, and persuasion."

Page 9, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out all after line 2 over to and including line 2 on page 10 and insert:

"(e) Sections 6 and 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 shall apply to actions under this Act."

Page 10, line 10, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "The" and insert: "In accordance with the provisions of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, the".

Page 17, line 5, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "sums" and insert: "sums, not in excess of $3,000,000 for any fiscal year,".

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are the amendments germane to the bill?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I ask the question because I understand another bill may soon come over from the other body to which totally ungermane legislation has been attached.

Mr. PERKINS. This is the bill that the House passed the day before yesterday and passed unanimously.

Mr. GROSS. I understand, but as I just stated another bill is scheduled to come over from the other body with completely ungermane amendments to it.

Mr. PERKINS. I do not know about that.

Mr. GROSS. All I want to ascertain is that the amendments are germane to this bill.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments to the House amendment were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN CARL D. PERKINS, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. PUCINSKI. 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. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, late yesterday evening the House and Senate conferees on the poverty bill reached agreement and reported out a favorable conference report. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate our colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], the chairman of our full Committee on Education and Labor, for the truly inspiring and spectacular job that he did in conference.

When we went to conference we had 196 major points of disagreement between the two bodies. Under the skillful leadership of the gentleman from Kentucky, under his dedicated leadership, and under his determination to protect the interests of the House, we were able to resolve these differences and put together a bill that I think every Member of the House can support.

I would like particularly to stress that our chairman did retain the principal features of the home-rule provision that was enacted by this House, and I firmly believe that this new legislation, as it has been restructured by the House, will bring at least 2,000 additional communities into the poverty program by the time this legisaltion comes up for renewal in 1969.

We retained all the features of the home-rule amendment which I have fought for during the past 2 years. This amendment will eliminate or substantially reduce many of the shortcomings in the program in the past.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky, CARL PERKINS, has written a spectacular page of achievement through his impressive leadership in the conference.

I am sure he deserves the gratitude not only of the people in his own district, but the people of the entire United States.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am happy to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois. If anyone has ever worked any harder and with greater devotion on any bill than has CARL PERKINS on this bill, both in committee and in conference, I cannot remember who it was. He did a great job on behalf of the House.

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

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. I would personally like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Illinois for bringing the results of this conference report to the attention of the House on this occasion, because I share his point of view with regard to the gentleman from Kentucky. If I have ever seen a magnificent job done by a committee chairman on a controversial piece of legislation since I have been here, the gentleman from Kentucky has done that job, and I think a number of other members of the committee have done yeoman work on it, too.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the three gentlemen who have preceded me. I think without any question, if it had not been for the patience, the persistence, and the understanding of the chairman of the House committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] we would not have been able to reach an agreement.

I also share with the gentleman from Illinois the belief that we bring back to the House a bill that contains the essential features of the legislation as it was passed by the House.

SUBSTITUTION OF CONFEREE ON S. 889, DESIGNATING SAN RAFAEL WILDERNESS, LOS PADRES NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE] be relieved from further duties on the conference committee on S. 889, to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest in California.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Utah [Mr. BURTON] as a conferee, and the Clerk will notify the Senate.

AMENDING THE ACT ESTABLISHING THE PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 12121) to amend the act of September 19, 1967 (78 Stat. 983), establishing the Public Land Law Review Commission, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

On page 2, after line 14, insert:

"SEC. 2. Section 8 of the Act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 986), is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 8. The authorizations and requirements of this Act shall expire six months after the final report of the Public Land Law Review Commission has been submitted to Congress, except that any segregation prior to such time of any public lands from settlement, location, sale, selection, entry, lease, or other form of disposal under the public land laws shall continue for the period of time allowed by this Act.'

"SEC. 3. Section 7 of the Act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 988), is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 7. The authority granted by this Act shall expire six months after the final report of the Public Land Law Review Commission has been submitted to Congress, except that sales concerning which notice has been given in accordance with section 3 hereof prior to such time may be consummated and patents issued in connection therewith after such time.' "

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I will not object—I would ask our distinguished chairman to explain the Senate amendment and tell the House whether or not this amendment is germane to the bill that is being considered.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, I will be glad to explain.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the House passed H.R. 12121 on August 21, 1967. This bill extends the life of the Public Land Law Review Commission by 1½ years or until December 31, 1970, rather than the present termination date of June 30, 1969. It also increases the amount authorized to be appropriated to finance the Commission by $3,390,000. The amendment is germane to the original legislation.

The Senate passed H.R. 12121 on November 30 with an amendment that would extend the life of two closely related acts to parallel the extension of time proposed for the Public Land Law Review Commission.

The first of these, Public Law 88–607, provides legislative guidelines for the orderly classification, retention, or disposal of public lands during the time that the Commission is conducting its study of these lands. The second, Public Law 88–608, permits the sale of certain public lands that have been classified for such disposal. These two acts were considered and passed at the same time that the Public Land Law Review Commission was created. They provide certain essential interim management and disposal authority to the Secretary of the Interior during the Commission's study and they also provide the Commission with valuable background material and case histories on the classification and management of public lands that may prove useful in its studies and recommendations to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I urge that the House concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 12121.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I commend our colleague, the chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, for his explanation. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 425]

Abbitt	Dingell	Pirnie
Abernethy	Eshleman	Reinecke
Adair	Fountain	Resnick
Annunzio	Frelinghuysen	Rhodes, Ariz.
Arends	Gardner	St. Onge
Ashley	Gurney	Sandman
Barrett	Hagan	Schweiker
Bates	Halleck	Scott
Battin	Hansen, Wash.	Sisk
Bell	Hardy	Steed
Bingham	Heckler, Mass.	Stratton
Bolling	Holifield	Tuck
Bray	Jones, Mo.	Van Deerlin
Broomfield	Keith	Vanik
Button	Landrum	Watkins
Cahill	Latta	Watson
Cederberg	McFall	Watts
Clausen, Don H.	Mathias, Md.	Willis
	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Charles H.
Daddario	Monagan	Wright
Dawson	Moorhead	Wyatt
Derwinski	Multer	Wydler
Dickinson	Pepper	
Diggs	Pike	

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

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

FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6111) to provide for the establishment of a Federal Judicial Center, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 996)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6111) to provide for the establishment of a Federal Judicial Center having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

TITLE I—FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

SEC. 101. Title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting, immediately following chapter 41, a new chapter as follows:

"CHAPTER 42.—FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

"Sec.
"620. Federal Judicial Center.
"621. Board; composition, tenure of members, compensation.
"622. Meetings; conduct of business.
"623. Duties of the Board.
"624. Powers of the Board.
"625. Director and staff.
"626. Compensation of the Director.
"627. Retirement; employee benefits.
"628. Appropriations and accounting.
"629. Organizational provisions.

"§ 620. Federal Judicial Center

"(a) There is established within the judicial branch of the Government a Federal Judicial Center, whose purpose it shall be to further the development and adoption of improved judicial administration in the courts of the United States.

"(b) The Center shall have the following functions:

"(1) to conduct research and study of the operation of the courts of the United States, and to stimulate and coordinate such research and study on the part of other public and private persons and agencies;

"(2) to develop and present for consideration by the Judicial Conference of the United States recommendations for improvement of the administration and management of the courts of the United States;

"(3) to stimulate, create, develop, and conduct programs of continuing education and training for personnel of the judicial branch of the Government, including, but not limited to, judges, referees, clerks of court, probation officers, and United States commissioners; and

"(4) insofar as may be consistent with the performance of the other functions set forth in this section, to provide staff, research, and planning assistance to the Judicial Conference of the United States and its committees.

"§ 621. Board; composition, tenure of members, compensation

"(a) The activities of the Center shall be supervised by a Board to be composed of—

"(1) the Chief Justice of the United States, who shall be the permanent Chairman of the Board;

"(2) two active judges of the courts of appeals of the United States and three active judges of the district courts of the United States elected by vote of the members of the Judicial Conference of the United States: *Provided, however,* That the judges so elected shall not be members of the Judicial Conference of the United States; and

"(3) the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, who shall be a permanent member of the Board.

"(b) The term of office of each elected member of the Board shall be four years: *Provided, however,* That section 629 of this chapter shall govern the terms of office of the first members elected to the Board: *And provided further,* That a member elected to serve for an unexpired term arising by virtue of the death, disability, retirement, or resignation of a member shall be elected only for such unexpired term.

"(c) No member elected for a four-year term shall be eligible for reelection to the Board.

"(d) Members of the Board shall serve without additional compensation, but shall be reimbursed for actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their official duties.

"§ 622. Meetings; conduct of business

"(a) Regular meetings of the Board shall be held quarterly. Special meetings shall be held from time to time upon the call of the Chairman, acting at his own discretion or pursuant to the petition of any four members.

"(b) Each member of the Board shall be entitled to one vote. A simple majority of the membership shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of business. The Board shall act upon the concurrence of a simple majority of the members present and voting.

"§ 623. Duties of the Board

"(a) In its direction and supervision of the activities of the Federal Judicial Center, the Board shall—

"(1) establish such policies and develop such programs for the Federal Judicial Center as will further achievement of its purpose and performance of its functions;

"(2) formulate recommendations for improvements in the administration of the courts of the United States, in the training of the personnel of those courts, and in the management of their resources;

"(3) submit to the Judicial Conference of the United States, at least one month in advance of its annual meeting, a report of the activities of the Center and such recommendations as the Board may propose for the consideration of the Conference;

"(4) present to other government departments, agencies, and instrumentalities whose programs or activities relate to the administration of justice in the courts of the United States the recommendations of the Center for the improvement of such programs or activities;

"(5) study and determine ways in which automatic data processing and systems procedures may be applied to the administration of the courts of the United States, and include in the annual report required by paragraph (3) of this subsection details of the results of the studies and determinations made pursuant to this paragraph; and

"(6) consider and recommend to both public and private agencies aspects of the operation of the courts of the United States deemed worthy of special study.

"(b) The Board shall transmit to Congress and to the Attorney General of the United States copies of all reports and recommendations submitted to the Judicial Conference of the United States. The Board shall also keep the Committees on the Judiciary of the United States Senate and House of Representatives fully and currently informed with respect to the activities of the Center.

"§ 624. Powers of the Board

"The Board is authorized—

"(1) to appoint and fix the duties of the Director of the Federal Judicial Center, who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board;

"(2) to request from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Government any information it deems necessary to the performance of the functions of the Federal Judicial Center set forth in this chapter, and each such department, agency, or instrumentality is directed to cooperate with the Board and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such information to the Center upon request of the Chairman or upon request of the Director when the Board has delegated this authority to him;

"(3) to contract with and compensate government and private agencies or persons for research projects and other services, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), and to delegate such contract authority to the Director of the Federal Judicial Center, who is hereby empowered to exercise such delegated authority.

"§ 625. Director and staff

"(a) The Director shall supervise the activities of persons employed by the Center and perform other duties assigned to him by the Board.

"(b) The Director shall appoint and fix the compensation of such additional professional personnel as the Board may deem necessary, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in competitive service, or the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates: *Provided, however,* That the compensation of any person appointed under this subsection shall not exceed the annual rate of basic pay of level V of the Executive Schedule pay rates, section 5316, title 5, United States Code: *And provided further,* That the salary of a reemployed annuitant under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be adjusted pursuant to the provisions of section 8344, title 5, United States Code.

"(c) The Director shall appoint and fix the compensation of such secretarial and clerical personnel as he may deem neces-

sary, subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in competitive service and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

"(d) The Director may procure personal services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not to exceed the daily equivalent of the highest rate payable under General Schedule pay rates, section 5332, title 5, United States Code.

"(e) The Director is authorized to incur necessary travel and other miscellaneous expenses incident to the operation of the Center.

"§ 626. Compensation of the Director

"The compensation of the Director of the Federal Judicial Center shall be the same as that of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and his appointment and salary shall not be subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in competitive service, or the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates: *Provided, however,* That any Director who is a justice or judge of the United States in active or retired status shall serve without additional compensation.

"§ 627. Retirement; employee benefits

"(a) A Director of the Federal Judicial Center who attains the age of seventy years shall be retired from that office.

"(b) The Director, the professional staff, and the clerical and secretarial employees of the Federal Judicial Center shall be deemed to be officers and employees of the judicial branch of the United States Government within the meaning of subchapter III of chapter 83 (relating to civil service retirement), chapter 87 (relating to Federal employees' life insurance program), and chapter 89 (relating to Federal employees' health benefits program) of title 5, United States Code: *Provided, however,* That the Director, upon written notice filed with the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts within six months after the date on which he takes office, may waive coverage under subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code (relating to civil service retirement), and elect coverage under the retirement and disability provisions of this section: *And provided further,* That upon his non-retirement separation from the Federal Judicial Center, such waiver and election shall not operate to foreclose to the Director such opportunity as the law may provide to secure civil service retirement credit for service as Director by depositing with interest the amount required by section 8334 of title 5, United States Code.

"(c) Upon the retirement of a Director who has elected coverage under this section and who has served at least fifteen years and attained the age of sixty-five years the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall pay him an annuity for life equal to 80 per centum of the salary of the office at the time of his retirement.

"Upon the retirement of a Director who has elected coverage under this section and who has served at least ten years, but who is not eligible to receive an annuity under the first paragraph of this subsection, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall pay him an annuity for life equal to that proportion of 80 per centum of the salary of the office at the time of his retirement that the number of years of his service bears to fifteen, reduced by one-quarter of 1 per centum for each full month, if any, he is under the age of sixty-five at the time of separation from service.

"(d) A Director who has elected coverage under this section and who becomes permanently disabled to perform the duties of his office shall be retired and shall receive an annuity for life equal to 80 per centum of the salary of the office at the time of his retirement if he has served at least fifteen years, or equal to that proportion of 80 per centum of such salary that the aggregate number of years of his service bears to fifteen if he has served less than fifteen years, but in no event less than 50 per centum of such salary.

"(e) For the purpose of this section, 'service' means service, whether or not continuous, as Director of the Federal Judicial Center, and any service, not to exceed five years, as a judge of the United States, a Senator or Representative in Congress, or a civilian official appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"§ 628. Appropriations and accounting

"There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this chapter. The Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall provide accounting, disbursing, auditing, and other fiscal services for the Federal Judicial Center.

"§ 629. Organizational provisions

"(a) The terms of office of the members first elected to the Board shall commence on the thirtieth day after the first meeting of the Judicial Conference after the date on which this chapter shall take effect.

"(b) The members first elected to the Board shall continue in office for terms of one, two, three, three, and four years, respectively, the term of each to be designated by the Judicial Conference of the United States at the time of his election.

"(c) Members first elected to the Board who are designated by the Judicial Conference of the United States to serve terms of office of less than four years shall be eligible for reelection to one full term of office."

TITLE II—ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 201. (a) Chapter 41 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 611. Retirement of Director

"(a) The Director may, by written election filed with the Chief Justice of the United States within six months after the date on which he takes office, waive coverage under subchapter III (relating to civil service retirement) of chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, and bring himself within the purview of this section. Such waiver and election shall not operate to foreclose to the Director, upon separation from service other than by retirement, such opportunity as the law may provide to secure civil service retirement credit for service as Director by depositing with interest the amount required by section 8334 of title 5, United States Code.

"(b) Upon the retirement of a Director who has elected coverage under this section and who has served at least fifteen years and attained the age of sixty-five years the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall pay him an annuity for life equal to 80 per centum of the salary of the office at the time of his retirement.

"Upon the retirement of a Director who has elected coverage under this section and who has served at least ten years, but who is not eligible to receive an annuity under the first paragraph of this subsection, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall pay him an annuity for life equal to that proportion of 80 per centum of the salary of the office at the time of his retirement that the number of years of his service bears to fifteen, reduced by one-quarter of 1 per centum for each full month, if any, he is under the age of sixty-five at the time of separation from service.

"(c) A Director who has elected coverage under this section and who becomes permanently disabled to perform the duties of his office shall be retired and shall receive an annuity for life equal to 80 per centum of the salary of the office at the time of his retirement if he has served at least fifteen years, or equal to that proportion of 80 per centum of such salary that the aggregate number of years of his service bears to fifteen if he has served less than fifteen years, but in no event less than 50 per centum of such salary.

"(d) For the purpose of this section, 'service' means service, whether or not continuous, as Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and any service, not to exceed five years, as a judge of the United States, a Senator or Representative in Congress, or a civilian official appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

(b) The table of contents preceding such chapter is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new item:

"611. Retirement of Director.".

SEC. 202. Section 376, title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsections:

"(r) The Director of the Federal Judicial Center shall be deemed a judge of the United States for the purposes of this section and shall be entitled to bring himself within the purview of this section by filing an election as provided in subsection (a) of this section within the time therein specified. As applied to a Director of the Federal Judicial Center, the phrase 'retirement from office by resignation on salary under section 371(a) of this title' as used in subsections (b), (c), (g), (i), and (n) of this section shall mean 'retirement from office under subsection (c) or (d) of section 627 of this title or by removal after not less than ten years service', the phrase 'salary paid after retirement' as used in subsection (b) of this section shall mean 'annuity paid after retirement under subsection (c) or (d) of section 627 of this title', and the phrase 'resigns from office other than on salary under section 371 (a) of this title' as used in subsection (f) of this section shall mean 'resigns from office otherwise than on retirement under subsection (c) or (d) of section 627 of this title or is removed after less than ten years service'.

"(s) The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall be deemed a judge of the United States for the purposes of this section and shall be entitled to bring himself within the purview of this section by filing an election as provided in subsection (a) of this section within the time therein specified. As applied to a Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, the phrase 'retirement from office by resignation on salary under section 371(a) of this title' as used in subsections (b), (c), (g), (i), and (n) of this section shall mean 'retirement from office under section 611 of this title or by removal after not less than ten years service', the phrase 'salary paid after retirement' as used in subsection (b) of this section shall mean 'annuity paid after retirement under section 611 of this title', and the phrase 'resigns from office other than on salary under section 371(a) of this title' as used in subsection (f) of this section shall mean 'resigns from office otherwise than on retirement under section 611 of this title or is removed after less than ten years service'."

SEC. 203. Subsection (a) of section 604, title 28, United States Code, is amended by amending:

(a) Paragraph (7) to read as follows:

"(7) Regulate and pay annuities to widows and surviving dependent children of judges, Directors of the Federal Judicial Center, and Directors of the Administrative Office, and necessary travel and subsistence expenses incurred by judges, court officers and employees, and officers and employees of the Ad-

ministrative Office, and the Federal Judicial Center, while absent from their official stations on official business,";

(b) Paragraph (9), to insert between the word "courts" and the word "and" a comma and the words "the Federal Judicial Center,";

(c) Paragraphs (10) and (11), to insert between the word "courts" and the word "and" a comma and the words "the Federal Judicial Center,".

SEC. 204. The table of contents to "PART III.—COURT OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES" of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after

"41. Administrative Office of the United States Courts..... 601"

a new chapter reference as follows:

"42. Federal Judicial Center..... 620".

SEC. 205. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the amendments made by this title, insofar as they relate to retirement and survivorship benefits of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall be applicable only with respect to persons first appointed to such office after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) The provisions of section 611(a), the first paragraph of section 611(b), and section 376(s), of title 28, United States Code, as added by such amendments, shall be applicable to a Director or former Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts who was first appointed prior to the date of enactment of this Act if at the time such Director or former Director left or leaves such office he had, or shall have, attained the age of sixty-five years and completed fifteen years of service as Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and if, on or before the expiration of six months following the date of enactment of this Act, he makes the election referred to in section 611(a) or section 376(s), or both, as the case may be.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for the establishment of a Federal Judicial Center, and for other purposes."

And agree to the same.

EMANUEL CELLER,
PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
BYRON G. ROGERS,
CLARK MACGREGOR,
ROBERT MCCLORY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
SAMUEL J. ERVIN, Jr.,
PHILIP A. HART,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6111) to provide for the establishment of a Federal Judicial Center, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate passed the House bill after amending it by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting its own provisions. The House disagreed to the Senate amendment and requested a conference; the Senate then agreed to the conference.

The conference report recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and agree to the same with an amendment. The amendment makes two changes in the bill as passed by the Senate. First, the word "stimulate" is added to paragraph 620(b)(3), relating to programs of continuing education and training for judicial personnel. New paragraph 620(b)(3) provides that one function of the Center will be to stimulate, create, develop, and conduct programs of continuing education and training for personnel of the judicial branch.

Second, the amendment inserts a new paragraph 623(a)(5), relating to the use of automatic data processing and systems procedures, in lieu of the provision passed by the Senate.

With respect to the use of automatic data processing and systems procedures in the administration of the Federal judicial system, the House directed the Board of the Federal Judicial Center to ". . . study and determine ways in which automatic data processing and systems procedures may be used in Federal judicial administration." The House further required the Board specifically to submit to the Congress separate annual reports on the results of such studies.

In the Senate, the provision related to the use of automatic data processing and systems procedures required the Board of the Federal Judicial Center to ". . . evaluate proposals for the application of data processing and systems techniques to the administration of the courts of the United States." The Senate did not require a separate report on the discharge of this responsibility.

While the language in the Senate version is designed to accomplish the same objective of that of the House, the conferees preferred the more affirmative statement, particularly the provision for a separate reporting requirement, that had been passed originally by the House. The conferees believe that it is imperative that the Board study and use all modern advanced administrative techniques and tools in the solution of the administrative problems that now confront the Federal judiciary.

Representative MacGregor and Representative McClory, although they signed the conference report, emphasize their exceptions to two portions of the amendment. They would except as to that part of section 620 that locates the Federal Judicial Center in the judicial branch of the Government rather than in the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and except as to that part of section 625 that authorizes the Director to appoint and fix the compensation of professional personnel rather than to require the Board to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel.

EMANUEL CELLER,
PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
BYRON G. ROGERS,
CLARK MACGREGOR,
ROBERT MCCLORY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CELLER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman give us a brief explanation of what occurred in the conference?

Mr. CELLER. I will be glad to.

H.R. 6111 provides for the establishment of a Federal Judicial Center to foster research and development for improvements in the administration of the U.S. judicial system. This bill has not been a subject of controversy. It passed the House on June 19, 1967, on suspension of the rules after it had been unanimously recommended by both Subcommittee No. 5 and by the full Committee on the Judiciary.

When the Senate passed the bill on November 17, 1967, it struck all after the enacting clause, and inserted new provisions. In addition to a number of grammatical and stylistic changes, the Senate amendment contained five substantive differences from the House-passed bill that were of concern to the conferees.

The conference committee has resolved these differences and recommends that the House recede, and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The amendment makes two changes in the bill as passed by the Senate. First, the word "stimulate" is added to paragraph 620(b)(3); relating to programs of continuing education and training for judicial personnel. New paragraph 620(b)(3) provides that one function of the Center will be "to stimulate, create, develop, and conduct" programs of continuing education and training for personnel of the judicial branch.

Second, the recommended amendment inserts a new paragraph 623(a)(5), relating to the use of automatic data processing and systems procedures, in lieu of the provision passed by the Senate.

With respect to the use of automatic data processing and systems procedures in the administration of the Federal judicial system, the House directed the Board of the Federal Judicial Center to "study and determine ways in which automatic data processing and systems procedures may be used in Federal judicial administration." The House further required the Board specifically to submit to the Congress separate annual reports on the results of such studies.

In the Senate, the provision related to the use of automatic data processing and systems procedures required the Board of the Federal Judicial Center to "evaluate proposals for the application of data processing and systems techniques to the administration of the courts of the United States." The Senate did not require a separate report on the discharge of this responsibility.

While the language in the Senate version is designed to accomplish the same objective of that of the House, the conferees preferred the more affirmative statement, particularly the provision for a separate reporting requirement, that had been passed originally by the House. The conferees believe that it is imperative that the Board study and use all modern advanced administrative techniques and tools in the solution of the administrative problems that now confront the Federal judiciary.

The conferees agreed to accept the provisions adopted by the Senate on the following issues:

1. LOCATION OF THE JUDICIAL CENTER

The Senate provided that the Federal Judicial Center would be established "within the judicial branch of the Government"—section 620(a). The House, as a matter of organization, had located the Judicial Center "in the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts." The conferees accepted the Senate view to emphasize that the Federal Judicial Center was not to be a subordinate or a constituent part of the Administrative Office

of the U.S. Courts. These two offices are to be equal in stature, each has different functions. The Administrative Office is the "operations arm" of the judicial branch; it is charged with the record keeping, budgeting, statistics gathering, and other personnel administrative functions. The Federal Judicial Center, on the other hand, is the "research and development arm" of the judiciary, and is to be responsible for the development of improved techniques in the administration of the courts.

2. APPOINTMENT OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

Section 625(b) of the bill, as it passed the Senate, authorizes the Director to appoint and fix the compensation of the personnel staff of the Center. The House had required the Board of Directors of the Center to appoint and fix the salary of the staff. The conferees accepted the Senate language. It was considered to be better administrative practice for the Director, who is responsible for the Center's performance, to have the power to hire the employees that serve under him. The Director needs the authority to hire staff in order to effectively carry out the directions of the Board. In addition, it would be unwieldy for the Board, since it meets only quarterly, to be directly concerned with personnel matters of this sort.

3. QUALIFICATIONS FOR BOARD MEMBERSHIP

The Board of the Federal Judicial Center is to be composed of the Chief Justice of the United States, who is the permanent chairman, two judges from the courts of appeals, and three judges from the district courts of the United States. The Senate in its amendment required all members of the Board to be active judges; and specifically provided that Board members could not also be members of the Judicial Conference. The House language permitted senior judges and members of the Judicial Conference to be eligible to serve as members of the Board of the Judicial Center. The conferees adopted the Senate provision. It was felt that active judges would likely be more familiar with the problems that currently face the judiciary, and would be more ready to authorize research in innovative procedures and techniques. Further, the experience of senior judges, under the bill, may be made available to the Board by having them serve as consultants. The prohibition against members of the Judicial Conference serving on the Board is to avoid interlocking relationships between the Conference and the Board. The Judicial Center in its operations may be called upon to evaluate the work of the Judicial Conference or its committees, and the Conference will regularly review the work of the Center. The objectivity of both the Center and Conference could be impaired if the same individuals were eligible to serve on both.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield 10 minutes to me?

Mr. CELLER. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY] who has rendered yeoman service in connection with this bill.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York yield further to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, who is a member of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to make some comments with reference to this conference committee report. In my opinion, the bill establishing a Federal Judicial Center is a most significant piece of legislation. It offers great hope for the expedition and the administration of justice in our Federal courts. The aim is to develop some modern techniques, modern machinery through which we can help to eliminate part of the backlog in our Federal courts, and so we will not be faced constantly with the need of providing more and more Federal judges to take care of the increasing caseload.

A great many of the States have already provided for modernizing machinery, and really what we are seeking to have the Federal court system do is to adopt some of the patterns that have already been laid out by these State courts.

For one thing, we want the courts to take advantage of automatic data processing so that we can know where the cases are, how big the caseload the various judges are taking care of, where the greatest need for judicial talent is, how long we are taking in the trial of cases, how many cases judges are handling, and a great many of the things which are necessary in order to do an efficient and modern job in our Federal court system.

When we established the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts in 1939, it was hoped that it would provide the complete answer. But it is now felt that supplementary legislation establishing a Federal Judicial Center is needed in order to carry out the job in a more efficient and modern way.

May I explain briefly the differences in the views of the House and Senate memberships with regard to this legislation? In the House bill we provided that the Judicial Center should be housed in the office of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. The gentleman from Iowa asked the question of me during the debate on this bill as to where the Judicial Center would be located.

I assured him, in response, that the office would be located in the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and that we would not need any new office. In the Senate they amended our bill and provided that the Center should be an independent agency established in the judicial branch, so that it would be separate and distinct and independent from the Administrative Office of the Courts except for the fact that the Director of the Administrative Office would serve on the board of the Judicial Center and for audit and fiscal purposes. Otherwise, there is no structural administrative liaison between the two offices.

Also, we provided in the House bill that we wanted the board to assume responsibility for the management of the Judicial Center and that the board should appoint and fix the compensation of the professional staff, because we felt that they should assume and take on that responsibility, and not appoint a director and then have the director appoint the staff. The other body disagreed with us on that point and decided that the director should be the person who should appoint and fix the compensation of the professional staff.

Those are the two main points of difference. If you look at the statement of the managers on the part of the House, you will notice the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. MACGREGOR, and I excepted from those two parts of the conference report. We stated our exception in the statement of the managers on the part of the House. I am informed that parliamentary procedure limits us to that form as the only way we can express those exceptions while desiring at the same time to support the objectives and aims and the general concept of this legislation.

That, in brief, is my position with regard to this legislation. Those are the points of difference, and that is the acquiescence which the House conferees had to provide in order to get a conference report here for action at this session.

Mr. Speaker, as the report of the committee on conference appointed to resolve the differences between the House and the Senate with respect to H.R. 6111 indicates, I have approved the report with two exceptions. These two exceptions appear to me to be sufficiently basic to this landmark legislation to warrant a brief explanation.

Mr. Speaker, there is an urgent need for establishing a Federal Judicial Center, first, to provide research and technical support including education and training of personnel in the judicial branch of Government; and, second, for staff research and planning assistance to the Judicial Conference of the United States. These are vital to an improved administration of justice in our Federal court system.

It was the hope of many that a complete answer to a more expeditious and orderly handling of cases in the Federal courts would be accomplished through the enactment in 1939 of the Administrative Office Act. While that legislation has served a most useful purpose, the need to supplement the work of the Administrative Office has become apparent.

The serious question which has arisen in my mind between the Senate and House versions of this legislation is where the new Judicial Center shall be reposed. The President of the United States in his message to the Congress of February 6, 1967, recommended that—

> A Federal Judicial Center, *established in the Administrative Office of the United States Courts*, will enable the courts to begin the kind of self-analysis, research and planning necessary for a more effective judicial system—and for better justice in America.

The Attorney General of the United States, the Judicial Conference, a Special Committee appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States and all who recommended this legislation to the House Judiciary Committee emphasized

that the proposed Judicial Center should be established in the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

In the House bill passed on June 19, 1967, it was specifically provided in section 620 of that bill, as follows:

There is established in the Administrative Office of the United States Courts a Federal Judicial Center for the purpose of seeking knowledge of the best methods of judicial administration through scientific study so that it may be possible to administer justice in the Federal courts with maximum effectiveness and minimum waste.

In other words, the aim of providing maximum effectiveness and minimum waste in our Federal courts was coupled with the establishment of a Federal Judicial Center in the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

The Senate version of this legislation departed completely from this philosophy and provided instead that the Federal Judicial Center shall be established within "the judicial branch of the Government." In other words, the Senate seeks to establish the Federal Judicial Center as a new and independent governmental agency which is neither lodged in the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts nor in the Department of Justice, nor any other existing Federal department or agency.

The broad description of "the judicial branch of Government" is nowhere provided in the Constitution or laws of the United States. While article III of the Constitution refers to the "judicial power" of the United States, the courts which are specified are nowhere denominated as "judicial branch" of the Government. To give support to legislative language of this character would seem to justify future legislation establishing new and independent bureaus and agencies in the "judicial branch" and "legislative branch" of the Federal Government. The inartistic language of the Senate version would establish not only a precedent with regard to new agencies and bureaus in these branches of Government, but, in addition, would seem to provide a unique quality of autonomy and independence which no other agency of Government appears to enjoy.

In the report of the Special Committee appointed by the Chief Justice to the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, dated May 10, 1967, the suggestion for establishing the Judicial Center as a separate or independent agency was specifically and emphatically rejected. This report on page 4 declares:

The Special Committee concluded that it would only cause friction and difficulty if the Center was organized as a third body, separate and distinct from the Judicial Conference and the Administrative Office which acts under direction of the Conference. The Special Committee concluded that efficient, coordinated management and development of the Judicial Conference programs and projects can be achieved by establishing the Federal Judicial Center in the Administrative Office but with its own autonomous board of judges to be elected by the Judicial Conference.

The Special Committee set forth advantages which this form of organization would permit.

The concept of a Judicial Center distinctly separate from the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts appears to have evolved among staff members of the other body or elsewhere. This concept is not reflected in any of the legislative proposals introduced on this subject in the House, nor is it supported by any of the testimony or recommendations upon which the House acted.

As the hearings and Senate committee Report No. 781 indicated, the work of the Judicial Center and that of the Administrative Office should be very closely related one to the other. The Judicial Center should form the technical and research arm while the housekeeping or administrative arm should continue in the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. The need for close liaison and cooperation are readily apparent since the objective of both offices is to expedite and improve the administration of justice. Indeed, all versions of this legislation have provided that the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts shall be a permanent member of the Board of the Judicial Center.

To reject the recommendations made to the House Judiciary Committee, and to permit instead the establishment of the Judicial Center as a new and independent agency is to countenance proliferation of Government and to run the risk of the creation of a new bureaucracy. Such an agency with its independent status may well duplicate through its personnel and operations existing functions of the Administrative Office itself.

The budget submitted to the committee and to the House of Representatives contained no provision for a new or additional office or building where the Judicial Center might be located. Indeed, during the House debate on this measure, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] inquired "as to where the Judicial Center is going to be located," to which I replied unequivocally, "the Judicial Center will be located in the Administrative Office of the U.S. courts, which already is established, I believe, in the Supreme Court Building. The Judicial Center will be located in the same office. This supplements what was done, I believe, about 20 years ago. I am not sure when the Administrative Office of the Courts was established, but it was a long time ago, and this brings the whole system up to date." I could not depart from this assurance which I gave to the House during House debate on this measure, nor could I fail to support the House position with regard to this vital and basic aspect of the Judicial Center legislation. As a House conferee I worked diligently to keep faith with the House membership.

I can only hope that following approval of this conference committee report the Judicial Center will, indeed, be established in the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. The language which was inserted by the other body, and insisted upon by its conferees, does not, in my opinion, prevent establishment of the Judicial Center in the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. Accordingly, I am hopeful that, despite the broad and imperfect language to which the conferees have agreed, the original intention of this House will be honored.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I have taken exception to that part of the bill which permits the Director of the new Judicial Center to appoint and fix the compensation of professional personnel. In my opinion, the House version of this legislation which lodged this responsibility in the Board, should have been followed by the conferees. The professional personnel, in addition to their responsibility to the Director, should be answerable to the members of the Board. The Board established by this legislation is intended to be a responsible and acting Board charged with the general direction and supervision of the activities of the Federal Judicial Center. The members are not intended to be figureheads, nor should they delegate their responsibility with regard to the "professional personnel" which may serve in the new Judicial Center. It is expected that such professional personnel will be highly skilled specialists enjoying high salaries.

The issue as to whether or not the Board should possess this authority was debated fully and thoroughly in the House Judiciary Committee. It was discussed during the general debate on this measure and the House position was made eminently clear. I am disappointed that the House conferees were obliged to recede from their position on this issue. Accordingly, I have been constrained to except also to that part of the conference committee report.

I am heartened by other provisions of this legislation, including the emphasis placed upon the use of automatic data processing to assist in the work of the Center. I am hopeful also that the seemingly endless practice of appointing new and additional Federal judges and other judicial personnel may be averted and that the efficient and effective utilization of personnel and facilities may be greatly augmented.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have been associated with the formulation of this key legislation. My disappointments with respect to the final version of the measure are counterbalanced by my confidence that the measure as passed will be interpreted and applied in a manner not inconsistent with the hopes and aims of those of us who have given this subject the careful study and earnest support which it has received and deserves.

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

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

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCCLORY] has accurately outlined the two points in the conference report which are deeply troubling to the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Minnesota.

The gentleman from Illinois worked very assiduously and very effectively on this bill in Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Committee on the Judiciary. He continued that work during deliberations of the full Committee on the Judiciary, and he was, I may say, in my judgment the most active, the most knowledgeable, and the most farsighted of the conferees in the consideration of this particular proposal.

I am troubled by the fact that the hearings held in the Judiciary Committee

of the other body do not in any measure whatsoever support the Senate version of the bill in the two particulars to which the gentleman from Illinois and I object. I am particularly disturbed, in addition, by the fact that these changes were made in the other body without consultation with the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and without any opportunity for responsible officials of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts to counsel with our sister group in the other body on the wisdom of these changes.

The two changes to which I refer are the changes made in the other body, and accepted by the conferees, which are outlined at the bottom of page 9 and the top of page 10 of the conference report. They are located in the section entitled "Statement of the Managers on the Part of the House."

Those two provisions, again for emphasis, are as follows, and they are the two provisions to which the gentleman from Illinois and I object most strenuously. In the first provision the Senate version locates the Federal Judicial Center in the judicial branch of the Government rather than in the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. The second provision, to which we except most strenuously, is that which authorizes the director appoint and fix the compensation of professional personnel, rather than, as provided in the House, requiring the board to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that wholly inadequate and in some respects improper legislative procedures led to the adoption of the Senate version of these two particular provisions, and I register my objections most strenuously.

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

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CELLER. I want to address my statement to both the gentleman from Illinois and to the gentleman from Minnesota.

I recognize that both gentlemen fought hard to bring about the suggestions about which they have told us. I take it they realize every conference involves a compromise. I take it, however, they are in favor of passage of this legislation and are reporting favorably on the conference report, but they want to register as emphatically as they can their exceptions to these two provisions.

Is that the attitude of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. McCLORY. Let me say, in response to the comment of the chairman of the committee, it was my position that the House version was the sound one. We were following the recommendations of the President, who recommended this legislation to the Congress. Also, we were following the recommendations of the Special Committee of the Judicial Conference. And we were following the recommendations of the American Bar Association, and the recommendations of Subcommittee No. 5 and of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House.

I might say, with regard to the power of the Board with respect to the appointment of and the fixing of compensation of professional personnel, the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] participated actively in the debate and supported that version following a debate in the subcommittee on that issue.

Let me add that the Senate version, adopted in the other body, does not emanate from the official recommendations to the House and does not emanate from the legislation as introduced by the gentleman from California and myself or by the chairman of the committee and others, but springs from some other source, which is a little mystifying to me and I believe to the gentleman from Minnesota.

I am supporting this legislation. It is my hope that in the application of this legislative measure the House recommendation to utilize the Office of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts will be taken advantage of.

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

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

Mr. MACGREGOR. In connection with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee of the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY] and the gentleman from Minnesota, not only were fighting in conference for what they thought was right, but were fighting to maintain the House position, the House-passed bill, which we understand is the function of the House conferees.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MACGREGOR. We were fighting also to maintain and to enact into law, as the House proposed, the formal recommendations to us from the Judicial Conference.

Let the record show that we have received no revision of those recommendations which would support the Senate-sponsored provisions of the conference report that are brought before the House today.

Mr. McCLORY. The gentleman from Minnesota is absolutely correct.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may address an inquiry to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I take it, despite what the gentleman has said, he will support this conference report?

Mr. MACGREGOR. The gentleman from Minnesota signed the conference report with great reservations, making it clear he took these two specific exceptions to the conference report.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. First let me ask the gentleman the ultimate cost as a result of the conference report changes to the House bill as to the cost of the establishment of this institution?

Mr. McCLORY. We inquired about that. It was represented to us as conferees that there would be no additional cost involved in this change in the legislation.

However, I may say that the budget estimate presented to the committee, when we considered this legislation, did not include any amount for rent or for new office space or anything of that nature. It also contemplated administrative functions like budget and personnel would be provided by the Administrative Office. If the office is to be located elsewhere than in the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, and if separate administrative functions will have to be provided out of the Center's budget, it is bound to involve some additional money.

Mr. GROSS. From where is the personnel to be obtained, now to be placed in the hands of the Director for selection? From where is this personnel to be obtained?

Mr. McCLORY. The professional personnel would be the same as that contemplated in our House bill. I do not think that there is any change in the number. It may be there will be additional administrative and clerical help involved, but the professional personnel, in my judgment, would be the same in both versions.

Mr. GROSS. Are the laws governing the hiring of supergrades set aside in the creation of this Judicial Center?

Mr. McCLORY. Yes, I believe it is, up to a point.

Mr. GROSS. You believe it is?

Mr. McCLORY. I refer you to section 625 of the Senate bill which says that the Civil Service Act is not applicable to professional personnel but limits that exception up to the ceiling of level V of the executive schedule.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield the gentleman from Illinois 2 more minutes?

Mr. CELLER. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCLORY. I know that most of these provisions of the Civil Service Code will not be applicable with regard to professional personnel.

Mr. GROSS. But does it not have to do with the salary level?

Mr. McCLORY. The salary level will undoubtedly be very high and in accordance with the grade levels of the Civil Service Code.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, we have supergrades now under control, at least to some extent. I am very much concerned about this employment of personnel to staff the Judicial Center as to whether it is setting aside the civil service procedures or what the means of obtaining them is. Let me ask another question since there appears to be some area of doubt on it.

Mr. McCLORY. Let me say I was not in controversy about that portion of the Senate bill and I was not dissatisfied with the subject of the application and nonapplication of parts of the Civil Service Code.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any authority lodged in this Judicial Center or lodged in any of the officials thereof to do anything about the removal of Federal judges or the circumscribing of cases assigned to Federal judges? Of course, I have in mind—and the gentleman from Illinois probably recognizes it—the case in Okla-

homa where three Federal judges have been feuding for some 3 years, and calling each other names.

Mr. McCLORY. May I respond to that by saying it is not covered in this legislation at all. This is essentially a research, study and technical arm of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. It is supposed to provide ideas and recommendation for machinery to modernizing and streamlining the courts and expediting the administration of justice.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I thought the gentleman said in his original or previous statement. It was for the purpose of expediting the cases in the Federal courts and the package that has been used in Oklahoma is quite the contrary.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] 2 minutes.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6111, to provide for the establishment of a Federal Judicial Center.

Of the recommendations included in the President's crime message to the Congress early this year, improvement of the administration of justice in our Federal courts was one of the more important. My own interest in and concern about our Federal court system led me to introduce H.R. 6111 shortly after this session convened.

The Center will conduct research and study of the operation of Federal courts and stimulate and coordinate such research and study on the part of public and private agencies; make recommendations to the Judicial Conference of the United States for improvement of the administration and management of the U.S. courts; stimulate, create, develop and conduct programs of continuing education and training for personnel in the judicial system—including judges; and provide staff, research, and planning assistance to the Judicial Conference of the United States and its committees.

H.R. 6111 is a nonpartisan piece of legislation with bipartisan support because it represents a reasonable, necessary approach toward solving some of the major problems which plague our courts; namely, serious delays in completing court action and growing docket congestion.

Mr. Speaker, this delay and congestion in our courts has reached crisis proportions in recent years. The number of civil cases pending before the U.S. district courts, for instance, was 79,906 at the end of fiscal year 1967—an increase of approximately 5 percent over the 76,607 cases pending at the end of fiscal 1966 and an increase of more than 23 percent over the number of cases pending 5 years earlier at the end of 1962. More than 10 percent of the civil cases pending before district courts at the end of fiscal 1967 had been on the dockets 36 months or more. The U.S. courts of appeal are facing problems of similar proportions. I am sure that many of my distinguished colleagues are finding parallel conditions in their own districts.

Statistics are available which paint a dismal picture of the state of justice in the Federal courts. Only those with infinite patience—and financial resources—can afford to pursue justice when the road is such a lengthy one. With a growing population and with the greater complexity of many of the cases with which our Federal courts must deal, this road is lengthening alarmingly.

Congress has responded to accelerating judicial business by establishing new judgeships but this has not worked to reduce this backlog substantially. Between 1959 and 1964, the number of trial judgeships was increased 25 percent, but the number of cases disposed of in 1964 was only 3 percent greater than in 1959. The creation of new judgeships is well worth the expense involved if this were the answer to reducing delay and docket congestion, but it is apparent that this alone is not sufficient. What is needed is better judicial administration, and to obtain this we must have programs of research, training and continuing education.

We have been asking our Federal judges—men who owe primary devotion to their courts—to be administrators. And, we have been asking them to do this without providing them with sufficient facilities, staff, funds or training to meet this task.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6111, by providing for comprehensive programs of continuing education and training would give judges and judicial personnel the administrative expertise necessary for them to discharge their obligations.

The key to the effectiveness of programs of research, training and education is not their proliferation, but their quality. The committees of the Judicial Conference of the U.S. courts have struggled with the problem of judicial administration in our courts before and plans and programs have been initiated—but only on a piecemeal basis, and often hurriedly. Their solutions sometimes lacked the insight that only complete information, protracted research and unhurried analysis can bring.

Continuity was lacking and staffing and financial support were inadequate. The Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts has done an excellent job of providing the judiciary with valuable fiscal and housekeeping services, but it too, is handicapped in its efforts to engage in continuing the in-depth research necessary to provide long-term answers to the administrative and training problems of our courts.

We have operated our courts under a system which is in the Dark Ages in terms of management techniques and in terms of adequate staff assistance. It is a system which can only serve to debilitate our capacity for justice. If we are to have effective, just courts—courts which reflect the best aspects of our modern, scientific era—we must equip the judiciary with the resources necessary to meet their needs. I believe H.R. 6111 will do this.

Mr. Speaker, as you will recall, the House passed H.R. 6111 with strong support from both sides of the aisle. Though the Senate disagreed on certain technical points, I am pleased that the conferees have agreed on a bill that is faithful to the purpose and principal provisions of my proposal.

The bill as it now stands is a good bill—an urgently needed bill—and I hope my colleagues will support the conference report now before them.

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to ask a question. Am I correct in my assumption that the wording of the bill in several places "courts of the United States" refers only to the courts in the Federal system and has no connection with States?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman explain to me in the purposes of this Federal Judicial Center what is meant by provision 3 on page 2 of the report, which states:

(3) to stimulate, create, develop, and conduct programs of continuing education and training for personnel of the judicial branch of the Government, including, but not limited to, judges, referees, clerks of court, probation officers, and United States commissioners—

What type of education is proposed to be given the judges in the Judicial Center?

Mr. CELLER. Well, primarily, it is to keep judicial personnel updated on current cases. There are many, many courts in this country and there are courts in foreign countries. We have a lot to do to keep abreast of current developments, especially in foreign countries. In my opinion it is well to have all the facts and data coordinated in this Judicial Center. The judges and other personnel could partake of the judicial nourishment afforded them. In that sense they could obtain education in judicial matters which they are not now obtaining. They must keep abreast of the times. The judicial system must go forward, as must all other branches of the Federal Government go forward.

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

Mr. CELLER. Yes. I yield further to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. In furnishing this "nourishment" to the judges, that is the thing about which I am most concerned. Does that nourishment include philosophical or political nourishment?

Mr. CELLER. I suppose it is very difficult to separate that which is judicial from that which is philosophical.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, that is what I am afraid of.

I wonder if the gentleman from New York has been confronted with or heard of the fact that there has been too much interference with the judiciary already from people in other parts of the Government, for instance, the Attorney General and others representing the various executive departments?

There was recently an article which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report with reference to this matter.

I just do not see any good purpose to be served by the enactment of this legislation. I am afraid that our justices have already become too indoctrinated in political philosophy, and are continuing to be so indoctrinated.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary yield to me at this point?

Mr. CELLER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for yielding to me at this time. It is my opinion that the type of education about which we are talking here goes more to procedure than it does to philosophy. It is the hope that this Center will devise methods of operations that will expedite the work of the judicial branch of our Government.

Further, Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the matter to which the gentleman from Mississippi refers—that is "philosophy"—comes much more from the work of the appellate courts than it comes or would come from this Judicial Center.

Mr. Speaker, the great State of California for some years has followed the practice of attempting to educate members of the bench. However, that procedure goes to the methods of expediting the job of the courts rather than substantive law or philosophy.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman from New York will yield further, permit me to comment just briefly upon that statement which has been made by the learned gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN].

I have no objection to procedural indoctrination. But the thing about which I am most concerned is the philosophical narrowing down to political indoctrination. There is a growing sentiment in the country that our judiciary is not the independent body of the Government which was intended when it was originally established.

Will the gentleman from New York agree with me on that point?

Mr. CELLER. I wonder——

Mr. COLMER. And may I add further that I am a little nonplused that the reaction of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the very able and learned gentleman from New York, and the very able and learned member of that committee, the distinguished gentleman from California, since it would seem to be and to represent an attempt at accomplishing that which this language does not provide.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I take the position that our judiciary has been independent and has been independent all through its history.

There has been tremendous conflict, particularly between the executive branch of the Government and the judiciary branch of the Government.

I was one of those who refused to allow the Court to be packed, and I voted against the provision that would extend the Court from nine judges to 11 judges, to allow the President to appoint two additional judges that might do his bidding.

I remember also that President Truman, in his opinion, had difficulty with the Court. They did not really abide by what he thought would be a proper decision. And I am quite sure if you talked to President Johnson you would find that the Court has not always been, in his opinion, in accord with what he thought was proper.

I do not believe the gentleman can find very much authenticity for the statement that the courts have not been independent of the executive branch of government.

Mr. COLMER. In reference to the last statement the gentleman made—and the gentleman has made so many statements that it is hard to comment on all of them—but with reference to the last statement I would say that I have just replied to a constituent of mine the other day who was very much concerned about the matter we are talking about now, and I expressed the hope that this article that I referred to a moment ago was exaggerated, that it was not true. But for a long time in my own mind I have been concerned about the question that I raised.

Now, insofar as the packing of the Court is concerned, of course, as I recall, I was here too at the time, and we did not vote on that in the House, did we?

But I recall that I was opposed to it. However, my point is, regardless of that, that while the Congress are representatives of the people, and did not give President Roosevelt the power to stack the Court, that, "Oh, death, oh, time," passed, and the Court was stacked, and it is now of one predominant philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, much has been said this afternoon about the necessity of the Judicial Center for the purpose of expediting cases in the courts. I noticed in yesterday's paper that the senior judge of the courts of the District of Columbia has put the judges in the District of Columbia on a 5-day week. Perhaps this is what is needed more than anything else to expedite business in the courts. I doubt, in view of the action that was taken by the senior judge in the District of Columbia yesterday, that a Judicial Center is needed in order to put the judges on a 5-day week.

Mr. CELLER. I do not know what relevancy that has to the main import of the bill under consideration.

Mr. GROSS. Only this: If the burning desire of the gentleman is to expedite cases in the Federal courts, if we do not have judges on the bench 5 days a week, there is bound to be a slowdown.

Mr. CELLER. I can say as far as the Federal judges are concerned, in the southern district of New York and the eastern district of New York, of which I am familiar, work more than 5 days a week. The gentleman must realize that a judge may have a very intricate case, and he may hear the case. Then he has to take the papers and the documents home, and give reflection, study, and research to it after hours. It is not only the time spent actually on the bench that occupies the duties of the judges. There are many other ways by which the judges must exert their efforts in the interest of carrying out justice. I believe it is unfair to just test the efficacy or the worthwhileness of a judge by the number of hours he spends in the courtroom; there are many other chores he has to do outside of the courtroom.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to my friend, the gentleman from New York, that I have no doubt that the senior judge in the District of Columbia took all that into account when he ordered 5 days of service out of the judges in the District of Columbia.

Mr. CELLER. I am sure that he took all of that into account.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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 230, nays 126, not voting 76, as follows:

[Roll No. 426]

YEAS—230

Adams	de la Garza	Grover
Addabbo	Delaney	Gude
Albert	Dellenback	Halpern
Anderson, Ill.	Denney	Hamilton
Anderson, Tenn.	Dent	Hammer-schmidt
Ashley	Donohue	Hanley
Aspinall	Dow	Hanna
Ayres	Downing	Harsha
Belcher	Dulski	Harvey
Berry	Dwyer	Hathaway
Biester	Edmondson	Hawkins
Blackburn	Edwards, Calif.	Hays
Blanton	Edwards, La.	Hechler, W. Va.
Boggs	Eilberg	Helstoski
Boland	Erlenborn	Hicks
Brademas	Evans, Colo.	Holifield
Brasco	Everett	Holland
Brock	Fallon	Horton
Brooks	Farbstein	Hosmer
Brotzman	Fascell	Howard
Brown, Calif.	Feighan	Hull
Broyhill, Va.	Findley	Hungate
Burke, Mass.	Fisher	Ichord
Burton, Calif.	Flood	Irwin
Burton, Utah	Foley	Jacobs
Bush	Ford, Gerald R.	Joelson
Byrne, Pa.	Ford William D.	Johnson, Calif.
Carey	Fraser	Johnson, Pa.
Casey	Friedel	Jones, Ala.
Celler	Fulton, Pa.	Karsten
Cleveland	Gallagher	Karth
Cohelan	Garmatz	Kastenmeier
Collier	Giaimo	Kazens
Conable	Gibbons	Kee
Conte	Gilbert	Kelly
Conyers	Gonzalez	King, Calif.
Corbett	Goodell	Kirwan
Corman	Goodling	Kluczynski
Cowger	Gray	Kupferman
Culver	Green, Oreg.	Kyros
Curtis	Green, Pa.	Leggett
Daniels	Griffiths	Lloyd

Long, Md.	O'Hara, Mich.	St Germain
McCarthy	O'Neill, Mass.	Scheuer
McClory	Ottinger	Schneebeli
McCulloch	Patman	Schwengel
McDade	Patten	Shipley
McDonald, Mich.	Perkins	Slack
McFall	Philbin	Smith, Iowa
Macdonald, Mass.	Pickle	Smith, N.Y.
MacGregor	Pike	Springer
Machen	Poff	Stafford
Madden	Price, Ill.	Staggers
Mahon	Pryor	Stanton
Martin	Pucinski	Stubblefield
Mathias, Calif.	Quie	Sullivan
Matsunaga	Railsback	Tenzer
May	Randall	Thompson, N.J.
Meeds	Rees	Tiernan
Meskill	Reid, N.Y.	Tunney
Miller, Calif.	Reifel	Udall
Mills	Reinecke	Ullman
Minish	Reuss	Vander Jagt
Mink	Rhodes, Pa.	Vigorito
Moore	Robison	Waldie
Morgan	Rodino	Walker
Morris, N. Mex.	Rogers, Colo.	Wampler
Morse, Mass.	Ronan	Whalen
Moss	Rooney, N.Y.	White
Murphy, Ill.	Rooney, Pa.	Widnall
Murphy, N.Y.	Rosenthal	Wiggins
Myers	Rostenkowski	Wilson, Bob
Natcher	Roth	Wolff
Nedzi	Roush	Wyman
Nix	Roybal	Yates
O'Hara, Ill.	Rumsfeld	Young
	Ruppe	Zablocki
	Ryan	

NAYS—126

Andrews, Ala.	Gettys	Price, Tex.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Gross	Purcell
Ashbrook	Haley	Rarick
Ashmore	Hall	Reid, Ill.
Baring	Hansen, Idaho	Riegle
Bennett	Harrison	Rivers
Betts	Henderson	Roberts
Bevill	Herlong	Rogers, Fla.
Bolton	Hunt	Roudebush
Bow	Hutchinson	Satterfield
Brinkley	Jarman	Saylor
Brown, Mich.	Jonas	Schadeberg
Brown, Ohio	Jones, N.C.	Scherle
Broyhill, N.C.	King, N.Y.	Selden
Buchanan	Kleppe	Shriver
Burke, Fla.	Kornegay	Sikes
Burleson	Kuykendall	Skubitz
Byrnes, Wis.	Kyl	Smith, Okla.
Cabell	Laird	Snyder
Carter	Langen	Steiger, Ariz.
Chamberlain	Lennon	Steiger, Wis.
Clancy	Lipscomb	Stephens
Clawson, Del	Long, La.	Stuckey
Colmer	McClure	Taft
Cramer	McEwen	Talcott
Cunningham	Marsh	Taylor
Davis, Ga.	Mayne	Teague, Calif.
Davis, Wis.	Michel	Teague, Tex.
Derwinski	Miller, Ohio	Thompson, Ga.
Devine	Minshall	Thomson, Wis.
Dole	Mize	Utt
Dorn	Montgomery	Waggonner
Dowdy	Morton	Whalley
Duncan	Mosher	Whitener
Edwards, Ala.	Nelsen	Whitten
Esch	Nichols	Williams, Miss.
Fino	O'Konski	Williams, Pa.
Flynt	O'Neal, Ga.	Winn
Fuqua	Passman	Wylie
Galifianakis	Pelly	Zion
Gardner	Pettis	Zwach
Gathings	Poage	
	Pollock	

NOT VOTING—76

Abbitt	Dickinson	McMillan
Abernethy	Diggs	Mailliard
Adair	Dingell	Mathias, Md.
Annunzio	Eckhardt	Monagan
Arends	Eshleman	Moorhead
Barrett	Evins, Tenn.	Multer
Bates	Fountain	Olsen
Battin	Frelinghuysen	Pepper
Bell	Fulton, Tenn.	Pirnie
Bingham	Gubser	Pool
Blatnik	Gurney	Quillen
Bolling	Hagan	Resnick
Bray	Halleck	Rhodes, Ariz.
Broomfield	Hansen, Wash.	Sandman
Button	Hardy	St. Onge
Cahill	Hébert	Schweiker
Cederberg	Heckler, Mass.	Scott
Clark	Jones, Mo.	Sisk
Clausen, Don H.	Keith	Smith, Calif.
Daddario	Landrum	Steed
Dawson	Latta	Stratton
	Lukens	Tuck
Van Deerlin	Watts	Wright
Vanik	Willis	Wyatt
Watkins	Wilson, Charles H.	Wydler
Watson		

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Annunzio for, with Mr. Abernethy against.

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Fountain against.

Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. Hagan against.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Hardy against.

Mr. Stratton for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. McMillan against.

Mr. Sandman for, with Mr. Bray against.

Mr. Cahill for, with Mr. Dickinson against.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Eshleman against.

Mr. Pirnie for, with Mr. Gurney against.

Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Latta against.

Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Quillen against.

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Watson against.

Mr. Bates for, with Mr. Smith of California against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Monagan with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Bingham with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.

Mr. Sisk with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Vanik with Mr. Wydler.

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Olsen with Mr. Schweiker.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Button.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Lukens.

Mr. Pool with Mr. Multer.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. Willis with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Dawson with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. MINSHALL 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.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the conference report just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

COMPOSITION OF A SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE HOUSE BEAUTY SHOP

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] and myself, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 1000) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1000

Resolved, (a) That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of three Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom shall be designated as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(b) Effective upon the date of approval of this resolution, until otherwise ordered by the House, the management of the House Beauty Shop and all matters connected therewith shall be under the direction of the Select Committee herein created and shall be operated under such rules and regulations as such Committee may prescribe for the operation and the employment of necessary assistance for the conduct of said Beauty Shop by such business methods as may produce the best results consistent with economical and modern management.

SEC. 2. The Select Committee is hereby authorized to purchase, at a cost not to exceed $15,000, the initial equipment and materials required for the operation of the House Beauty Shop, and the expense thereof shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. 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 gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the $15,000 advanced to reestablish the House beauty shop will be in the course of the next year, barring unforeseen circumstances, be returned to the contingency fund, and it is my earnest hope that the next time you hear from the select committee, it will be for the pleasant task of returning money to the Treasury of the United States.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOUSE BEAUTY SHOP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1000, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee on the House Beauty Shop the following Members: Mrs. GRIFFITHS, chairman; Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, and Mrs. MAY.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORTS ON H.R. 13510 AND H.R. 6167, UNTIL MIDNIGHT SATURDAY

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services have until midnight Saturday to file conference reports on the bills H.R. 13510 to increase the basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, and H.R. 6167, to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence and a new loan, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. POAGE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 12144) to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 998)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12144) to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the Wholesome Meat Act and that the provisions appearing under the subheading 'FOR MEAT INSPECTION:' under the heading 'BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY' in the Act approved March 4, 1907, entitled 'An Act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and eight' (34 Stat. 1260–1265, as amended; 21 U.S.C. 71–91), are hereby designated as the 'Federal Meat Inspection Act'; the first twenty paragraphs thereof are hereby designated, respectively, as sections 3 through 22, and the twenty-first and twenty-second paragraphs thereof as section 23; and said sections 3 through 23 are hereby designated as 'TITLE I—INSPECTION REQUIREMENTS; ADULTERATION AND MISBRANDING'.

"SEC. 2. The Federal Meat Inspection Act is hereby amended by adding, in title I, new *sections 1 and* 2 reading, respectively, as follows:

"'SECTION 1. As used in this Act, except as otherwise specified, the following terms shall have the meanings stated below:

"'(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States or his delegate.

"'(b) The term "firm" means any partnership, association, or other unincorporated business organization.

"'(c) The term "meat broker" means any person, firm, or corporation engaged in the business of buying or selling carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat, or meat food products of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines on commission, or otherwise negotiating purchases or sales of such articles other than for his own account or as an employee of another person, firm, or corporation.

"'(d) The term "renderer" means any person, firm, or corporation engaged in the business of rendering carcasses or parts or products of the carcasses, of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, except rendering conducted under inspection or exemption under title I of this Act.

"'(e) The term "animal food manufacturer" means any person, firm, or corporation engaged in the business of manufacturing or processing animal food derived wholly or in part from carcasses, or parts or products of the carcasses, of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines.

"'(f) The term "State" means any State of the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"'(g) The term "Territory" means Guam, the Virgin Islands of the United States, American Samoa, and any other territory or possession of the United States, excluding the Canal Zone.

"'(h) The term "commerce" means commerce between any State, any Territory, or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof; or within any Territory not organized with a legislative body, or the District of Columbia.

"'(i) The term "United States" means the States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories of the United States.

"'(j) The term "meat food product" means any product capable of use as human food which is made wholly or in part from any meat or other portion of the carcass of any cattle, sheep, swine, or goats, excepting products which contain meat or other portions of such carcasses only in a relatively small proportion or historically have not been considered by consumers as products of the meat food industry, and which are exempted from definition as a meat food product by the Secretary under such conditions as he may prescribe to assure that the meat or other portions of such carcasses contained in such product are not adulterated and that such products are not represented as meat food products. This term as applied to food products of equines shall have a meaning comparable to that provided in this paragraph with respect to cattle, sheep, swine, and goats.

"'(k) The term "capable of use as human food" shall apply to any carcass, or part or product of a carcass, of any animal, unless it is denatured or otherwise identified as required by regulations prescribed by the Secretary to deter its use as human food, or it is naturally inedible by humans.

"'(l) The term "prepared" means slaughtered, canned, salted, rendered, boned, cut up, or otherwise manufactured or processed.

"'(m) The term "adulterated" shall apply to any carcass, part thereof, meat or meat food product under one or more of the following circumstances:

"'(1) if it bears or contains any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render it injurious to health; but in case the substance is not an added substance, such article shall not be considered adulterated under this clause if the quantity of such substance in or on such article does not ordinarily render it injurious to health;

"'(2)(A) if it bears or contains (by reason of administration of any substance to the live animal or otherwise) any added poisonous or added deleterious substance (other than one which is (i) a pesticide chemical in or on a raw agricultural commodity; (ii) a food additive; or (iii) a color additive) which may, in the judgment of the Secretary, make such article unfit for human food;

"'(B) if it is, in whole or in part, a raw agricultural commodity and such commodity bears or contains a pesticide chemical which is unsafe within the meaning of section 408 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act,

"'(C) if it bears or contains any food additive which is unsafe within the meaning of section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act,

"'(D) if it bears or contains any color additive which is unsafe within the meaning of section 706 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act: *Provided*, That an article which is not adulterated under clause (B), (C), or (D) shall nevertheless be deemed adulterated if use of the pesticide chemical, food additive, or color additive in or on such article is prohibited by regulations of the Secretary in establishments at which inspection is maintained under title I of this Act;

"'(3) if it consists in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance or is for any other reason unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food;

"'(4) if it has been prepared, packed, or held under insanitary conditions whereby it may have become contaminated with filth, or whereby it may have been rendered injurious to health;

"'(5) if it is, in whole or in part, the product of an animal which has died otherwise than by slaughter;

"'(6) if its container is composed, in whole or in part, of any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render the contents injurious to health;

"'(7) if it has been intentionally subjected to radiation, unless the use of the radiation was in conformity with a regulation or exemption in effect pursuant to section 409 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act;

"'(8) if any valuable constituent has been in whole or in part omitted or abstracted therefrom; or if any substance has been substituted, wholly or in part therefor; or if damage or inferiority has been concealed in any manner; or if any substance has been added thereto or mixed or packed therewith so as to increase its bulk or weight, or reduce its quality or strength, or make it appear better or of greater value than it is; or

"'(9) if it is margarine containing animal fat and any of the raw material used therein consisted in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance.

"'(n) The term "misbranded" shall apply to any carcass, part thereof, meat or meat food product under one or more of the following circumstances:

"'(1) if its labeling is false or misleading in any particular;

"'(2) if it is offered for sale under the name of another food;

"'(3) if it is an imitation of another food, unless its label bears, in type of uniform size and prominence, the word "imitation" and immediately thereafter, the name of the food imitated;

"'(4) if its container is so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading;

"'(5) if in a package or other container unless it bears a label showing (A) the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor; and (B) an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count: *Provided*, That under clause (B) of this subparagraph (5), reasonable variations may be permitted, and exemptions as to small packages may be established, by regulations prescribed by the Secretary;

"'(6) if any word, statement, or other information required by or under authority of this Act to appear on the label or other labeling is not prominently placed thereon with such conspicuousness (as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices, in the labeling) and in such terms as to render it likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use;

"'(7) if it purports to be or is represented as a food for which a definition and standard of identity or composition has been prescribed by regulations of the Secretary under section 7 of this Act unless (A) it conforms to such definition and standard, and (B) its label bears the name of the food specified in the definition and standard and, insofar as may be required by such regulations, the common names of optional ingredients (other than spices, flavoring, and coloring) present in such food;

"'(8) if it purports to be or is represented as a food for which a standard or standards of fill of container have been prescribed by regulations of the Secretary under section 7 of this Act, and it falls below the standard of fill of container applicable thereto, unless its label bears, in such manner and form as such regulations specify, a statement that it falls below such standard;

"'(9) if it is not subject to the provisions of subparagraph (7), unless its label bears (A) the common or usual name of the food, if any there be, and (B) in case it is fabri-

cated from two or more ingredients, the common or usual name of each such ingredient; except that spices, flavorings, and colorings may, when authorized by the Secretary, be designated as spices, flavorings, and colorings without naming each: *Provided*, That, to the extent that compliance with the requirements of clause (B) of this subparagraph (9) is impracticable, or results in deception or unfair competition, exemptions shall be established by regulations promulgated by the Secretary;

"'(10) if it purports to be or is represented for special dietary uses, unless its label bears such information concerning its vitamin, mineral, and other dietary properties as the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, determines to be, and by regulations prescribes as, necessary in order fully to inform purchasers as to its value for such uses;

"'(11) if it bears or contains any artificial flavoring, artificial coloring, or chemical preservative, unless it bears labeling stating that fact: *Provided*, That, to the extent that compliance with the requirements of this subparagraph (11) is impracticable, exemptions shall be established by regulations promulgated by the Secretary; or

"'(12) if it fails to bear, directly thereon or on its container, as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe, the inspection legend and, unrestricted by any of the foregoing, such other information as the Secretary may require in such regulations to assure that it will not have false or misleading labeling and that the public will be informed of the manner of handling required to maintain the article in a wholesome condition.

"'(o) The term "label" means a display of written, printed, or graphic matter upon the immediate container (not including package liners) of any article.

"'(p) The term "labeling" means all labels and other written, printed, or graphic matter (1) upon any article or any of its containers or wrappers, or (2) accompanying such article.

"'(q) The term "Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act" means the Act so entitled, approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1040), and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

"'(r) The terms "pesticide chemical", "food additive", "color additive", and "raw agricultural commodity" shall have the same meanings for purposes of this Act as under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

"'(s) The term "official mark" means the official inspection legend or any other symbol prescribed by regulations of the Secretary to identify the status of any article or animal under this Act.

"'(t) The term "official inspection legend" means any symbol prescribed by regulations of the Secretary showing that an article was inspected and passed in accordance with this Act.

"'(u) The term "official certificate" means any certificate prescribed by regulations of the Secretary for issuance by an inspector or other person performing official functions under this Act.

"'(v) The term "official device" means any device prescribed or authorized by the Secretary for use in applying any official mark.'

"SEC. 2. Meat and meat food products are an important source of the Nation's total supply of food. They are consumed throughout the Nation and the major portion thereof moves in interstate or foreign commerce. It is essential in the public interest that the health and welfare of consumers be protected by assuring that meat and meat food products distributed to them are wholesome, not adulterated, and properly marked, labeled, and packaged. Unwholesome, adulterated, or misbranded meat or meat food products impair the effective regulation of meat and meat food products in interstate or foreign commerce, are injurious to the public welfare, destroy markets for wholesome, not adulterated, and properly labeled and packaged meat and meat food products, and result in sundry losses to livestock producers and processors of meat and meat food products, as well as injury to consumers. The unwholesome, adulterated, mislabeled, or deceptively packaged articles can be sold at lower prices and compete unfairly with the wholesome, not adulterated, and properly labeled and packaged articles, to the detriment of consumers and the public generally. It is hereby found that all articles and animals which are regulated under this Act are either in interstate or foreign commerce or substantially affect such commerce, and that regulation by the Secretary and cooperation by the States and other jurisdictions as contemplated by this Act are appropriate to prevent and eliminate burdens upon such commerce, to effectively regulate such commerce, and to protect the health and welfare of consumers.

"SEC. 3. Said Act is hereby further amended by—

"(a) deleting the phrase 'interstate or foreign' wherever it appears in sections 3 through 23 of title I of said Act; and

"(b) deleting in section 3 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 71) the phrase 'the Secretary of Agriculture, at his discretion, may' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'the Secretary shall' and deleting the words 'of Agriculture' wherever they appear after the word 'Secretary' thereafter in title I of the Act.

"SEC. 4. Section 4 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 72) is hereby amended by deleting the phrases 'for human consumption' and 'for transportation or sale', and by inserting after the word 'commerce' the phrase 'which are capable of use as human food'.

"SEC. 5. Section 5 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 73) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'The Secretary may limit the entry of carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat and meat food products, and other materials into any establishment at which inspection under this title is maintained, under such conditions as he may prescribe to assure that allowing the entry of such articles into such inspected establishments will be consistent with the purposes of this Act.'

"SEC. 6. Section 7 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 75) is hereby amended by—

"(a) deleting the provisions thereof reading as follows: ', and no such meat or meat food products shall be sold or offered for sale by any person, firm, or corporation in interstate or foreign commerce under any false or deceptive name; but established trade name or names which are usual to such products and which are not false and deceptive and which shall be approved by the Secretary are permitted';

"(b) designating the remaining provisions as paragraph (a); and

"(c) adding at the end of said section the following provisions as paragraphs (b) through (e), respectively:

"'(b) All carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat and meat food products inspected at any establishment under the authority of this title and found to be not adulterated, shall at the time they leave the establishment bear, in distinctly legible form, directly thereon or on their containers, as the Secretary may require, the information required under paragraph (n) of section 1 of this Act.

"'(c) The Secretary, whenever he determines such action is necessary for the protection of the public, may prescribe: (1) the styles and sizes of type to be used with respect to material required to be incorporated in labeling to avoid false or misleading labeling in marketing and labeling any articles or animals subject to this title or title II of this Act; (2) definitions and standards of identity or composition for articles subject to this title and standards of fill of container for such articles not inconsistent with any such standards established under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and there shall be consultation between the Secretary and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare prior to the issuance of such standards under either Act relating to articles subject to this Act to avoid inconsistency in such standards and possible impairment of the coordinated effective administration of these Acts. There shall also be consultation between the Secretary and an appropriate advisory committee provided for in section 301 of this Act, prior to the issuance of such standards under this Act, to avoid, insofar as feasible, inconsistency between Federal and State standards.

"'(d) No article subject to this title shall be sold or offered for sale by any person, firm, or corporation, in commerce, under any name or other marking or labeling which is false or misleading, or in any container of a misleading form or size, but established trade names and other marking and labeling and containers which are not false or misleading and which are approved by the Secretary are permitted.

"'(e) If the Secretary has reason to believe that any marking or labeling or the size or form of any container in use or proposed for use with respect to any article subject to this title is false or misleading in any particular, he may direct that such use be withheld unless the marking, labeling, or container is modified in such manner as he may prescribe so that it will not be false or misleading. If the person, firm, or corporation using or proposing to use the marking, labeling or container does not accept the determination of the Secretary, such person, firm, or corporation may request a hearing, but the use of the marking, labeling, or container shall, if the Secretary so directs, be withheld pending hearing and final determination by the Secretary. Any such determination by the Secretary shall be conclusive unless, within thirty days after receipt of notice of such final determination, the person, firm, or corporation adversely affected thereby appeals to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such person, firm, or corporation has its principal place of business or to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. The provisions of section 204 of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 162, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 194), shall be applicable to appeals taken under this section."

"SEC. 7. Section 10 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 78) is hereby amended to read:

"'SEC. 10. No person, firm, or corporation shall, with respect to any cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, or any carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat or meat food products of any such animals—

"'(a) slaughter any such animals or prepare any such articles which are capable of use as human food at any establishment preparing any such articles for commerce, except in compliance with the requirements of this Act;

"'(b) sell, transport, offer for sale or transportation, or receive for transportation, in commerce, (1) any such articles which (A) are capable of use as human food and (B) are adulterated or misbranded at the time of such sale, transportation, offer for sale or transportation, or receipt for transportation; or (2) any articles required to be inspected under this title unless they have been so inspected and passed;

"'(c) do, with respect to any such articles which are capable of use as human food, any act while they are being transported in commerce or held for sale after such transportation, which is intended to cause or has the effect of causing such articles to be adulterated or misbranded.'

"SEC. 8. Section 11 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 79) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 11. (a) No brand manufacturer,

printer, or other person, firm, or corporation shall cast, print, lithograph, or otherwise make any device containing any official mark or simulation thereof, or any label bearing any such mark or simulation, or any form of official certificate or simulation thereof, except as authorized by the Secretary.

"'(b) No person, firm, or corporation shall—

"'(1) forge any official device, mark, or certificate;

"'(2) without authorization from the Secretary use any official device, mark, or certificate, or simulation thereof, or alter, detach, deface, or destroy any official device, mark, or certificate;

"'(3) contrary to the regulations prescribed by the Secretary, fail to use, or to detach, deface, or destroy any official device, mark, or certificate;

"'(4) knowingly possess, without promptly notifying the Secretary or his representative, any official device or any counterfeit, simulated, forged, or improperly altered official certificate or any device or label or any carcass of any animal, or part or product thereof, bearing any counterfeit, simulated, forged, or improperly altered official mark;

"'(5) knowingly make any false statement in any shipper's certificate or other nonofficial or official certificate provided for in the regulations prescribed by the Secretary; or

"'(6) knowingly represent that any article has been inspected and passed, or exempted, under this Act when, in fact, it has, respectively, not been so inspected and passed, or exempted.'

"SEC. 9. The present provisions of section 19 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 87) are hereby deleted and the following new provisions are substituted therefor:

"'SEC. 19. No person, firm, or corporation shall sell, transport, offer for sale or transportation, or receive for transportation, in commerce, any carcasses of horses, mules, or other equines or parts of such carcasses, or the meat or meat food products thereof, unless they are plainly and conspicuously marked or labeled or otherwise identified as required by regulations prescribed by the Secretary to show the kinds of animals from which they were derived. When required by the Secretary, with respect to establishments at which inspection is maintained under this title, such animals and their carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products shall be prepared in establishments separate from those in which cattle, sheep, swine, or goats are slaughtered or their carcasses, parts thereof, meat or meat food products are prepared.'

"SEC. 10. The present provisions of section 20 of said Act (21 U.S.C. 88) are hereby deleted and the following new provisions are substituted therefor:

"'SEC. 20. (a) No carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat or meat food products of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines which are capable of use as human food, shall be imported into the United States if such articles are adulterated or misbranded and unless they comply with all the inspection, building construction standards, and all other provisions of this Act and regulations issued thereunder applicable to such articles in commerce within the United States. All such imported articles shall, upon entry into the United States, be deemed and treated as domestic articles subject to the other provisions of this Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act: *Provided*, That they shall be marked and labeled as required by such regulations for imported articles: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall apply to any individual who purchases meat or meat products outside the United States for his own consumption except that the total amount of such meat or meat products shall not exceed fifty pounds.

"'(b) The Secretary may prescribe the terms and conditions for the destruction of all such articles which are imported contrary to this section, unless (1) they are exported by the consignee within the time fixed therefor by the Secretary, or (2) in the case of articles which are not in compliance with the Act solely because of misbranding, such articles are brought into compliance with the Act under supervision of authorized representatives of the Secretary.

"'(c) All charges for storage, cartage, and labor with respect to any article which is imported contrary to this section shall be paid by the owner or consignee, and in default of such payment shall constitute a lien against such article and any other article thereafter imported under this Act by or for such owner or consignee.

"'(d) The knowing importation of any article contrary to this section is prohibited.

"'(e) Not later than March 1 of each year the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate a comprehensive and detailed written report with respect to the administration of this section during the immediately preceding calendar year. Such report shall include, but shall not be limited to—

"'(1) a certification by the Secretary that foreign plants exporting carcasses or meat or meat products referred to in subsection (a) of this section have complied with requirements at least equal to all the inspection, building construction standards, and all other provisions of this Act and regulations issued thereunder;

"'(2) the names and locations of plants authorized or permitted to have imported into the United States therefrom carcasses or meat or meat products referred to in subsection (a) of this section;

"'(3) the number of inspectors employed by the Department of Agriculture in the calendar year concerned who were assigned to inspect plants referred to in paragraph (e) (2) hereof and the frequency with which each such plant was inspected by such inspectors;

"'(4) the number of inspectors licensed by each country from which any imports subject to the provisions of this section were imported who were assigned, during the calendar year concerned, to inspect such imports and the facilities in which such imports were handled and the frequency and effectiveness of such inspections; and

"'(5) the total volume of carcasses or meat or meat products referred to in subsection (a) of this section which was imported into the United States during the calendar year concerned from each country, including a separate itemization of the volume of each major category of such imports from each country during such year, and a detailed report of rejections of plants and products because of failure to meet appropriate standards prescribed by this Act.'

"SEC. 11. Section 23 of said Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 23. (a) The provisions of this title requiring inspection of the slaughter of animals and the preparation of the carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products at establishments conducting such operations for commerce shall not apply to the slaughtering by any person of animals of his own raising, and the preparation by him and transportation in commerce of the carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products of such animals exclusively for use by him and members of his household and his nonpaying guests and employees; nor to the custom slaughter by any person, firm, or corporation of cattle, sheep, swine or goats delivered by the owner thereof for such slaughter, and the preparation by such slaughterer and transportation in commerce of the carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products of such animals, exclusively for use, in the household of such owner, by him and members of his household and his nonpaying guests and employees: *Provided*, That such custom slaughterer does not engage in the business of buying or selling any carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat or meat food products of any cattle, sheep, swine, goats or equines, capable of use as human food.

"'(b) The Secretary may, under such sanitary conditions as he may by regulations prescribe, exempt from the inspection requirements of this title the slaughter of animals, and the preparation of carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products, by any person, firm, or corporation in any Territory not organized with a legislative body solely for distribution within such Territory when the Secretary determines that it is impracticable to provide such inspection within the limits of funds appropriated for administration of this Act and that such exemption will otherwise facilitate enforcement of this Act. The Secretary may refuse, withdraw, or modify any exemption under this paragraph (b) in his discretion whenever he determines such action is necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

"'(c) The adulteration and misbranding provisions of this title, other than the requirement of the inspection legend, shall apply to articles which are exempted from inspection or not required to be inspected under this section.'

"SEC. 12. Said Act is hereby further amended by:

"(a) deleting the phrase 'cattle, sheep, swine, and goats' and the phrase 'cattle, sheep, swine, or goats' wherever they appear in title I of the Act, and substituting therefor, respectively, the phrase 'cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, and other equines' and the phrase 'cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines';

"(b) in sections 3 and 4 (21 U.S.C. 71, 72), deleting the phrase 'unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food' each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'adulterated';

"(c) in section 4 (21 U.S.C. 72), deleting the phrase 'sound, healthful, wholesome, and fit for human food' and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase 'not adulterated';

"(d) in section 4 (21 U.S.C. 72), deleting the phrase 'unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or in any way unfit for human food' and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'adulterated';

"(e) in section 6 (21 U.S.C. 74), deleting the phrase 'sound, healthful, and wholesome, and which contain no dyes, chemicals, preservatives, or ingredients which render such meat or meat food products unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or unfit for human food' and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase 'not adulterated', and deleting the phrase 'unsound, unhealthful, and unwholesome, or which contain dyes, chemicals, preservatives, or ingredients which render such meat or meat food products unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or unfit for human food' and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'adulterated';

"(f) in section 8 (21 U.S.C. 76), deleting the phrase 'unclean, unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food' and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'adulterated';

"(g) in section 17 (21 U.S.C. 85), deleting the phrase 'or goat meat, being the meat of animals killed after the passage of this Act, or except as hereinbefore provided' and substituting therefor the phrase 'goat or equine meat';

"(h) in section 18 (21 U.S.C. 86), deleting the phrase "sound and wholesome."; and

"(i) in section 21 (21 U.S.C. 89), deleting the phrase 'sound and wholesome.'; and

and fit for human food, and to contain no dyes, chemicals, preservatives, or ingredients which render such meat food product un-

sound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or unfit for human food; and to have been prepared under proper sanitary conditions, hereinbefore provided for' and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase 'not adulterated'.

"SEC. 13. Said Act is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section in title I:

" 'SEC. 24. The Secretary may by regulations prescribe conditions under which carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat, and meat food products of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, capable of use as human food, shall be stored or otherwise handled by any person, firm, or corporation engaged in the business of buying, selling, freezing, storing, or transporting, in or for commerce, or importing, such articles, whenever the Secretary deems such action necessary to assure that such articles will not be adulterated or misbranded when delivered to the consumer. Violation of any such regulation is prohibited. However, such regulations shall not apply to the storage or handling of such articles at any retail store or other establishment in any State or organized Territory that would be subject to this section only because of purchases in commerce, if the storage and handling of such articles at such establishment is regulated under the laws of the State or Territory in which such establishment is located, in a manner which the Secretary, after consultation with the appropriate advisory committee provided for in section 301 of this Act, determines is adequate to effectuate the purposes of this section.'

"SEC. 14. Said Act is hereby further amended by adding after title I thereof, the following new sections as:

" 'TITLE II—MEAT PROCESSORS AND RELATED INDUSTRIES

" 'SEC. 201. Inspection shall not be provided under title I of this Act at any establishment for the slaughter of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, or the preparation of any carcasses or parts or products of such animals, which are not intended for use as human food, but such articles shall, prior to their offer for sale or transportation in commerce, unless naturally inedible by humans, be denatured or otherwise identified as prescribed by regulations of the Secretary to deter their use for human food. No person, firm, or corporation shall buy, sell, transport, or offer for sale or transportation, or receive for transportation, in commerce, or import, any carcasses, parts thereof, meat or meat food products of any such animals, which are not intended for use as human food unless they are denatured or otherwise identified as required by the regulations of the Secretary or are naturally inedible by humans.

" 'SEC. 202. (a) The following classes of persons, firms, and corporations shall keep such records as will fully and correctly disclose all transactions involved in their businesses; and all persons, firms, and corporations subject to such requirements shall, at all reasonable times, upon notice by a duly authorized representative of the Secretary, afford such representative access to their places of business and opportunity to examine the facilities, inventory, and records thereof, to copy all such records, and to take reasonable samples of their inventory upon payment of the fair market value therefor—

" '(1) Any persons, firms, or corporations that engage, for commerce, in the business of slaughtering any cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, or preparing, freezing, packaging, or labeling any carcasses, or parts or products of carcasses, of any such animals, for use as human food or animal food;

" '(2) Any persons, firms, or corporations that engage in the business of buying or selling (as meat brokers, wholesalers or otherwise), or transporting in commerce, or storing in or for commerce, or importing, any carcasses, or parts or products of carcasses, of any such animals;

" '(3) Any persons, firms, or corporations that engage in business, in or for commerce, as renderers, or engage in the business of buying, selling, or transporting, in commerce, or importing, any dead, dying, disabled, or diseased cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, or parts of the carcasses of any such animals that died otherwise than by slaughter.

" '(b) Any record required to be maintained by this section shall be maintained for such period of time as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe.

" 'SEC. 203. No person, firm, or corporation shall engage in business, in or for commerce, as a meat broker, renderer, or animal food manufacturer, or engage in business in commerce as a wholesaler of any carcasses, or parts or products of the carcasses, of any cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, whether intended for human food or other purposes, or engage in business as a public warehouseman storing any such articles in or for commerce, or engage in the business of buying, selling, or transporting in commerce, or importing, any dead, dying, disabled, or diseased animals of the specified kinds, or parts of the carcasses of any such animals that died otherwise than by slaughter, unless, when required by regulations of the Secretary, he has registered with the Secretary his name, and the address of each place of business at which, and all trade names under which, he conducts such business.

" 'SEC. 204. No person, firm, or corporation engaged in the business of buying, selling, or transporting in commerce, or importing, dead, dying, disabled, or diseased animals, or any parts of the carcasses of any animals that died otherwise than by slaughter, shall buy, sell, transport, offer for sale or transportation, or receive for transportation, in commerce, or import, any dead, dying, disabled, or diseased cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules or other equines, or parts of the carcasses of any such animals that died otherwise than by slaughter, unless such transaction, transportation or importation is made in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe to assure that such animals, or the unwholesome parts or products thereof, will be prevented from being used for human food purposes.

" 'SEC. 205. The authority conferred on the Secretary by section 202, 203, or 204 of this title with respect to persons, firms, and corporations engaged in the specified kinds of business in or for commerce may be exercised with respect to persons, firms, or corporations engaged, in any State or organized Territory, in such kinds of business but not in or for commerce, whenever the Secretary determines, after consultation with an appropriate advisory committee provided for in section 301 of this Act, that the State or Territory does not have at least equal authority under its laws or such authority is not exercised in a manner to effectuate the purposes of this Act including the State providing for the Secretary or his representative being afforded access to such places of business and the facilities, inventories, and records thereof, and the taking of reasonable samples, where he determines necessary in carrying out his responsibilities under this Act; and in such case the provisions of section 202, 203, or 204, respectively, shall apply to such persons, firms, and corporations to the same extent and in the same manner as if they were engaged in such business in or for commerce and the transactions involved were in commerce.'

"SEC. 15. Said Act is hereby further amended by adding after title II thereof, the following new section as:

" 'TITLE III—FEDERAL AND STATE COOPERATION

" 'SEC. 301. (a) It is the policy of the Congress to protect the consuming public from meat and meat food products that are adulterated or misbranded and to assist in efforts by State and other Government agencies to accomplish this objective. In furtherance of this policy—

" '(1) The Secretary is authorized, whenever he determines that it would effectuate the purposes of this Act, to cooperate with the appropriate State agency in developing and administering a State meat inspection program in any State which has enacted a State meat inspection law that imposes mandatory ante mortem and post mortem inspection, reinspection and sanitation requirements that are at least equal to those under title I of this Act, with respect to all or certain classes of persons engaged in the State in slaughtering cattle, sheep, swine, goats, or equines, or preparing the carcasses, parts thereof, meat or meat food products, of any such animals for use as human food solely for distribution within such State.

" '(2) The Secretary is further authorized, whenever he determines that it would effectuate the purposes of this Act, to cooperate with appropriate State agencies in developing and administering State programs under State laws containing authorities at least equal to those provided in title II of this Act; and to cooperate with other agencies of the United States in carrying out any provisions of this Act.

" '(3) Cooperation with State agencies under this section may include furnishing to the appropriate State agency (i) advisory assistance in planning and otherwise developing an adequate State program under the State law; and (ii) technical and laboratory assistance and training (including necessary curricular and instructional materials and equipment), and financial and other aid for administration of such a program. The amount to be contributed to any State by the Secretary under this section from Federal funds for any year shall not exceed 50 per centum of the estimated total cost of the cooperative program; and the Federal funds shall be allocated among the States desiring to cooperate on an equitable basis. Such cooperation and payment shall be contingent at all times upon the administration of the State program in a manner which the Secretary, in consultation with the appropriate advisory committee appointed under paragraph (4), deems adequate to effectuate the purposes of this section.

" '(4) The Secretary may appoint advisory committees consisting of such representatives of appropriate State agencies as the Secretary and the State agencies may designate to consult with him concerning State and Federal programs with respect to meat inspection and other matters within the scope of this Act, including evaluating State programs for purposes of this Act and obtaining better coordination and more uniformity among the State programs and between the Federal and State programs and adequate protection of consumers.

" '(b) The appropriate State agency with which the Secretary may cooperate under this Act shall be a single agency in the State which is primarily responsible for the coordination of the State programs having objectives similar to those under this Act. When the State program includes performance of certain functions by a municipality or other subordinate governmental unit, such unit shall be deemed to be a part of the State agency for purposes of this section.

" '(c) (1) If the Secretary has reason to believe, by thirty days prior to the expiration of two years after enactment of the Wholesome Meat Act, that a State has failed to develop or is not enforcing, with respect to all establishments within its jurisdiction (except those that would be exempted from Federal inspection under subparagraph (2)) at which cattle, sheep, swine, goats, or equines are slaughtered, or their carcasses, or parts or products thereof, are prepared for use as human food, solely for distribution within

such State, and the products of such establishments, requirements at least equal to those imposed under titles I and IV of this Act, he shall promptly notify the Governor of the State of this fact. If the Secretary determines, after consultation with the Governor of the State, or representative selected by him, that such requirements have not been developed and activated, he shall promptly after the expiration of such two-year period designate such State as one in which the provisions of titles I and IV of this Act shall apply to operations and transactions wholly within such State: *Provided*, That if the Secretary has reason to believe that the State will activate such requirements within one additional year, he may delay such designation for said period, and not designate the State, if he determines at the end of the year that the State then has such requirements in effective operation. The Secretary shall publish any such designation in the Federal Register and, upon the expiration of thirty days after such publication, the provisions of titles I and IV shall apply to operations and transactions and to persons, firms, and corporations engaged therein in the State to the same extent and in the same manner as if such operations and transactions were conducted in or for commerce. Thereafter, upon request of the Governor, the Secretary shall revoke such designation if the Secretary determines that such State has developed and will enforce requirements at least equal to those imposed under title I and title IV of this Act: *And provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of this section, if the Secretary determines that any establishment within a State is producing adulterated meat or meat food products for distribution within such State which would clearly endanger the public health he shall notify the Governor of the State and the appropriate Advisory Committee provided by section 301 of the Act of such fact for effective action under State or local law. If the State does not take action to prevent such endangering of the public health within a reasonable time after such notice, as determined by the Secretary, in light of the risk to public health, the Secretary may forthwith designate any such establishment as subject to the provisions of titles I and IV of the Act, and thereupon the establishment and operator thereof shall be subject to such provisions as though engaged in commerce until such time as the Secretary determines that such State has developed and will enforce requirements at least equal to those imposed under title I and title IV of this Act.

"'(2) The provisions of this Act requiring inspection of the slaughter of animals and the preparation of carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products shall not apply to operations of types traditionally and usually conducted at retail stores and restaurants, when conducted at any retail store or restaurant or similar retail-type establishment for sale in normal retail quantities or service of such articles to consumers at such establishments if such establishments are subject to such inspection provisions only under this paragraph (c).

"'(3) Whenever the Secretary determines that any State designated under this paragraph (c) has developed and will enforce State meat inspection requirements at least equal to those imposed under titles I and IV, with respect to the operations and transactions within such State which are regulated under subparagraph (1), he shall terminate the designation of such State under this paragraph (c), but this shall not preclude the subsequent redesignation of the State at any time upon thirty days notice to the Governor and publication in the Federal Register in accordance with this paragraph, and any State may be designated upon such notice and publication at any time after the period specified in this paragraph whether or not the State has theretofore been designated upon the Secretary determining that it is not effectively enforcing requirements at least equal to those imposed under titles I and IV.

"'(4) The Secretary shall promptly upon enactment of the Wholesome Meat Act and periodically thereafter, but at least annually, review the requirements, including the enforcement thereof, of the several States not designated under this pargraph (c), with respect to the slaughter, and the preparation, storage, handling and distribution of carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products, of such animals, and inspection of such operations, and annually report thereon to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate in the report required under section 17 of the Wholesome Meat Act.

"'(d) As used in this section, the term "State" means any State (including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) or organized Territory.'

"SEC. 16. Said Act is hereby further amended by adding after title III thereof, the following new sections as:

"'TITLE IV—AUXILIARY PROVISIONS

"'SEC. 401. The Secretary may (for such period, or indefinitely, as he deems necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act) refuse to provide, or withdraw, inspection service under title I of this Act with respect to any establishment if he determines, after opportunity for a hearing is accorded to the applicant for, or recipient of, such service, that such applicant or recipient is unfit to engage in any business requiring inspection under title I because the applicant or recipient, or anyone responsibly connected with the applicant or recipient, has been convicted, in any Federal or State court, of (1) any felony, or (2) more than one violation of any law, other than a felony, based upon the acquiring, handling, or distributing of unwholesome, mislabeled, or deceptively packaged food or upon fraud in connection with transactions in food. This section shall not affect in any way other provisions of this Act for withdrawal of inspection services under title I from establishments failing to maintain sanitary conditions or to destroy condemned carcasses, parts, meat or meat food products.

"'For the purpose of this section a person shall be deemed to be responsibly connected with the business if he was a partner, officer, director, holder, or owner of 10 per centum or more of its voting stock or employee in a managerial or executive capacity.

"'The determination and order of the Secretary with respect thereto under this section shall be final and conclusive unless the affected applicant for, or recipient of, inspection service files application for judicial review within thirty days after the effective date of such order in the appropriate court as provided in section 404. Judicial review of any such order shall be upon the record upon which the determination and order are based.

"'SEC. 402. Whenever any carcass, part of a carcass, meat or meat food product of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, or any product exempted from the definition of a meat food product, or any dead, dying, disabled, or diseased cattle, sheep, swine, goat, or equine is found by any authorized representative of the Secretary upon any premises where it is held for purposes of, or during or after distribution in, commerce or otherwise subject to title I or II of this Act, and there is reason to believe that any such article is adulterated or misbranded and is capable of use as human food, or that it has not been inspected, in violation of the provisions of title I of this Act or of any other Federal law or the laws of any State or Territory, or the District of Columbia, or that such article or animal has been or is intended to be, distributed in violation of any such provisions, it may be detained by such representative for a period not to exceed twenty days, pending action under section 403 of this Act or notification of any Federal, State, or other governmental authorities having jurisdiction over such article or animal, and shall not be moved by any person, firm, or corporation from the place at which it is located when so detained, until released by such representative. All official marks may be required by such representative to be removed from such article or animal before it is released unless it appears to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the article or animal is eligible to retain such marks.

"'SEC. 403. (a) Any carcass, part of a carcass, meat or meat food product of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules or other equines, or any dead, dying, disabled, or diseased cattle, sheep, swine, goat, or equine, that is being transported in commerce or otherwise subject to title I or II of this Act or is held for sale in the United States after such transportation, and that (1) is or has been prepared, sold, transported, or otherwise distributed or offered or received for distribution in violation of this Act, or (2) is capable of use as human food and is adulterated or misbranded, or (3) in any other way is in violation of this Act, shall be liable to be proceeded against and seized and condemned, at any time, on a libel of information in any United States district court or other proper court as provided in section 404 of this Act within the jurisdiction of which the article or animal is found. If the article or animal is condemned it shall, after entry of the decree, be disposed of by destruction or sale as the court may direct and the proceeds, if sold, less the court costs and fees, and storage and other proper expenses, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States, but the article or animal shall not be sold contrary to the provisions of this Act, or the laws of the jurisdiction in which it is sold: *Provided*, That upon the execution and delivery of a good and sufficient bond conditioned that the article or animal shall not be sold or otherwise disposed of contrary to the provisions of this Act, or the laws of the jurisdiction in which disposal is made, the court may direct that such article or animal be delivered to the owner thereof subject to such supervision by authorized representatives of the Secretary as is necessary to insure compliance with the applicable laws. When a decree of condemnation is entered against the article or animal and it is released under bond, or destroyed, court costs and fees, and storage and other proper expenses shall be awarded against the person, if any, intervening as claimant of the article or animal. The proceedings in such libel cases shall conform, as nearly as may be, to the proceedings in admiralty, except that either party may demand trial by jury of any issue of fact joined in any case, and all such proceedings shall be at the suit of and in the name of the United States.

"'(b) The provisions of this section shall in no way derogate from authority for condemnation or seizure conferred by other provisions of this Act, or other laws.

"'SEC. 40. The United States district courts, the District Court of Guam, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, the highest court of American Samoa, and the United States courts of the other Territories, are vested with jurisdiction specifically to enforce, and to prevent and restrain violations of, this Act, and shall have jurisdiction in all other kinds of cases arising under this Act, except as provided in section 7(e) of this Act.

"'SEC. 405. Any person who forcibly assaults, resists, opposes, impedes, intimidates, or interferes with any person while engaged in or on account of the performance of his official duties under this Act shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both. Whoever, in the commission of any such acts, uses a deadly

or dangerous weapon, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both. Whoever kills any person while engaged in or on account of the performance of his official duties under this Act shall be punished as provided under sections 1111 and 1114 of title 18, United States Code.

" 'SEC. 406. (a) Any person, firm, or corporation who violates any provision of this Act for which no other criminal penalty is provided by this Act shall upon conviction be subject to imprisonment for not more than one year, or a fine of not more than $1,000, or both such imprisonment and fine; but if such violation involves intent to defraud, or any distribution or attempted distribution of an article that is adulterated (except as defined in section 1(m)(8) of this Act), such person, firm, or corporation shall be subject to imprisonment for not more than three years or a fine of not more than $10,000, or both: *Provided*, That no person, firm, or corporation, shall be subject to penalties under this section for receiving for transportation any article or animal in violation of this Act if such receipt was made in good faith, unless such person, firm, or corporation refuses to furnish on request of a representative of the Secretary the name and address of the person from whom he received such article or animal, and copies of all documents, if any there be, pertaining to the delivery of the article or animal to him.

" '(b) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as requiring the Secretary to report for prosecution or for the institution of libel or injunction proceedings, minor violations of this Act whenever he believes that the public interest will be adequately served by a suitable written notice of warning.

" 'SEC. 407. For the efficient administration and enforcement of this Act, the provisions (including penalties) of sections 6, 8, 9, and 10 of the Act entitled "An Act to create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes", approved September 26, 1914 (38 Stat. 721–723, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 46, 48, 49, and 50) (except paragraphs (c) through (h) of section 6 and the last paragraph of section 9), and the provisions of subsection 409(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1096, as amended; 47 U.S.C. 409(1)), are made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary in administering and enforcing the provisions of this Act and to any person, firm, or corporation with respect to whom such authority is exercised. The Secretary, in person or by such agents as he may designate, may prosecute any inquiry necessary to his duties under this Act in any part of the United States, and the powers conferred by said sections 9 and 10 of the Act of September 26, 1914, as amended, on the district courts of the United States may be exercised for the purposes of this Act by any court designated in section 404 of this Act.

" 'SEC. 408. Requirements within the scope of this Act with respect to premises, facilities and operations of any establishment at which inspection is provided under title I of this Act, which are in addition to, or different than those made under this Act may not be imposed by any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, except that any such jurisdiction may impose recordkeeping and other requirements within the scope of section 202 of this Act, if consistent therewith, with respect to any such establishment. Marking, labeling, packaging, or ingredient requirements in addition to, or different than, those made under this Act may not be imposed by any State or Territory or the District of Columbia with respect to articles prepared at any establishment under inspection in accordance with the requirements under title I of this Act, but any State or Territory or the District of Columbia may, consistent with the requirements under this Act, exercise concurrent jurisdiction with the Secretary over articles required to be inspected under said title, for the purpose of preventing the distribution for human food purposes of any such articles which are adulterated or misbranded and are outside of such an establishment, or, in the case of imported articles which are not at such an establishment, after their entry into the United States. This Act shall not preclude any State or Territory or the District of Columbia from making requirement or taking other action, consistent with this Act, with respect to any other matters regulated under this Act.

" 'SEC. 409. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, including section 902(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 392(a)), the provisions of this Act shall not derogate from any authority conferred by the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act prior to enactment of the Wholesome Meat Act.

" '(b) The detainer authority conferred by section 402 of this Act shall apply to any authorized representative of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for purposes of the enforcement of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to any carcass, part thereof, meat, or meat food product of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, or equines that is outside any premises at which inspection is being maintained under this Act, and for such purposes the first reference to the Secretary in section 402 shall be deemed to refer to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

" 'SEC. 410. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.'

"SEC. 17. The Secretary shall annually report to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate with respect to the slaughter of animals subject to this Act, and the preparation, storage, handling and distribution of carcasses, parts thereof, meat and meat food products, of such animals, and inspection of establishments operated in connection therewith, including the operations under and effectiveness of this Act.

"SEC. 18. The provisions relating to equine meat and meat food products beginning with the phrase 'And, hereafter,' under the heading 'BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY' and the subheading 'MEAT INSPECTION, BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY:' in the Act approved July 24, 1919, entitled 'An Act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and twenty' (41 Stat. 241; 21 U.S.C. 96), and paragraph (b) of section 306 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 689, as amended; 19 U.S.C. 1306(b)) are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 19. If any provision of this Act or of the amendments made hereby or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and the remaining amendments and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 20. This Act shall become effective upon enactment except as provided in paragraphs (a) through (d):

"(a) The provisions of paragraph (b)(1) and (c) of section 10 and the provisions of section 20 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended by sections 7 and 10 of this Act, and the provisions of section 18 of this Act repealing paragraph (b) of section 306 of the Tariff Act of 1930, shall become effective upon the expiration of sixty days after enactment hereof.

"(b) The provisions of title I of the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended by this Act, shall become effective with respect to equines (other than horses) and their carcasses and parts thereof, meat, and meat food products thereof upon the expiration of sixty days after enactment hereof.

"(c) Section 11 of this Act, amending section 23, of the Federal Meat Inspection Act, shall become effective upon the expiration of sixty days after enactment hereof.

"(d) Section 204 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as added by section 14 of this Act, shall become effective upon the expiration of sixty days after enactment hereof."

And the Senate agree to the same.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,
GRAHAM PURCELL,
PAGE BELCHER,
CHARLES M. TEAGUE,
CATHERINE MAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
GEORGE MCGOVERN,
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
WALTER F. MONDALE,
HARRY F. BYRD, JR.,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
J. CALEB BOGGS,
JACK MILLER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12144) to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The amendment of the Senate struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and substituted language which, except for several typographical and other non-substantive technical corrections, differed from the House bill in seven instances. These differences and their disposition by the Committee of Conference are as follows:

1. The Senate amendment included a new subsection requiring annual reports on the administration of the imported meat provisions of this Act. The House Conferees receded with an amendment clarifying and simplifying reporting requirements related to the handling of imported meat and meat products.

2. The Senate amendment continued a provision in present law which gives the Secretary of Agriculture authority to exempt certain retail butchers and retail dealers from the application of full federal meat inspection. The Senate Conferees receded and this provision was deleted from the conference substitute.

3. The Senate amendment deleted a provision in the bill which would have permitted the Secretary of Agriculture to grant certain exemptions in the District of Columbia and unorganized territories from the application of the Act. The House Conferees receded with an amendment which authorizes these exemptions to be made in unorganized territories, but does not reinstate authority therefor in the District of Columbia.

4. The Senate amendment substituted the term "at least equal" in lieu of the term "comparable" to describe the standards which States must meet in order to qualify for federal assistance under the Act. The House Conferees receded on this provision.

5. The Senate amendment included a provision requiring that the appropriate State law be exercised so as to permit access by the Secretary of Agriculture in order for such law to be considered at least equal to the requirements of Title II of the Federal Meat Inspection Act. The House Conferees receded on this provision. In regard to Title II the Conferees intend to limit the scope of Sec-

tion 202(a) to the keeping and inspection of those records which are properly necessary for effective enforcement of the provisions of the Act in order to insure against adulterated or misbranded meat products for the American consumer, upon such reasonable terms and conditions as are spelled out by regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture.

6. The Senate amendment provided for the extension of federal inspection to all intrastate operations under three circumstances: *First*, upon request of a governor who waived the application of State law in order to permit immediate federal inspection; *Second*, upon a finding that the State has not, within a prescribed period of time (no later than three years from the date of enactment of this legislation) developed an inspection system at least equal to the federal system; and *Third*, if the Secretary finds any plant is distributing adulterated products dangerous to the public health. The House Conferees receded with an amendment deleting the authority of a governor to request federal inspection by the waiver of State law.

The Conferees do not intend that the deletion of this provision shall interfere with the power of any governor or the Secretary of Agriculture to act quickly and effectively to prevent the sale or distribution of unsafe or unwholesome meat or meat products.

7. The Senate amendment required more detailed reports concerning the operation and administration of the Act to be submitted annually to the Committee on Agriculture of the House and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate. The House Conferees receded on this provision.

It is also the intention of the Conferees that in any State which has enacted a meat inspection program and is enforcing requirements at least equal to those under titles I and IV of this Act, that those intrastate plants regulated under such a State program shall be entitled to participate in bidding on Federal contracts for meat supplies.

In order to clarify the application of federal building standards under this legislation, the Chairman of the Committee of Conference requested and received the following letter from the Department of Agriculture:

"Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

"DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: This letter is written in response to your request made at the meeting of the conferees on H.R. 12144 for information regarding plant construction requirements in connection with the Federal Meat Inspection Program.

"The eligibility of an establishment for inspection under the Federal Meat Inspection Program is based upon a combined evaluation of the operating procedures used by the establishment and the building construction and physical facilities rather than upon a separate evaluation of these factors. As a result of many requests a guide to plant construction and equipment has been put together for use by industry operators, architects, engineers, and other Government officials (foreign and domestic) interested in the sanitary handling of products within an establishment. The guide is a collection of recommended minimum standards. However, a great variety of arrangements, building materials, and equipment have been considered acceptable so long as they lend themself to the production under sanitary conditions of clean wholesome product.

"The only mandatory construction requirements are set forth in general terms in the regulations. These requirements relate directly to maintenance of sanitary conditions for the production of wholesome meat. For example, 'The floors, walls, ceilings, partitions, posts, doors, and other parts of all structures shall be of such materials, construction, and finish as will make them susceptible of being readily and thoroughly cleaned.'

"The Secretary has responsibility under the statutory authority to insure that meat and meat food products are produced under sanitary conditions which will result in the production of wholesome food. Therefore, the only building construction or equipment requirements mandatorily prescribed under or contemplated by the statute are such as are necessary to insure sanitary conditions in the light of operating procedures which are to be used in the establishment.

"Sincerely yours,

"RODNEY LEONARD,
"Deputy Assistant Secretary."

THOMAS S. FOLEY,
GRAHAM PURCELL,
PAGE BELCHER,
CHARLES M. TEAGUE,
CATHERINE MAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12144) to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to this unanimous-consent request because of the serious concern which has been expressed over the provisions of the Senate version of this bill by the commissioner of agriculture of the State of Georgia. During the period of consideration of this legislation the commissioner of agriculture of the State of Georgia, who is the director and supervisor of a very competent State meat inspection system, has run into a situation which has involved a number of threats from personnel of the U.S. Department of Agriculture if he continued his opposition to the substitute for the House-passed bill.

During the time which may be available in the discussion of the conference report, I request that the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture make available to me a few minutes in order to make the record clear on certain points.

Mr. POAGE. I will be glad to give the gentleman from Georgia time.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, today I find myself in the same position which I occupied when we sent this bill to conference. I have no desire to interfere with or delay consideration of the bill. I full well recognize the very proper desire of every Member of this House to secure and maintain the very best possible meat inspection program for the United States. I join in that desire. The conference report which our committee brings you is intended to achieve that result. I hope it will.

This report is signed by all of the conferees on the part of the Senate and all but two of the conferees on the part of the House. I am one of those two. Our failure to sign this report does not indicate that we are opposed to clean meat. I repeat, we are all agreed on the objectives. Nor does it indicate that we are in anywise critical of our colleagues who did sign the report. We believe that they were sincere in their views. We feel that we are sincere in ours. I expect this report will be adopted, and I hope that it functions better than I anticipate. I shall shortly call on the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL], to explain the details of the conference agreement.

Before you pass upon the report, I ask your indulgence while I outline my reasons for voting against the report. Those reasons are based upon two premises. The first is philosophical. I am old enough to remember when there was in practice, as well as in theory, such a thing as intrastate commerce. Commerce has changed somewhat since I was a boy, but the decisions of our courts have changed much more. I realize that there is today a widespread feeling that if a certain action is thought to be needed and if the States are not meeting that need that the Federal Government should step in and fill the need.

I think it is perfectly clear that in the final analysis, the only justification for this philosophy is the belief that if the objective is good, the ends always justify the means. But Mr. Speaker, this is not my philosophy. I believe that our form of government is the greatest ever devised by man. I do not believe that we should pervert it no matter how laudable our immediate objective may be.

In the second place, I think as a practical matter that the bill passed by this House would be far more likely to secure better and more effective meat inspection than the bill agreed upon by the conference committee, which is in essence the Senate bill. I learned a long time ago, Mr. Speaker, that to enforce legislation, you need the support of at least a substantial segment of the population, particularly of the people affected by the regulations. I am old enough to have observed the difficulties attendant on the attempted enforcement of prohibition. This experience compels me to point out that the subcommittee so ably directed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] with the support of the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] and of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] and other Members had by many months of hard work secured a rather broad consensus of agreement and support, which is totally lacking in regard to the measure on which you will soon vote. For instance, the House bill had the endorsement of all of the major livestock producers' associa-

tions. It had the support and the pledged cooperation of all of the major packing associations; it had the endorsement of the commissioners of agriculture clear across the Union; and it had the endorsement of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. These are the people whose cooperation is so essential to the successful enforcement of any kind of inspection.

Of all of these groups, the conference report seems to have the support of only the Federal Department of Agriculture and a part of the meatpackers. Is it not reasonable to assume that it would help—not hurt—to have the support of the State commissioners? But the Senate bill and the conference report substitutes for this cooperation the stark power of the Federal courts to impose penalties. The House bill, which I supported, relied primarily on the carrot, the Senate bill—that is, the conference report relies primarily on the stick.

The House bill presented a very attractive cooperative program, one which few, if any, States could have afforded to reject. The conference report ignores this concensus and puts a black snake in the hand of the Secretary and says to the States: "Stand back. If you are good, we are in time going to give you a carrot, but Simon Legree is going to stand over you while you eat it." I anticipate that many of the proud and self-reliant States of this Union will refuse to eat the carrot under those circumstances. As a result, you are probably not going to eat as good meat as you might have eaten under the terms of the House bill.

I recognize that I may well be branded as an enemy of society, but I think in the long run society will be best served by the use of a program calculated to get cooperation, and that my Government will be best served by protecting its dual character.

I do not ask any Member to join me in what I recognize as probably a hopeless quest, but as for me, I shall respectfully and as unobtrusively as I can vote "no."

I will yield now, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] and ask that he be allowed to control the time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, if I have the time, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman, he will not be alone in his "no" vote. I think the gentleman is to be commended for his constitutionally correct statement.

Personally, I am repelled to think that the Federal Government has the right to regulate a wholly intrastate activity.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER].

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from California, who spoke just a minute ago, when he jumped up and agreed with the plaintiff, that is just exactly what I used to do when I was a clerk of the court. I would hear the plaintiff give his opening statement, and I would think the plaintiff certainly had a case here, and I would not understand even why the defendant was coming into court. Then I would hear the defendant, and I would wonder why the plaintiff ever filed the suit in the first place. I would say to my friend, if he will sit down and listen to the defendant's side of the case for the same length of time he listened to the plaintiff, then I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think my record of 17 years in the House would brand me as either a liberal or a strong central government man or a man against States rights. At the same time, I feel that the citizens of the United States have a dual citizenship—they are citizens of the State and they also are American citizens. I think both governments have responsibilities to their citizens. I think the Federal Government has a responsibility to protect the lives and the health of citizens of America, even if they happen also to be citizens of Texas or Oklahoma or some other State.

In regard to this present instance, this does not take away the right of any State. Any State within the next 2 years can pass and inaugurate a meat inspection system that is equal to the Federal standards, and the Federal Government will pay half of the bill, and will cooperate with the State in the accepting of the responsibility to the citizens of the State and the American citizens who happen to be citizens of the State.

The States rights also entail States responsibilities. If the State does not care enough about the citizens of that State to have a meat inspection bill, even though they can get the Federal Government to pay half of the bill, and if the Governor and the legislature of the State absolutely sit still, I do not believe as a Federal legislator, I am discharging my duty as a Federal legislator if I say to the citizens of Texas: "Your legislature and your Governor will not protect you from contaminated insanitary meat." I do not believe as a Federal legislator that I can then say to the people of Texas: "You just live in the wrong State. If you lived in another State, a State that did care about its citizens, then you would be protected."

As a Federal legislator, I am responsible for the American citizens who live in that State of Texas, and I think I have a responsibility to protect their health, if the State of Texas will not protect the health of its citizens. If there were no American citizens living in the State of Texas, then I would say the Governor of Texas and the State of Texas could do as they pleased with the citizens of Texas. But there are American citizens who live there, and as a Federal legislator, I feel a responsibility to protect them from contaminated meat. Contaminated meat can kill as quickly as a bullet, if it has the right kind of contamination.

Therefore, in the first place, I do not believe that in this conference report we are taking away any rights the State has.

The State, under the conference report, will have the right to have inspection. It even will have the right to require the Federal Government to pay half of its own inspection cost.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Within the past year, in my part of the State of Michigan, we have had a number of serious meat scandals, even under good State legislation. Those accused were prosecuted, both individuals and corporations. Under the State law a number of convictions were achieved.

I believe we have an excellent State law. As I indicated, when violations of law did occur, convictions were obtained.

Under the conference report, can the State of Michigan continue its program and can it qualify for 50-percent funding by the Federal Government?

Mr. BELCHER. The fact of the matter is that we invite the State of Michigan and the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, or Nebraska to do the same thing that Michigan did, and the Federal Government will pay half of the bill.

I hope—and I believe all the conferees hope—every State will take over the responsibility, together with the Federal Government, of protecting the people. Most certainly, the only requirement at all is that the meat inspection should be equal to the standards set forth by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In checking those requirements, I do not believe they are unusual requirements.

I feel that anyone who eats a piece of meat would like to have it at least treated in as sanitary a manner as the U.S. Department of Agriculture would treat it.

Last night I ate a piece of beef. On the menu, right at the bottom, was the statement:

We do not serve any meat that does not have the USDA inspection stamp on it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I want to compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma, the members of the Committee on Agriculture on the House side both on the majority and minority sides, and particularly the conferees, who I believe have taken the vehicle we passed in this body and combined it with the proposal which was approved in the other body and ended up with very constructive legislation.

I particularly wish to compliment the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY], who over a long period of time has had a great interest in good meat inspection legislation and even though being the victim of some severe and undeserved criticism has steadfastly worked for strong consumer protection. She served with distinction on the National Commission on Food Marketing, and that Commission has had an interest in this particular problem. As the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains of the House Committee on Agriculture, she also has had an interest in this problem and she was particularly constructive in helping to bring this kind of legislation to the floor of the House for considera-

tion. As one of the original authors of this improved meat inspection legislation she has also been in the vanguard of those seeking to protect the American consumer.

I compliment the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] and the other Members of the Committee on Agriculture for doing a fine job and while I have some question as to how the Secretary of Agriculture will exercise his authority to apply Federal inspection to intrastate plants. I believe this is a good conference report.

Mr. BELCHER. I thank the gentleman.

I want to answer one thing my good chairman said. I agree with 90 percent of what my chairman said. I am just as adverse to a lot of the Supreme Court decisions which have destroyed the rights of individual States as he is. My conservative voting record, I believe, is as good as that of anyone else in the House.

The bill which passed the House, which was such a good bill that the chairman says he could put his complete stamp of approval on it—but he could not put it on this conference report—had Senate amendments. The most objectionable part of the Senate amendments was that amendment by the Senate which provided that a State Governor could just turn over to the Federal Government, and dump into the lap of the U.S. Department of Agriculture any day after the President signed the bill, the whole problem, and let the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Federal Government pay the entire bill. That part of the Senate amendments was eliminated. The rest of the Senate amendments, certainly, in my opinion, do not make this a bad bill.

I want to say, and I am going to say this with all the sincerity that I possess, if you vote against this bill and somebody dies of ptomaine poisoning and you try to explain the reason why you did not provide a clean meat bill was because of some of the Senate amendments, then you are not going to have any place to hang your hat on those Senate amendments, because they are not that bad.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

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

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

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned the fact that in certain States there may be exemptions from inspection and that you want to protect the citizens in those particular States. I am sure the conferees took into account the fact that in this country there is a great pitch going on now to travel America. This man who eats the meat at a noninspected area, this intrastate meat, might well be a man from North Carolina, Oklahoma, or some other State who is passing through and is not aware of the fact that it is not inspected. Is that not correct?

Mr. BELCHER. That is correct. I think he ought to be able to travel any place in the United States and buy a steak without thinking that he might get contaminated because the Governor or the State legislature of that State did not think enough of protecting the health of their own citizens to pass an inspection law.

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

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman who already decided the case for the plaintiff.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to say that I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Oklahoma for his work on the committee. I know he is a pretty fair country lawyer, too. I have had enough private conversation with the gentleman to know that he does not believe this Federal Government has plenary power to do all that it thinks is necessary. Yet I feel the essence of the gentleman's remarks is such that I do not subscribe to his point of view, and I am sorry that the gentleman does have them in this case. I think he succinctly stated the case when he stated a few moments ago that if someone dies, you will have difficulty in explaining your vote on this bill. I agree that you may have, but nevertheless he is wrong.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. BELCHER. I hope that if the gentleman ever gets in a tough position, he does not ask me to help to defend him against his vote against a clean meat bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say in passing I do not care how you vote on this bill. I have never tried to represent the conscience of any of the Members of this House of Representatives. In all sincerity I feel that I have a duty and a responsibility after having lived with this bill for many, many months in the full committee and on the floor of the House and as a member of the conferees, in reading the testimony and in conferring with packers, cattlemen, consumers, and Secretaries of Agriculture and everybody else—I owe a duty and responsibility to my colleagues to come before them and tell them what this bill is all about, what it is and what my viewpoint on it is. However, from there on out it is your own conscience, and any way you vote is going to be perfectly all right with me.

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

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

Mr. DOLE. I wonder if the gentleman will tell us the approximate cost of and how many Federal employees might be employed if this legislation is enacted.

Mr. BELCHER. If the States do their duty, there will be no more Federal employees. If the States do not do their duty, I am willing, even though I am a rank conservative, to hire an inspector to protect the citizens of Kansas or the citizens of Oklahoma, or any other State.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I arise in opposition to the conference report. We are all in favor of laws which would provide for strong protection of the American public from unwholesome or unsanitary meat.

While the Federal Meat Inspection Act undoubtedly needs some revision, it is my opinion that this proposed legislation has far reaching objectives whose ultimate motives need clarification.

I am worried that the conference report on intrastate meat inspection has gone too far. I think this bill in its present form would lead to Federal domination and ultimately to an elimination of State and municipal meat inspection systems.

Under the conference report, it will also be impossible to estimate the cost of this legislation. It is my opinion that under the changes made to the Purcell bill, that the incentive for the individual States to support their own meat inspection programs will be substantially lowered. I do know that there will be an additional cost to the Government of millions of dollars.

While I favored the Purcell bill, I cannot vote for the conference report making substantial changes leading to a Federal takeover when my own State of Mississippi has already taken positive action on the matter with the enactment of: "The Animal and Poultry Byproducts Disposal Act of 1964."

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the conference report.

While the conference report on the meat inspection bill is not as strong as the bill I cosponsored with Congressmen SMITH and FOLEY, I am satisfied that it goes a long way in affording protection to the consumer, who has in the past been duped in the purchase of what he believed to be meat fit for human consumption.

The good effect of this bill will not stop at the consumer level—the farmer's market will be sizably enhanced by the fact that consumers will now be buying good meat, not meat mixed with foreign material.

Even though the States are given a maximum of 3 years to meet Federal standards on their meat processing, it is my belief that there will be considerably less violation of proper processing practices in the meat industry. The consumer is further protected during this interim period by the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture will have the authority to inspect intrastate plants and proper action may be taken when it is apparent that public health is threatened when the States themselves have failed to act.

It is appalling to me to read what has been going into some of our processed meat products, contaminated meat, meat from sick animals, horsemeat, chopped hides, carcass portions, animal entrails, artificial coloring, and what have you.

It came as a surprise to me when I heard that even in the District of Columbia, unfit meat and meat products have been sold and served.

My own State of Ohio has recently

passed a law imposing mandatory meat inspection requirements and there are inspection programs being conducted in several areas of the State by the municipalities. The city of Cleveland presently has a meat inspection system located in the department of public health and welfare. I understand that there are three plants in the city which have qualified to receive the Federal grading service.

Again I urge support of the report.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] for yielding to me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I support the conference committee report on the Wholesome Meat Act, and I am hopeful that my colleagues in the House of Representatives will do the same.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the conference committee have reached an agreement which, if endorsed by the House and the other body, will result in stronger, more effective and more uniform meat inspection programs in all States that do not have meat inspection systems at least equal to the Federal program.

Last week we recommended that the House go to conference on this bill, and we pointed out the fact that the other body had made several changes in the House-passed measure.

One of the changes caused a great deal of concern. It involved providing for the extension of Federal inspection to intrastate operations in any State, upon request of the Governor thereof. This would have, in effect, penalized the responsible States and rewarded those which wish to abdicate their responsibility. So, Mr. Speaker, because of this and other questions concerning the changes made by the other body, the Members of the House will recall that the House sent its Members to the conference uninstructed with the understanding that we would fully discuss these changes and their implications and attempt to arrive at a satisfactory agreement.

Mr. Speaker, our conferees met upon two separate occasions and went over the amendments, point by point. As has already been noted, the conferees of the other body receded upon two points:

First, the Governor's provision which I just mentioned, and second, a provision which would have extended the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to exempt retail butchers and retail dealers from the inspection requirements of the act.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the conferees of the other body agreed to some clarifying changes in the language of the Hruska amendment relating to imported meat. The other changes which were made by the other body were accepted by the House conferees, and the result is the bill which we bring before you today.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the agreement reached by the House and Senate conferees is a good one and I am sure that in view of the overwhelming support which the House has already given to the bill which has been introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL], there can be no question about supporting the decision of the conference committee.

The additional provisions adopted by the other body, and agreed to by the conference committee, includes a stick as well as a carrot, and will give additional assurance that our Nation's meat inspection services will be strengthened and improved.

Mr. Speaker, under this bill, the States will be encouraged, as well as firmly guided, toward the enactment and enforcement of meat inspection laws, at least equal to the high standards required under the Federal inspection system.

Mr. Speaker, this measure will provide an instrument through which every meat plant in the United States, large or small, will be required to live up to standards which will insure that not even 1 pound of dirty or unwholesome meat will find its way into an American kitchen.

After working for quite a number of years to get our meat inspection systems updated, it is most gratifying to me to see this legislation well upon its way toward enactment into law.

This is a major victory for all Americans and will serve to inspire even greater confidence in the purity and wholesomeness of our Nation's meat supply.

I might say that while my own State of Washington has an excellent meat inspection system, I intend to continue working with my State to make sure our program is completely adequate in every respect, and I would hope that my colleagues in this House would offer the same type of cooperation and encouragement to their States where they know that needed changes should be made.

Mr. Speaker, before I end my remarks I certainly would be remiss if I did not pay respect to the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] with whom I have worked over these many months. We found it to be a very complicated, difficult, and controversial matter to write a bill that provided good consumer protection through a balanced Federal-State arrangement which protected the innocent and punished the guilty.

I feel the Purcell bill in its final form did this and I am proud to have played a part in its creation.

I also wish to thank the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], for his great fairness and certainly his statesmanlike approach to this whole matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, I urge my colleagues to give their approval to the conference report, and in so doing place their seal of final endorsement on this highly significant and important legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I will take only a very few minutes to try to perhaps add to some of the explanations that have already been made by previous speakers.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss in my duty—and I did not comment on the fact that, in my judgment, in this piece of legislation we have seen the most cooperative effort on the part of the minority Members and, I believe, the majority Members toward any piece of legislation that it has been my privilege to work on during the time that I have been in Congress.

I want to pay particular tribute to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], who made his statement a moment ago. I believe the Members who want to vote for this bill, like I do, will agree with me that I am glad Mr. POAGE is not really opposed to this bill, because his explanation of it is rather definitive, and I appreciate the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the chairman of the Agriculture Committee is not really opposed to the bill.

Then I would like to say that the ranking minority member of the committee the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER], has made an unusually significant contribution to this bill.

The gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] has worked endlessly and with complete objectivity on this bill. Also our colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY], has taken a deep interest in this legislation, and is as sincere about it as a man can be.

I further want to say that my dear friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH]—whom I have not agreed with throughout many aspects of this procedure—has devoted himself and his interest to this, and I believe has maintained a very high degree of objectivity in his dealings.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, we have before us today a piece of legislation that has genuinely been the handiwork of both parties, and of people from all parts of our country. In my opinion it is a reassurance to the American people that we do have the finest meat inspection law in the world. We have had a strong law all of the time, but the additions that the House has made, and which I do not believe were detracted from on the part of the additions made by the other body, have made this as nearly a fool-proof piece of legislation as can possibly be made from the standpoint of cleanliness and wholesomeness of American meat as we could have asked for.

As you know, this conference report, which I hope will be adopted here today, represents a pinnacle of efforts by the Congress to update and strengthen our present national meat inspection system. I would merely be duplicating previous disclosures to attempt to catalog the many different problems and room for unwholesomeness that exist in our present national system of meat inspection. Unsanitary conditions, filthy plants, both

large and small, and in short, a system of consumer protection that does not achieve its primary purpose of insuring safe meat to the American homemaker, all are found in our present system.

Mr. Speaker, as you will recall, the bill passed by the House of Representatives—by a vote of 403 to 1—accomplished three major purposes:

First, it would broaden the present meat inspection program by establishing a Federal-State cooperative meat inspection arrangement under which the Federal Government would provide both personnel and financial assistance to State agencies in order to improve the quality of State meat inspection services.

Second, it would rewrite and modernize present meat inspection statutes as a single Federal Meat Inspection Act designed to provide the appropriate means for achieving the purposes of the program.

Third, it would give the Department of Agriculture new legislative authority to eliminate numerous opportunities now present to defraud consumers and endanger the public health.

This legislation which the House of Representatives saw fit to adopt by an overwhelming majority was good and sound legislation, and carefully examined. However, I think the amendments added by the other body resulted in an even greater strengthening of the provisions of the House bill. In addition to minor changes of a technical nature having no substantive effect on the provisions of the House-passed bill, there are four major changes that were added by the other body which are substantive in nature and deserve summarizing.

First, there was inserted a provision to require annual reports on the administration of the imported meat provisions of the act to be made to the House Committee on Agriculture and its counterpart in the other body. The report will include a certification by the Secretary that foreign countries exporting carcasses, meat, or meat products, have complied with the high standards that we expect for our domestic meat and meat products.

In addition, this provision provides for detailed reporting of the total volume of meat imported from each country and the number of inspectors assigned both by the Department of Agriculture and the country from which the meat is being imported who are engaged in enforcing the provisions of this act.

Second, the other body in defining the system of meat inspection that a State must enact in order to be eligible for Federal cooperative assistance given under title III of the House bill provided that the State meat inspection system must be "at least equal to" instead of "comparable" as contained in the bill passed by the House of Representatives. This makes it perfectly clear that we expect the strongest requirements from the States and, in fact, gives them clear-cut authority to enact stronger standards than the Federal inspection system, and still be eligible for Federal assistance under title III of the bill.

Third, and in my opinion most important, was the amendment to provide authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to designate a State as being subject to Federal meat inspection for intrastate plants should the State delay in moving towards an adequate meat inspection program beyond 2 years. This is tempered by an additional provision providing that if the State is taking substantial steps toward enacting a strong meat inspection program to protect its own consumers, the Secretary of Agriculture may, within his discretion, give the State an additional year to achieve its goal.

Additionally, authority is given the Secretary to identify intrastate plants whose operation procedures or production result in an unsanitary or unwholesome situation and to call the existence of this plant to the attention of the State Governor. Should the State choose not to act within a reasonable time thereafter to police this plant, the Department of Agriculture itself is authorized to take appropriate steps to insure that unhealthful products are not being allowed from this installation.

Mr. Speaker, of course, these are not all of the changes that the other body attempted to make to our bill. However, I am happy to say that these are the only ones which the conferees agreed to being worthy of the strong bill originally passed by the House. It cannot be denied that the American consumer is entitled to the strongest possible protection in this area, nor can it be denied that there must be a quality of reasonableness inserted in our regulations so as not to create a great hardship on a vital segment of our domestic industry. The provisions which the conferees were willing to accept which were added by the other body do not, in my opinion, decrease the effectiveness of the House-passed bill. Quite the contrary, I think they add to the provisions which the House saw fit to include in our bill. The provisions providing for reporting of foreign meat imported into this Nation along with the certification by the Secretary that this meat is wholesome and has been produced in compliance with the provisions of this bill insure that meat being imported from other countries meets the same high standards as that produced here in the United States. There is no element of unfairness to another nation in this requirement, merely the logical expectation that those nations which would export meat and meat products to the United States must meet our high standards.

The amendment which would provide the States 2 years to enact an adequate meat inspection program or, at the grace of the Secretary, 3 years is logical. States are preserved their freedom of choice and their right to control those domestic industries within their borders as in the House-passed bill, but the safety of the American consumer is recognized as an overriding factor which is taken into account. When weighing the provisions before us, it cannot be denied that not one of us here would feel we had done our job adequately unless we could insure that there will be safe regulations put into effect for intrastate meat production. This area presently comprises approximately 15 percent of our present overall domestic meat production and needs regulation in some form to provide the necessary protection to the American consumer.

Three corollary problems deserve mention here, regarding interpretation of the efforts on this bill to date:

First. The conference report notes that it is the intention of the conferees that in any State which has enacted a meat inspection program qualifying for assistance under title III of this bill, that those intrastate industries regulated under such a State program shall be entitled to participate in bidding on Federal contracts for meat supplies.

Second. I also wish to take this opportunity to comment on the recordkeeping and inspection provisions in section 14 of the bill. As introduced and reported favorably by the Committee on Agriculture of this House, section 14 of H.R. 12144 contained a provision for recordkeeping by the regulated industry, as well as a provision authorizing the inspection of the facilities and records of regulated industry members by representatives of the Department of Agriculture.

As reported by the committee, section 14 of H.R. 12144 would have added section 202(a) to the Meat Inspection Act, requiring that the classes of persons and organizations specified by the bill "keep such records as will fully and correctly disclose all transactions involved in their businesses."

The broad class of business firms subject to this requirement was described in the following language:

> Any persons, firms, or corporations that engage, for commerce, in the business of slaughtering any cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, or preparing, freezing, packaging, or labeling any carcasses, or parts or products of carcasses, of any such animals, for use as human food or animal food.

Furthermore, the bill defined the term "prepared" as "slaughtered, canned, salted, rendered, boned, cut up, or otherwise manufactured or processed."

This provision was debated extensively in the course of the consideration by the Senate of the Senate bill, as reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with particular reference to the problems outlined in a letter by the Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., to Senator ELLENDER, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, dated November 20, 1967.

As the sponsor of H.R. 12144, I wish to take this occasion to join in the clarification of the intended scope and objective of section 202(a) with respect to recordkeeping and record inspection, in line with the colloquy between Senator HRUSKA and Senator MONTOYA in the course of the Senate debates of November 27.

There was no intention on the part of the sponsors of H.R. 12144 to require the keeping of records by the regulated industry, or to authorize inspection by representatives of the Secretary of Agriculture, beyond those records applicable to meat and meat products which were properly necessary for the effective en-

forcement of the provisions of the bill to insure wholesome meat and meat products for the American consumer.

I agree with and join in the statement of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue regulations setting forth specifically what records shall be kept and under what circumstances they are to be made available to duly authorized representatives of the Secretary, and to define in such regulations, after notice and hearings, the reasonable terms and conditions whereby such inspections may be made in conformance with applicable constitutional requirements.

Third. I would like to emphasize that those of us who have considered the important subject of improved consumer protection through expanded meat plant inspection realize that this involves additional Government costs. We are giving the Department of Agriculture a larger job to do. In the bill we are considering we have built in some concepts that should lead to qualitative as well as quantitative approach to this job. Protection of the consumer is the objective, not just maintaining inspectors. I urge the Department to review its program in order to distinguish between areas where its resources and personnel are required to achieve the objective and where the inspection may duplicate that already performed once or twice as in those areas where there is sufficient coverage by the Food and Drug Administration by their inspection procedures. I am hopeful that the Department will review its present operations and systems and come to the Appropriation Committee next year with the advantage of having examined where it can strengthen its work by judicious allocation of its resources to get the most real protection per dollar.

Fourth. It is further the intention of the conferees that appropriations for both Federal and State funds are not to be collected by "user" fees. A system providing for general appropriation in this area is much more sound and much more justifiable. Moreover, it will not result in an inordinate burden being placed on the American housewife for the protection she is entitled to have.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the part of the House were all knowledgeable of the problems involved in this critical area of consumer protection. Although I am certainly prejudiced, I feel they were much more knowledgeable than those critics outside of the Congress who attempted to use the spectacle of unsafe meat for their own selfish ends. All of us here today without question want the best possible protection for Americans. This was the attitude of your conferees. The conferees neither agreed to every amendment made by the other body, nor did they accept them. The provisions which are recommended are the ones which, in my estimation, provide the most logical additions to this bill and are entirely consistent with the goals we are attempting to reach with a system of national meat inspection. Accordingly, I sincerely urge the adoption by the House of Representatives of the conference report.

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

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

Mr. KYL. I would like to ask the subcommittee chairman to expand a bit on the matter of the fifth amendment which is listed in the sheets prepared by the conference. In line 2, under the fifth sequence, it says that the Federal Government will be permitted access.

Let us see if we understand this.

The States have 2 years—and if they are trying, an additional year—to bring their State laws to the standards of the Federal act. But in the meantime and immediately upon the passage of this act, and its being signed into law, the Secretary has the right to send inspectors to any intrastate plant to determine if there is a violation of good standards; is that correct at that point?

Mr. PURCELL. Yes; that would be correct.

Mr. KYL. If the Secretary or the inspector who is working under the Secretary goes to a plant which is acting completely intrastate in its commerce and finds there are some matters of sanitation that must be improved according to his judgment, what is the recourse—what happens to this plant that he is inspecting? Does he have the authority to stop the operation temporarily or permanently? What is his choice there?

Mr. PURCELL. My understanding is that the Secretary would only have authority first to call this to the attention of the plant and to the State officials and then if after a reasonable length of time curative or corrective action has not been taken, then the Secretary has the authority to use Federal inspections and standards for them.

I will be glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] if she would care to elaborate on that.

Mrs. MAY. I believe that the part which the gentleman from Iowa is referring to is in title II where Senate language has been added, which requires that the State include in their law provision for permission for the Secretary or his representative to have access to such place of business.

I am now reading from the wording "and the facilities, inventories and records thereof and the taking of reasonable samples where he determines it is necessary in carrying out these responsibilities under the act."

This refers to that portion of the bill which says that if the Secretary of Agriculture finds that any plant is distributing adulterated products dangerous to the public health, he shall be given permission to move in—in the first place he has, of course, to report it to the State—and if nothing is done, then he may move in so that the public health may be protected. But in an attempt to establish this there has to be within the State laws this express permission for him or his representatives to come in and make a check of samples where they have great suspicion that deleterious materials may be present in the meat.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. In those cases where an intrastate plant today uses Federal meat grading standards, even though he is not under Federal inspection generally, which means that a Federal inspector does periodically inspect the sanitation of the plant, would additional authority even under the State law be necessary for the Federal inspector to proceed beyond that point of the routine inspection that he makes for grading and labeling?

Mr. PURCELL. My understanding is that it would not.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAMPLER. I notice in section 2 of the statement of the managers on the part of the House that the Senate receded from the authority to exempt certain retail activities and retailer dealers from the application of the full Federal meat inspection.

My question is this: What was the intent of the conferees with regard to the treatment of building standards? Many of the small processors are operating now under Federal exemption certificates. Was it their intent to put stronger controls on them, or what was their intention?

Mr. PURCELL. Will the gentleman repeat the question?

Mr. WAMPLER. It is my understanding that there are some 540-odd establishments operating under Federal certificates of exemption today. The language in the bill of the other body provided for exemptions. It is my understanding that in the conference that language was deleted. My question is this: What was the intent of the conferees in regard to these establishments that are operating under retail exemption certificates?

Mr. PURCELL. For an answer to that question, I would again yield to the gentlewoman from Washington, for she has a letter from the Department on that subject.

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

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentlewomen from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. The gentleman will recall that in the House bill we established that further exemptions that are now in the statutory authority of the Secretary shall not continue. It would have to be redetermined.

Then the Senate acted under the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa, Mr. MILLER, to ask that these exemptions on retail certifications be retained. When the conferees were in disagreement on this question, the Department of Agriculture was asked to express its policy, now and in the future, as to what they intended to do about these present exemptions. In response to our questions, the Department of Agriculture sent a letter to the conferees. It was read to the Senator from Iowa, Mr. MILLER, who had offered the amendment. In a moment I shall be glad to show to the gentleman that letter in full. In that

letter it is pointed out that the stated policy of the Department of Agriculture is to phase out all authority for retail exemption certificates which is still discretionary with the Secretary.

In other words, there are some 500 plants operating under these exemptions. The Secretary has stated that he intends to phase-out these exemptions in a matter of, I suppose, the next few months. These exemptions are gradually being reduced. Therefore, there was no reason for retaining the exemptions under the announced stated policy of the Secretary. That is why the Senate conferees receded on this point.

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

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WAMPLER. It would certainly be my hope that these establishments that are now operating under Federal exemption certificates would be given a reasonable time to comply with whatever requirement might be placed upon them. It seems to me, from my recollection of the evidence before the committee, that there was little or no evidence that these establishments were responsible for placing into the market unwholesome meat for human consumption. But, on the contrary, many of them were reputable dealers. I certainly hope that the Department will use prudence as they apply the standards of this bill and not work undue hardship on these establishments.

Mr. PURCELL. I can say to the gentleman that under this bill they would be given a reasonable time to comply with the requirements.

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

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. There is a question that arises as to what might happen to some of the little packers that do not have proper buildings and facilities. It is feared that they might be put out of business by rigid requirements on the part of the Federal Government. The fact of the matter is that a small packer called me and said that he did not have any objection to conducting a completely sanitary plant, but that one of the requirements made by the Department of Agriculture was that he had to have rails 11 feet above the floor. In order to comply with that requirement he would have to completely rebuild his plant. In doing so he would be out of the business, and that would throw 100 people out of jobs.

We received a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, which is made a part of the report. In view of the fact that the report is not here for inspection, I wish to read a part of that letter, which would cover that very situation. The letter states as follows:

> This letter is written in response to your request made at the meeting of the conferees on H.R. 12144 for information regarding plant construction requirements in connection with the Federal Meat Inspection Program.
>
> The eligibility of an establishment for inspection under the Federal Meat Inspection Program is based upon a combined evaluation of the operating procedures used by the establishment and the building construction and physical facilities rather than upon a separate evaluation of these factors. As a result of many requests a guide to plant construction and equipment has been put together for use by industry operators, architects, engineers, and other Government officials (foreign and domestic) interested in the sanitary handling of products within an establishment. The guide is a collection of recommended minimum standards. However, a great variety of arrangements, building materials, and equipment have been considered acceptable so long as they lend themself to the production under sanitary conditions of clean wholesome product.
>
> The only mandatory construction requirements are set forth in general terms in the regulations. These requirements relate directly to maintenance of sanitary conditions for the production of wholesome meat. For example, "The floors, walls, ceilings, partitions, posts, doors, and other parts of all structures shall be of such materials, construction, and finish as will make them susceptible of being readily and thoroughly cleaned."

That is all that the Federal Government requires of a plant—that it must be sanitary and clean, and they do not have mandatory specifications or sizes that have to be complied with in order to meet the Federal standards. This letter will be a part of the report.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the report of the conference committee on the meat inspection bill, the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967, is a report which I am proud to support enthusiastically. The conference version on which this House will vote shortly is a vastly stronger bill than the House of Representatives itself voted on October 31.

In particular, the Senate amendments adopted by the House conferees provide that in 2 years—3 years at the most—there will be no State in the Union which will not be under Federal meat inspection unless it has adopted, with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, a meat inspection system at least equal to Federal standards.

I am not one who thinks the Federal Government ought to be the final arbiter in all fields; but in the field of meat inspection, there is no State in the Union, in my judgment, that can meet Federal standards today in both its law and its enforcement. And we know that the meat inspection system of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is a model for the world.

Thus the standards of the conference version are very high standards indeed. They are, however, no less than the American people have a right to expect from both their States and their Federal Government; and they are no less than those which it is the obligation of the Members of this House to provide.

In addition, there is some protection immediately for the public while States are preparing to meet these standards. One of the Senate amendments provides that the Secretary of Agriculture will have authority to enter any meat plant in the United States, whether or not it ships its products across State lines, and, if the Secretary believes that adulterated products dangerous to the public health are being distributed he would notify State authorities. If they failed to act in a reasonable time, he could place such plant under immediate Federal inspection.

Other provisions in the bill will allow and require full and detailed reporting by the Secretary of Agriculture on the operation of meat-inspection systems throughout the United States.

Many Members, moreover, have been praised by the speakers who have appeared in the well, including myself. There are, however, two Members of this House who, I feel, merit the gratitude not only of this House and of this Congress but also, the gratitude of every American consumer, of every responsible meat packer and processor and of the American livestock agricultural community.

The first is the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. NEAL SMITH, who for 7 years has labored in behalf of an adequate meat inspection bill. To the great credit not only of him but also of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture—who is opposed to this bill—this is the first year in the 7 that he has been given a hearing by the Committee on Agriculture, and that a bill could be brought forth in this House.

The second is the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] who in all fields relating to consumer protection has been an outstanding and stalwart champion of the American consumer. Mrs. SULLIVAN'S interest in meat inspection has gone back very many years.

These two, of all the Members of the House and Senate, merit the gratitude not only of this body but also of the American consuming public.

I say only one more thing in closing: The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and I occasionally have disagreed. But I would tell all of my friends who have supported my position in this House that I could not have asked for fairer, for straightforward, and more honest treatment than that which I received from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL]. I say this not in a spirit of mere courtesy in the House. I say it very sincerely. I was allowed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and through the courtesy of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN] to be a member of the conference committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], out of conscience and deep philosophical conviction, is taking another position on this bill. But I want to make it very clear to all of those who feel strongly about this matter that his conduct and his action with respect to those who disagreed with him on the committee could not have been more exemplary, could not have been more equitable and fair. I appreciate his conduct very, very much.

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

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate all who had a hand in prying this bill out of conference in a manner which will give the consumer the hope of achieving, within the next 3 years, the assurance that all meat and meat products sold in the stores or served in restaurants is slaughtered and processed under decent standards of sanitation and wholesomeness.

As the first Member of Congress to have introduced legislation to provide authority to the Federal Government for compulsory inspection of meat sold only in intrastate commerce, I am gratified by the fact that the bill now before us would provide such authority under certain circumstances. In many respects, this bill, H.R. 12144, goes beyond my bill, H.R. 1321, which I first introduced in 1962, and I support H.R. 12144 as a practical and, I hope, effective measure for meeting the serious problem of uninspected, diseased, and "doctored" meat now being sold in many jurisdictions.

Making this legislation work, however, will depend upon three things: adequate Federal appropriations; conscientious cooperation by the States; and strong Federal administration and enforcement.

I am sorry that the House conferees have divided so strongly on this conference report. Of course, it is not the first time that the consumer has received second- or third-priority consideration in matters which relate to the agricultural industry. But we are making progress.

ROLLCALL OF LEADERS IN MEAT INSPECTION BATTLE

For that progress, we can all be grateful to the late President John F. Kennedy, for having sent the first Presidential consumer message to Congress in 1962, in which he cited some of the problems in connection with noninspected meat sold in intrastate commerce; to President Johnson, for continuing and expanding the drive for consumer legislation; to Assistant Secretary of Labor Esther Peterson, the first Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, who spotlighted this issue of unwholesome meat during her 3 effective years as the administration's voice of the consumer; to the Honorable Betty Furness, who has demonstrated real courage and straightforwardness in fighting for a strong bill such as we now have before us for final passage; to Arnold Mayer of the Meat Cutters Union; to Ralph Nader, who dramatized an issue which some of us have labored over for 5 years without achieving the public support he helped us obtain; to such House colleagues as Representatives SMITH of Iowa and FOLEY, of Washington, and to Senators MONDALE and MONTOYA; and, as I said, to those conferees who pried a good bill out of conference committee.

If I have left out anyone whose efforts deserve recognition on this bill—and I am sure I have left out many—I hope that consumer groups will make up their own rollcalls of outstanding performance on this legislation and publicize them widely.

THE 1957 POULTRY ACT MACHINERY STILL UNUSED

Ever since 1957, we have had machinery for the compulsory inspection of poultry sold only in intrastate commerce, but that section of the Poultry Act has never been used. It is different from the procedures for intrastate inspection which would be established in this bill for the red meats. In testifying on the meat inspection bills, I urged the Committee on Agriculture to try to achieve uniformity in the two programs either by adopting for meat inspection the law as it now applies to poultry, or by amending the Poultry Products Inspection Act to conform to whatever system was eventually devised for compulsory Federal inspection of the red meats in intrastate commerce.

This has not been done. It should be done. It should be made the next step in the modernization of our food inspection laws. There is still a vast amount of poultry which cannot be sold across State lines because it is not slaughtered and processed under proper standards of cleanliness and wholesomeness.

So the job we are doing today in behalf of the consumer in passing this bill is far from finished, as long as poultry can be processed and sold to unwary purchasers in intrastate commerce without adequate inspection to insure its wholesomeness.

CAN WE NOW DRAMATIZE THE NEED FOR INVOKING POULTRY ACT?

I feel that the Department of Agriculture has been far too timid in the use of its existing powers to get at this unwholesome poultry moving only in intrastate commerce. The States have failed utterly to try to invoke the machinery of the Poultry Products Inspection Act to help them solve this problem. My own city of St. Louis, joined by St. Louis County, tried not once but several times to have our area designated a "major consuming area" under the 1957 Poultry Act, so that all poultry coming into the area from within Missouri would have to pass Federal inspection. Apparently, the law is cumbersome in its provisions, or the Department is not anxious to invoke it.

I would urge Mr. Nader, and others who helped to dramatize the meat situation, to take a look now at the poultry problem and perhaps we can get long-overdue action on that front, too. In the case of poultry, we already have a law which could be used to protect consumers against unwholesome poultry in intrastate commerce. Who will provide the push now to have this law invoked? I have tried to do so in every way I know, but I have not succeeded. Can I get some help?

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of us in this body support the objectives of this legislation. Some of us, including the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, question whether this conference report is the vehicle through which this objective can best be reached.

When the Purcell bill was before the House of Representatives several weeks ago I supported that bill with enthusiasm, because I thought then, as I do now, that it was a well-considered, properly planned piece of legislation which had been fully and carefully discussed in the Committee on Agriculture and on the floor of the House of Representatives.

The House of Representatives spoke its will at that time and overwhelmingly, I would say, supported the position of the Committee on Agriculture and the provisions of the Purcell bill.

There are many of us who believe that this conference report, which is in substance the Senate-passed version of this bill, would in effect be a step backward and, in many States, where State standards are the equivalent of or even better than Federal standards at the present time, there might be a tendency to let up. I hope that this will not happen.

But that would be a natural reaction by some of the State departments of agriculture which today set higher standards than does the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Let me give you two examples of this. Twice within recent years the State of Georgia, which has a substantial and I think an outstanding meat inspection system and program, appealed to the U.S. Department of Agriculture to raise Federal standards to equal the standards which were set in the State of Georgia. One of those was in the processing of pork products where the U.S. Department of Agriculture standards at that time permitted the pumping of excess water into hams and other meat products. The Department of Agriculture lowered its standards on pork products. It was only after an effort of several years, spearheaded by the State of Georgia and other States, that the Department of Agriculture of the Federal Government restored the standards to what they should have had in the first place.

We in Georgia are no strangers to stringent meat inspection requirements and standards. Georgia is one of the largest poultry producing States in the country. For many years the poultry inspection requirements of our own State have been superior to those of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. On several occasions the commissioner of agriculture of the State of Georgia asked the Secretary of Agriculture to raise the Federal standards. He said that he could not and would not do so because he did not think that the intent of the Congress as expressed in existing Federal statutes required it.

Mr. Speaker, I think this could well be a step backward instead of a step forward in guaranteeing highly rigid strict standards of meat inspection and the wholesome quality of meat.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my longtime and warm friend and colleague.

Mr. Speaker, no one favors unclean meat. No one wants lax inspection. The question is only one of responsibility. In Georgia we see to it that our own meat produced in the State is inspected by our

own inspectors, and we depend on Federal inspection for that which is produced in States over which we have no control. This is the way it should be. The State that wants to face its own responsibility can have locally produced meat as clean as it wants to have. Under the present system the State that has bad meat because of inadequate State inspection can only blame itself.

The effect of this bill, as now amended, will be to hasten the day when State responsibility will be nonexistent, and Mr. Speaker, that is not good. It is a trend in the wrong direction.

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

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. STEPHENS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to associate myself at this time with the remarks that my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT], made as well as to associate myself with the remarks of my other colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. O'NEAL].

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

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BRINKLEY].

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise also to associate myself with my colleagues from Georgia [Mr. O'NEAL and Mr. FLYNT]. I will say our State and the meat-processing industry of our State has already shown responsibility in meeting the challenges which confront them.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia, because he said something that needs to be stated. The commissioner of agriculture of the State of Georgia has tried in every way possible to cooperate with the Federal authorities. Several times he asked for some help in poultry inspection and was denied it. Georgia has been a leader among the States in meat inspection. I certainly congratulate the gentleman from Georgia for bringing this matter out. I would like to endorse his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 30 seconds.

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

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT]. His remarks are timely, and this is a good illustration of the example of a State which has shouldered its responsibility and done it well.

Mr. FLYNT. The bill which the House passed was fully debated and thoroughly considered by the House of Representatives. The rules under which the amendments were debated provided ample time for any Member to be heard.

Today this bill comes up under somewhat unusual circumstances when the Members of the House do not have before them copies of the conference report or the statement of the managers. I recognize that the statement of the managers was read and that a few copies have been available to Members upon request.

When the statement of the managers was read, there was a small attendance in the House and such attendance has not increased substantially during the 50 minutes which have already been used. It is therefore quite likely, Mr. Speaker, that a larger number of Members are more aware of the propaganda which has been circulated about this bill than they are about the conference report itself.

As I stated earlier in my remarks, the question of wholesome meat products is not a novel question as far as we in Georgia are concerned. We are proud of the high standards of meat inspection which have been promulgated and enforced by the general assembly and department of agriculture of our State. As a result of these high standards, Georgia has become a leading shipper of meat products of many varieties. Decades of experience have convinced wholesalers, retailers, and consumers of the high quality of the meat products of Georgia and the State approval on the package of meat products indicating that such products were produced in Georgia has long been accepted as an emblem of the highest quality and wholesomeness.

Several weeks ago the commissioner of agriculture of Georgia, the Honorable Phil Campbell informed me that he had been threated by officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture if he persisted in his opposition to the pending substitute to the original Purcell bill. These threats were in the nature that Federal inspectors would undertake smear campaigns and a series of harassing actions against him, other State agriculture commissioners who shared his views and the inspection services which were administered under such departments. He further informed me that more than 2 weeks of spot checks by USDA inspectors, instead of producing evidence of low-grade inspection standards, produced evidence of very high standards of inspection and processing in the Georgia plants.

It is difficult to understand why the original Purcell bill (H.R. 12144), introduced with the full approval of the Department of Agriculture and the administration, has now been scuttled and we are today confronted with a conference report which few Members of the House other than the conferees themselves have had an opportunity to study.

Of course I want the very highest standards of meat inspection for all meat products regardless of the State in which they are processed. I believed then and I believe now that H.R. 12144 as originally reported by the Committee on Agriculture was the best possible step in that direction.

It provided the best elements of a strong partnership between the Federal Government and the State to accomplish that objective. I am not sure that this conference report will accomplish this.

We have seen many instances especially in the field of agricultural research, where increased funds by the Federal Government have unfortunately resulted in corresponding reduction of funds provided by the States.

The provisions of this conference report could eventually preempt the field of meat inspection with the result that the effective efforts of local, municipal, and State inspection systems may be abandoned.

We are not certain that the Federal Government alone can do the job which needs to be done. It has been estimated that as many as 5,000 new Federal inspectors may be required and may be required on short notice. If this happens, it is very probable that many qualified persons will be employed who will be incapable of adequately inspecting meat products. The result could be very serious.

I support the objectives of this legislation but a comparison of the language of the House passed bill and the language of this conference report leads me to believe that the provisions of the original House-passed bill are in the best interests of the consumers of meat products.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. TIERNAN].

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, as a supporter of the Smith-Foley amendment to the recent Meat Inspection Act passed by the House, I am delighted that the House-Senate conference has reported a stronger bill than originally approved by the House. Although one of the key provisions of the Senate bill was dropped in conference—the Governor's waiver—I feel that the House should enact this legislation without delay. The conference measure is a real victory for the American consumer who has too often and too long been disregarded by the meatpacking industry.

During my college days, I remember reading an expose by Upton Sinclair of the conditions in the meatpacking industry in his novel "The Jungle." This book so graphically portrayed the horrors of the meatpacking trust that it eventually led to a full-scale Government investigation which created a climate of public concern and in turn led to the Meat Inspection Act of 1906. Although this act was a model of progressive and enlightened legislation in its day, it only covered, as we know, meat involved in interstate commerce. Today, 60 years later, meat products are still not subject to this inspection if State lines are not crossed, and conditions in some segments of the intrastate meat industry are scarcely better than is described in "The Jungle."

Like most consumers, I have assumed that modern meatpacking concerns—out of consideration for the health of their own customers—would adhere closely to Federal standards whether or not they were covered by the Meat Inspection Act of 1906. I do not think this was naivete on my part. I just did not realize that for many in the meatpacking industry, health is fine but filth pays dividends. I was appalled to read the Department of

Agriculture's survey that 9 million or more pounds of meat—15 percent of all slaughtered meat and 25 percent of all processed meat—is subject only to State inspection. No one can read this sad record of the meat industry neglect and disregard for consumer health and not be outraged.

I was shocked to learn that the water content of some processed meats also were found to run sometimes as much as 500 to 600 percent more than the federally accepted maximum.

In effect, what was happening was that the consumer was buying water at meat prices.

Perhaps the most sickening aspect of the Clarkson report is that part which brings to light the fact that some slaughterers and processors are engaged in what is commonly referred to as the 4–D trade—that is, meat that is taken from disabled, diseased, dead, and dying animals. I am horrified to know that this kind of meat which under Federal inspection is classified as unfit for human consumption has been sold to many unwitting consumers in this country.

With respect to my State, Rhode Island, I am most reassured by a recent letter from Dr. Joseph Cannon, the director of the Rhode Island Department of Health in which he stated that no 4–D cattle have been slaughtered in Rhode Island nor have any been purchased by any Rhode Island buyer at neighboring livestock auctions. I am also happy to report that Agriculture Department hearings revealed that Rhode Island is one of the States with a good mandatory inspection law.

As a State senator in the Rhode Island Legislature, I was a vigorous supporter of the transfer of the division of animal husbandry from the department of agriculture and conservation to the department of health where it rightfully belongs. As a result of the reorganization, a division of animal and dairy industry was created and one of its prime activities is the enforcement of the Rhode Island slaughter act. Since July of 1963, meat inspection activities in Rhode Island have been under the direction of a full-time public veterinarian, a former employee of the USDA Meat Inspection Division.

Clearly, the revelations of the Clarkson report reinforced by the Department of Agriculture of this year point up the need for this legislation. I urge the House to accept this conference report so that this legislation can be signed into law without delay.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, I include two recent articles on the subject of meat inspection:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 2, 1967]

TOWARD SAFER MEAT

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON.—Consumers have assumed for years that the Federal meat inspection law protected them against filthy, diseased or adulterated meat.

This is true for much of the meat they buy, but substantial quantities of meat and meat products are not federally inspected. Consumers have learned from the current Congressional hassle that Federal inspection applies only to meat sold across state lines and that some 9 million or more pounds—15 per cent of all slaughtered meat and 25 per cent of all processed meat—is subject only to state inspection, if any.

It is this intrastate meat, produced and sold wholly within states, that has produced for years the conflict in the states, the meat industry and the Federal Government. The Administration's growing emphasis on consumer affairs and the widening consumer-orientation of Congress brought the problem to a head this year because of the opposition of agricultural interests.

The conflict had been raging before Congress heard of Department of Agriculture reports of 1963 and another this year such as this one on a plant not federally inspected: "Abscessed beef and pork livers and parasitic infested livers mixed with edible products." Or "Mold and slime in coolers and debris and trash mixed throughout the plant." Or meat was dragged across the floor with "vermin droppings" and "No window screens—flies abundantly present."

SEEK MODERNIZATION

Two years ago the Administration sought to "modernize" the basic 1906 Federal meat inspection law that resulted from Upton Sinclair's exposure of meat industry conditions in "The Jungle." The Administration wanted to get at the purveyors of rotten, adulterated meat and even horse products and products from the 4–D—dead, dying, diseased and disabled—animals. It was stymied, however, without readily available proof that the meat moved in interstate commerce.

It must be said, however, that a few voices were heard within the meat industry saying that the intrastate situation had to be cleaned up, and that if the states didn't do it, the pressure on Congress could result in stringent Federal action.

Involved in this was the belief that if the Federal Government took over all meat inspection, the cost, now paid by the Government, would be shifted to the industry. The industry also saw more Federal encroachment and regulation of business.

Advancing technology, rapid transportation and communications, competitive marketing and new food preservation methods have revolutionized the meat industry. Slaughtering and other plants have been decentralized and specialized and located near large consumer markets. This has caused a growth of intrastate plants because they do not have to ship across state lines to get at markets.

Although some states have sought to meet the growing problem of uninspected meat, few have the needed manpower and financial resources.

The Administration's approach has been to offer the states money aid to upgrade inspection systems, whether mandatory or voluntary, and to install systems in states without inspection statutes.

The industry, fearing consumer backlash and more Government regulation, accepted this Federal-state cooperative approach in a House-passed bill this session. But the case against widespread filthy conditions built up again and forced considerations of stronger measures in the Senate.

After the House passed its bill and defeated an effort to put an estimated 9,000 of the 15,000 plants under Federal inspection immediately, Senator Walter F. Mondale, Democrat of Minnesota, moved to get all meat under Federal inspection.

A "SPOILER"

In a role as a "spoiler," he knew that such a bill might fail, leaving consumers with no bill at all. He succeeded in strengthening a Senate bill to give the states two years to shape up or face Federal intervention. The meat industry accepted this "stick" to prod the states into action.

Confusion resulted, however, when Betty Furness, Special Assistant to the President for Consumers Affairs, gave the Mondale bill unqualified endorsement while other Presidential assistants were still divided over whether they should go for the strongest bill or for a bill that Congress would pass.

The Senate bill retains the House "carrot" of matching Federal grants to help states gain inspection at least equal to Federal standards. It gives the states two years to meet the Federal standards or face a takeover of inspection by the Secretary of Agriculture, but the Secretary may add a third year of "grace" if he finds progress being made by a state on its own system. A Governor could waive the time period and put his state under Federal inspection immediately. Further, the Secretary is empowered to seize unwholesome meat and seek a court injunction to close a plant if he considers the plant a menace to health.

Senate and House conferees will meet this week to reconcile their difference after the House refused to instruct its conferees to accept the Senate version.

[From the Wilmington, Del., Evening Journal, Dec. 2, 1967]

UNITED STATES INDICTS TWO MEAT FIRMS HERE

A federal grand jury in Wilmington returned a 30-count indictment yesterday against two Wilmington slaughterhouses and a Philadelphia meat firm, charging violations of federal meat inspections laws.

Goldberg Bros. of South Market Street and Morris and Alec Goldberg, its president and vice president, respectively, were charged in 10 counts.

They are accused of causing transportation of a quantity of meat that had not been inspected and examined and marked as "inspected and passed" as required by the federal law and U.S. Department of Agriculture regulations.

The violations, according to the indictments, occurred in connection with meat being transported from Wilmington to Philadelphia between February and August in 1965.

Sidney Hendler, operator of a slaughterhouse at 737 S. Market St., was named in a similar 10-count indictment charging similar offenses over the same period of time.

The indictment also accused Morton Provision Co. of Philadelphia and Morton Gekoski, its president and manager, in 10 counts of transporting the meat bought from the Goldbergs and Hendler.

The Goldbergs are alleged to have shipped 42,570 pounds of meat and 1,333 additional pieces of meat.

Hendler's indictment involved 14,462¾ pounds and 673 pieces.

Federal law prohibits transportation, offering for transportation, receiving or causing to be transported from one state to another any carcasses, meat or meat products, which have not been inspected and examined and marked as "inspected and passed."

The penalty on conviction for the misdemeanor offense is up to $10,000 in fines, imprisonment up to two years, or both.

Asst. U.S. Atty L. Vincent Ramunno prepared and presented the case to the grand jury. Investigation was made by Clarence O. Cowgill Jr., an Agriculture Department meat laws investigator, and Sigmund P. Zeitlin, a special agent of the department.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the adoption of the conference report. It has been a real pleasure and a privilege to serve on this conference with such a fine group of members of the Committees on Agriculture of both

Houses of Congress. I oppose the conference report on the ground of principle. The chairman of our committee, Hon. W. R. POAGE, of Texas, has fought valiantly for the House bill as he believes it to be in the best interests of the farmer, the consumer, the packer, and the meat dealer. I commend him for a splendid job. It is a great thing to be associated with such an able leadership as that exemplified by Chairman POAGE and the ranking minority member, PAGE BELCHER, of Oklahoma. Mr. BELCHER is a stalwart, courageous legislator. As for Mr. POAGE, he is "Mr. Agriculture" in the Nation. There is no one who could run a close second to him in having the knowledge of all phases of farm problems as that of chairman BOB POAGE, of Texas.

In commenting with respect to this legislation I would like to bring to the attention of the House the superb services rendered by the chairman of the subcommittee and author of the bill, Hon. GRAHAM PURCELL of Texas, Representatives CATHERINE MAY and TOM FOLEY of Washington, NEAL SMITH of Iowa, and all the members of the subcommittee who worked tirelessly and diligently on this legislation.

It is a hobby of mine to buy meat over the counter. I engage in this hobby every Saturday. I feel that when the stamp, "Approved, U.S. Department of Agriculture," is placed on fresh meats it means something. It is a protection to the consuming public that the meat is wholesome. The Meat Inspection Service is a great organization and has served the interests of the people commendably and well. However, the State inspectors, too, have performed their jobs with credit and distinction. The House bill recognized the good in both State and Federal inspection services. The House bill was endorsed by all segments of the industry including the farmer, the commissioners of agriculture, the meatpackers and dealers. I am firm in the conviction that you do not have to go to Washington with every human ill that befalls the American people. The 50 States in this Union are close to the people themselves and should be recognized when it comes to a matter of dealing in intrastate commerce in all of its various phases. This bill just says to the State, "If you do not place your house in order within 2 years, or an additional 1-year period of grace, a 3-year period of time, we will step in and do the job for you" in connection with transactions that are local in nature and that do not involve intrastate commerce.

The legislation as approved by the conferees will in time mean the death knell of the State inspection of meats that do not cross state lines. This is a bad situation that will result from the approval of this legislation.

When we speak of the success of the Federal meat inspection program, and it has been a success, I cannot see that there should be a monopoly in the hands of the Federal Government in this field. There is no monopoly when it comes to the matter of classification of cotton. The cotton classing service of the Department of Agriculture is a great institution rendering fine services to the cotton farmers in the Nation, but it is recognized full well that private concerns have cotton classers whose classifications are readily approved by the U.S. Department of Agriculture officials. State meat inspectors have and do perform similar meritorious services.

It is estimated that $8 million additional funds would be required or requested for the Federal meat inspection service for the remainder of the current fiscal year. This money will be spent largely in intrastate operations.

I have doubts about the constitutionality of the conference proposal. I will not support the conference report.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, after the able and distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER], who described himself as the defendant, presented the case, there is not much left to say with reference to the substantive matters that are involved in this legislation.

However, I do wish to say that I do not think that this is any usual Federal-State matter. This is, really, a health matter. There is no part of the entire United States—and do not be fooled by these claims that there are—that insofar as the Federal meat inspection standards are concerned, will measure up and meet the standards of Federal inspection. Most everyone agreed that the great State of California does the best job, but they do not enforce their law as well, especially with reference to the labeling provisions.

Also, I want to refer very briefly to the States rights argument. This bill does not go any further into the regulation of sales within a State than do laws we already have with reference to tobacco and wheat marketing quotas. Courts held 25 years ago that a farmer in Kansas was subject to a wheat marketing quota although he sold no wheat outside the State. No authority contained in the bill agreed upon by the conference report goes further than those laws pertaining to tobacco and wheat legislation. So, people who support those laws certainly are in no position to complain about the question of jurisdiction in this matter.

Reference was made here to a bill relating to the USDA having access to plants not now federally inspected. That right of access is immediate upon the President signing the bill and would not require a State law.

Mr. Speaker, I think the bill proposed in the conference report is a great deal better than the bill originally passed by the House. It accomplishes about 95 percent of what, in my opinion, should be done and over a period of 3 years will upgrade the meat inspection system in this country and will provide the protection consumers need. This bill contains, almost word for word, provisions of the bill I have supported relative to imported meat, meat from rendering works or 4–D meat, labeling, and additives. It will require that imported meat meet the Federal standards that we have in this country. Some people have recently been alleging that the Smith-Foley and Mondale-Montoya bills did not provide this protection. That was an absolutely false allegation and, in fact, both of those bills and the House passed bill provide identical requirements for inspection of plants from which meat is imported. There is no 2- or 3-year delay in these provisions going into effect either.

This bill requires that dead, dying, diseased and disabled animals not be sold for human consumption. This meat, which is usually handled through rendering plants, must be denatured, and after the bill goes into full force and effect, the processing plants which have been exempt from Federal inspection will also be prohibited from bringing this meat within their establishment in a way enabling them to mix it with other meat.

The bill also prohibits improper labeling and fraud in labeling. If a processor puts chopped lips, chopped hides, lungs, flour and other foreign material into the meat, the label must clearly and truthfully show that fact and when they add 30-percent water they will not be able to label it in a way that hides that fact.

The bill also protects against the use of some extenders, additives, and chemicals designed to fool the public into thinking the meat is fresher than it is or contains less undesirable qualities than it does.

The big difference between this bill and the bill that originally passed the House is that it does require that plants which have not been federally inspected come up to Federal standards over a period of a maximum of 3 years. If a State does not provide an inspection system within that period which is at least equal to the Federal system, the plants will be subject to Federal inspection within that State. Many of these plants have carefully avoided Federal inspection through a loophole in the law which exempts any plant, regardless of size and regardless of its source animals, if it did not sell meat to customers in another State. When States bring their inspection system up to Federal standards, these plants will no longer enjoy the unfair competition that they had and will no longer be able to bilk the public by pawning off inferior and mislabeled meat.

Under the Smith-Foley bill which we considered in the House, the largest of these plants would have been immediately placed under Federal inspection. Under the bill finally passed by the Senate these nonfederally inspected plants would have a maximum period of 3 years to come up to Federal standards and in the interim 3 years, three principle tools would be used to give some measure of protection against the bad ones.

One tool is access by the USDA so that people can be informed as to their practices and to avoid to some extent the meat from those plants that are not operating under sanitary conditions and are mislabeling their products. This tool is retained in the bill now before us.

Another tool is a provision that when the USDA finds a plant selling adulterated meat and following practices endangering the health of people, under certain procedures the plants can be required to come up to Federal standards before the 3-year period has expired. This provision has also been retained.

Another tool which was in the Senate

bill which has been dropped by the conferees was a provision which permitted the Governor to turn responsibility over to the Federal inspection system before the 2- or 3-year period has expired. It would not have prevented the State from taking jurisdiction back at a later time. I still think this was a good provision. This tool would have had a salutory effect in two special ways: First, where the Secretary of Agriculture or the head of the inspection system has not been doing a good job, the Governor could have said, "straighten up the situation or I will ask for Federal inspection"; and second, where plants have been mislabeling and following bad practices, they would know they must change their ways or the Governor, who might be more responsive to public demand and more apt to be sensitive to public health needs, could make them subject to Federal inspection right away. This leverage has been omitted by the conferees. However, the other two tools are still in the bill and will help to bridge the gap during the next 3 years. During this period of time any one in doubt can refuse to buy meat that does not bear the Federal inspection seal, and in that way, can feel safe.

The bill on a whole makes a great stride forward for the benefit of the consumers and producers in this country. It is a good bill for farmers because it will stop the loss of billions of pounds of market by consumers unknowingly buying great amounts of foreign and inferior material and water in their meat in place of wholesome meat products. It will certainly also be good for the health of the Nation. Just because there is a waiting period for some plants, the dirty meat purveyors need not think they can relax. Some of us are going to be vigorously exercising some oversight functions, scanning the reports and information available and exposing them for what they are.

I think the bill represents one of the greatest victories consumers have had in recent years. While the Members and committees of Congress should be vigilant and exercise oversight functions on a continuing basis, the bill provides the legal machinery that can bring our inspection system up to the standards that the American people deserve in this day and age.

A considerable effort by a good many people is required to pass a bill as comprehensive as this one and as vigorously opposed as it has been. It has been opposed both by representatives of nonfederally inspected plants and by State secretaries of agriculture who have seen fit to oppose the Federal government cleaning up a mess which they have failed to clean up themselves. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL], chairman of the appropriate subcommittee, scheduled and held hearings in which this situation was originally developed. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] as chairman of the Agriculture Committee and even though he has stated that he was opposed to this bill has not sought to prevent the will of Congress from eventually being felt.

All of the Members know there have been committee chairmen who have sought to prevent the will of Congress from being expressed, but Chairman POAGE did not attempt to delay meetings of the conference committee or prevent bringing this bill back to the House. Two leading Members of the Senate, the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. MONTOYA, and the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. MONDALE, worked very, very hard on this bill during the period it was in that body, and I personally know they worked all through at least one weekend trying to find a formula that would do the job and also pass the Senate. Their grasp of the subject matter was tremendous and their unwillingness to accept the House bill without strengthening features was absolutely necessary in order to eventually have a bill as good as the one we are passing today. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] was an aggressive stalwart in the House Agriculture Committee for a strong bill. He has worked vigorously over a long period and given the kind of extraordinary service that the great unorganized horde of consumers in this country too seldom receive from public officials. Many provisions of the bill reflect his influence and hard work. Cosponsors of legislation, including Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GUDE, Mr. DOW, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mrs. SULLIVAN, and others made contributions and some made special efforts to inform the people of their particular area.

The result of action on bills that involve consumers, who are so inadequately represented on a day-to-day basis, many times depends upon the extent to which the consumers are informed enough to cause them to express their opinions vigorously. Those opposed to consumer bills are usually well organized with expert representatives on the scene. Newspaper reporters such as Nick Kotz, Tom Leach, Jim Adams, and a few others wrote articles with such clarity that this complicated and comprehensive bill could be understood well enough so that constituents began to write to their Congressmen on this bill. This was an absolutely necessary ingredient. Consumers representative, Ralph Nader, the Special Assistant to the President on Consumers Affairs, Betty Furness, and others spoke out on the matter and representatives of some of the organizations with large memberships, such as some of the labor unions, informed their members as to what the facts were in the situation. It really takes the interest of a lot of people to pass a bill such as this, and I am sure that the consumer should thank those I have mentioned who worked on the bill in the years to come.

I urge that the conference report be adopted and that the bill be passed.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to very briefly and very quickly ask some questions of the chairman of the subcommittee.

First of all, once the Federal Government is involved with the States, what is in this legislation which would cause the Federal Government to become uninvolved at such time as a State may decide to independently handle its own inspection program?

Mr. PURCELL. That is to be found on page 36 of the copy of the Senate bill, S. 2147, that we are using for this purpose, and it is particularly pointed out on page 37 in line 4. It provides that when the Secretary finds that there is adequate inspection on the State level he then shall withdraw the Federal inspector from that State.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask this question of the gentleman:

As far as State participation is concerned, it will be 50 percent. There are some 28 States that have full State inspection both post mortem and ante mortem. I would like to inquire how much of an additional burden this might create on the Department of Agriculture when they are already spending $48 million for meat inspection.

Mr. PURCELL. We have estimates which range from, I believe, $20 million up to $40 million a year that this bill may cost the Federal Government.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. There is no firm figure?

Mr. PURCELL. It will cost much less with the States participating.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. The time having expired I plan to submit further questions at a later date which I hope will be answered to show legislative intent.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. I have supported this legislation from the very inception because I believe the American people are entitled to the highest degree of protection in the food they consume.

Too long, Mr. Speaker, have too many meat processors used indescribable methods in processing meat. These irresponsible processors have brought great problems on those reputable meat processors who have taken the trouble to install adequate sanitation facilities to provide maximum health protection for their customers.

This legislation will go a long way toward establishing decent meat inspection procedures for all meat processors so that American consumers can be confident in the purchase of meat.

I believe this is one of the most important bills in this session and I am proud to vote for it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I support this conference report on the meat inspection bill. The American people are entitled to the highest possible measure of protection for their food and food products. They enjoy today the best system of meat inspection in the world but it is still not as good as it can be. This conference report will help strengthen the cause of adequate meat inspection and consumer protection and should be approved.

I want to commend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] for whose amendment I voted when the bill was under consideration in the House. Their amendment was not accepted, but they persisted in their fight for a strong

bill and they won. This bill is in great measure a tribute to their determination and their work.

It is now a good bill. It will provide much more protection for the fine men, women, and children of America. I urge Members to vote for it.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report on the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967 now being considered by the House. I congratulate the conferees for bringing back to the House a stronger bill than the one that passed the House a few weeks ago. I am glad that the House receded to the Senate and adopted many of the amendments that were adopted by the other body that make this bill a much better vehicle for the proper inspection of meat. The consuming public is entitled to the best possible protection and the Congress should not settle for less.

Mr. Speaker, it has been pointed out that there is no State in the Nation that comes up to the Federal standards respecting inspection of meat. The bill that we have before us will greatly assist in bringing State standards up to the Federal regulations. This bill is a victory for the consumer. I trust that it will be adopted overwhelmingly by the House.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today, once again, we are seeing the positive result that comes from allowing the House to work its will and by allowing free discussion and open debate in the consideration of H.R. 12144 and the conference report before us today. The other House has had the same opportunity to work its will. As often is the case, the Senate disagrees with the House and when this happens we have the unusual technique to use the talents of both Houses by providing for a conference committee. At the conference committee meetings most often, as in this case, the best talents and experience of both Houses are brought together. There is opportunity for "give and take." There, also, we find respect for the integrity and best judgments of both Houses. There we find the spirit of compromise which is the essence of good legislation often at its best. This is certainly a tribute to our system and the present leadership of the committees.

This problem of meat inspection is a serious one. Many of us have been aware of this for a long time. Because of public interest stirred by newspapers, periodicals, the other media, and the rekindled interest of the Agriculture Committee members we were finally successful in getting the great House Committee on Agriculture to act favorably on proposals for legislation. After weeks of testimony, discussion, and evaluating and, finally, of judgment, the House brought out the bill that resulted in the legislation passed today. This bill, itself, as voted out by the committee originally was a good approach, a long step in the right direction. It was my feeling that in the long run, because of a change of representation in all State legislatures, this bill would have been adequate. However, there were those who said they wanted a stronger bill and so when the bill was brought to the House, the bill was granted a rule that would provide an opportunity for those who believed there was room for improvement to have their day in court. After thorough debate of an amendment in the terms of its authors to improve the bill, the House, by a substantial vote majority, voted to disagree. This was not a record vote and those who supported this provision did not choose to make a record vote of it when we went into session. But to accept the judgment of the House, the vote then carried with one dissenting vote.

Mr. Speaker, there have been those who after that vote claim that those who disagreed with the Agriculture Committee version of the bill were voting for a dirty meat bill. Mr. Speaker, this is unfortunate and really it is "dirty politics" for those people to make that charge and claim it as a fact, for nothing could be further from the truth. Every Member, myself included, wanted improvement in this area. In my own case, I pled with the members of the committee to bring out some form of legislation that would insure the public we had a concern that we knew there was a problem and that we were willing to apply our talents toward its solution and I reiterate that I am grateful this Congress finally saw fit to present a bill and to provide for some positive solutions.

Some of these discussions both on the floor and in certain publications were unfair and resulted, unfortunately, in the public losing some confidence in a system that provides for more wholesome food, better quality food and at a more reasonable price than is provided in any other part of the world. These charges and countercharges have adversely affected the prices of meat on the market at a time when the farmer's income is already far too low, at a time when the parity price index is down. To indiscriminately criticize packing plants on a blanket basis has played and was the major influence in diminishing the consumption of meat and, thus, lowering livestock prices. These indiscriminate accusations of "dirty meat" and implication that most of the operators were careless in observing sanitary rules and regulations simply was not true and, therefore, it is—and I reiterate—"dirty politics."

Mr. Speaker, during my political career I have visited every plant that I know of that processes meat in my district and I can say without exception, every one of the operations I have seen and know about is clean and operated by honorable men and patronized by the best producers of meat in the world, the Iowa farmer. All of them, like most of the business community and all aspects of our free enterprise system, are dedicated to serving the public interest, to produce the very best products and give the best service at the very lowest cost. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we can say, and should say more often, that in America we have a system that produces more high quality food under more sanitary conditions and at a lower cost, when you compare the percentage of take-home pay required to buy food than can be credited to any other system or any other part of this world. This is made possible as we all know through the ingenious system we call the free enterprise system. In fact, I am very proud to report the Oscar Mayer plant I have visited many times is one of the finest and cleanest facilities for food production. They have had Federal inspection for as long as I can remember, but it is easy to see when you study this operation that they go far beyond Federal or State requirements under the law. This I am sure, is true, also, of the other plants in the First District.

Mr. Speaker, I am voting for the conference report, not because I think it is a perfect bill, nor do I admit it will take care of all the problems, but I am sure that the philosophies in the House version which envision the partnership of Federal and State inspection is very valuable and is the strongest feature of this bill.

The net result of this bill will be for the public—a development of a situation that was for the most part, very good, to one that makes it much better. The public should be grateful and I think most of the public will be—that the House, especially in its wisdom, had a major role in allowing the House to work its will without submitting to undue and unfair pressures. It is my conviction that no Member of the House, that I know of, at any point was guilty of voting for a "dirty meat" bill. Rather, we were supporting a very positive result by resisting moves that may not have been in the public interest.

There have been those who have made much of undue and unfair influences in the Congress, but thanks to the alertness of the House Agriculture Committee in particular, those influences and tactics had very little or no influence. So far as I am concerned, or the Iowa delegation, I am sure it could be said that none of us benefited directly or indirectly from the special fund for campaign purposes now or in the past.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the House Agriculture Committeee for the leadership it took in finally bringing out a bill that resulted in the positive, forward-looking and, hopefully, adequate and effective legislation we are passing today. This will further reassure the public of the great American process of legislating through Representatives and it will result in an even higher quality foods, while we protect the public interest in holding down the cost of its administration. I am predicting that both proponents and opponents of this legislation will be happy and that the public will finally recognize the value and virtue of the political integrity that insists on knowing all the facts and considers all of the facets that influence the process of legislation and the administration of that legislation before they cast their votes in favor of it.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report on the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967 now being considered by the House. I congratulate the conferees for bringing back to the House a stronger bill than the one passed the House a few weeks ago. At that time, I supported the Smith-Foley substitute which, in my judgment, was much more adequate and necessary than the bill reported by the committee.

I am glad that the House receded to the Senate and agreed to many of the

amendments that were adopted by the other body—amendments that make this bill a much stronger vehicle for the proper inspection of meat. The consuming public is entitled to the best possible protection and the Congress should not settle for less.

Mr. Speaker, it has been pointed out that there is no State in the Nation that comes up to the Federal standards respecting the inspection of meat. The bill that we have before us will greatly assist in bringing State standards up to the Federal regulations.

This bill is a victory for the consumer. I trust that it will be adopted overwhelmingly by the House.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I come from a meat State. More specifically, a beef State, Texas. And with these credentials, I would like to say a few words about the Federal Meat Inspection Act, and the conference report on that bill we have before us today.

All of us have followed the history of this piece of legislation. It is one with many sides. And beyond the issue of pure and wholesome meat, which everyone is for, there has been the constant problem of how to treat intrastate meats and the extent to which the Federal Government will move to protect Americans from dangerous intrastate meats.

The conference report does create a situation in which Federal standards could be applied and enforced on intrastate meats. But this alternative is not locked in. The States have an out. As you remember, the amendments offered in the House by the gentlemen from Iowa and Washington to draw in all intrastate meat plans with gross annual income over $250,000 was defeated. I believe that was a wise decision. In that amendment, the States had no choice. Federal law would have applied across the board.

In the other body, however, a very similar provision was included, so the conferees were faced with the problem of reconciling these two views.

In briefest terms, their solution allows the States to keep the initiative in the field of meat inspection, but gives them Federal matching funds when they do so. They are given 2, or on proof of good faith, 3 years to get State laws on the books which are at least as strict as the Federal meat laws amended by this same bill.

If the States fail to follow this course, then Federal standards will be applied to intrastate plants.

Some say this will impair the rights of the States. I say it will promote them. It will stimulate action both on the part of the State governments and intrastate meat producers. With enactment of this bill, all will have a valid interest in pure meat laws for their State.

Even to those who feel this solution is too much of an inroad on the powers of the States, I would ask that you weigh the factors in the balance. I do not see how there could be much argument that pure meat is absolutely primary and essential. Yesterday, President Johnson said that we must find ways to give parents assurances that every frankfurter and hamburger they give their children is pure and unadulterated.

I agree and I support the conference report.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to be recorded in favor of H.R. 12144 when it passed the House this October. I regret, however, that I cannot favor the report filed by the conferees. This report accepts the Senate provision that intrastate meat will be federally inspected unless States bring their inspection up to Federal standards. This way would be fine for a State with a highly developed livestock industry, but for Alaska it would be disastrous.

Our industry is small, struggling, and seasonal. The State has embarked upon a sensible program to develop an Alaska meat industry. I also have the views of the Governor of Alaska, Walter J. Hickel, that the bills provision will be highly detrimental to this development. Alaska has no slaughtering facilities that meet Federal inspection. Moreover such facilities cannot be built economically. The Governor opposes the provisions added by the other body. For the information of the House, I am inserting the Governor's views after my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I am as much in favor of guaranteed wholesome meat as anyone, but I fear that this legislation will be overregulation as far as the State of Alaska is concerned. The State of Alaska is not shirking its duty in this regard, yet the strong provisions of the conference bill may unnecessarily condemn the State's program and prematurely require Federal regulation of all meat produced in Alaska. Such provisions may very well be good for other areas, but may unintentionally harm the infant livestock industry of Alaska. For this reason, I must vote against the conference report.

The Governor's letter follows:

STATE OF ALASKA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Juneau, Alaska, November 29, 1967.

Hon. HOWARD POLLOCK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POLLOCK: I have recently been apprised of the passage of HR 12144 as amended by the Senate, which calls for all states to meet Federal Standards for meat inspection within a two year period, or face complete take-over by the Federal Government. The provisions of the Purcell Bill (H.R. 12144), as it originally passed the House, were not particularly onerous to Alaskans, however, the amendments proposed and agreed upon by the Senate, as you know, will virtually eliminate any chance Alaska has to develop a red meat industry, including reindeer, beef cattle, and other domestic livestock.

Alaska does not have Federal meat inspection. Neither do we have a slaughter facility that would meet the standards required under Federal Regulations. A Federal-approved slaughter facility is not economically feasible in Alaska at this time because of the relatively small volume and seasonal nature of the slaughter house business.

We are embarked on several well founded and logical programs, to revitalize the reindeer industry in Alaska, and to encourage, support and build a healthy livestock industry in the State. It appears that all of our efforts in this regard will be to no avail if Alaska is not specifically excluded in these amendments. I know you are keenly interested in seeing that this segment of Alaska's agriculture economy does not flounder, particularly before it has a chance to get underway. I urgently enlist your support and assistance in convincing your colleagues in the House that the amendments to the Purcell Bill do not accommodate the need of the people in this State and are totally detrimental. Whatever you can do in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

If you need further details and information, it will be furnished immediately through the Division of Agriculture.

Warm personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER J. HICKEL,
Governor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. 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 336, nays 28, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 427]

YEAS—336

Adams	Cleveland	Fuqua
Addabbo	Cohelan	Galifianakis
Albert	Collier	Gallagher
Anderson, Ill.	Conable	Gardner
Anderson, Tenn.	Conte	Garmatz
Andrews, Ala.	Conyers	Gettys
Andrews, N. Dak.	Corbett	Gibbons
Ashbrook	Corman	Gilbert
Ashley	Cowger	Gonzalez
Ashmore	Cramer	Goodell
Aspinall	Culver	Goodling
Ayres	Cunningham	Gray
Baring	Curtis	Green, Oreg.
Belcher	Daniels	Green, Pa.
Bennett	Davis, Wis.	Griffiths
Berry	de la Garza	Gross
Betts	Delaney	Grover
Bevill	Dellenback	Gude
Biester	Denney	Haley
Blackburn	Dent	Hall
Blanton	Derwinski	Halpern
Blatnik	Devine	Hamilton
Boggs	Dole	Hammer-schmidt
Boland	Donohue	Hanley
Bolton	Dow	Hansen, Wash.
Bow	Dowdy	Harrison
Brademas	Downing	Harsha
Brasco	Dulski	Harvey
Brock	Duncan	Hathaway
Brooks	Dwyer	Hawkins
Brotzman	Eckhardt	Hays
Brown, Mich.	Edmondson	Hechler, W. Va.
Brown, Ohio	Edwards, Ala.	Helstoski
Broyhill, N.C.	Edwards, Calif.	Herlong
Broyhill, Va.	Eilberg	Hicks
Buchanan	Erlenborn	Holifield
Burke, Fla.	Esch	Holland
Burke, Mass.	Evans, Colo.	Horton
Burton, Calif.	Everett	Hosmer
Burton, Utah	Fallon	Howard
Bush	Farbstein	Hull
Button	Fascell	Hungate
Byrne, Pa.	Feighan	Hunt
Byrnes, Wis.	Findley	Hutchinson
Cabell	Fino	Ichord
Carey	Fisher	Irwin
Carter	Flood	Jacobs
Casey	Foley	Jarman
Celler	Ford, Gerald R.	Joelson
Chamberlain	Ford, William D.	Johnson, Calif.
Clancy	Fraser	Johnson, Pa.
Clark	Friedel	Jonas
Clawson, Del	Fulton, Pa.	Jones, Ala.
	Fulton, Tenn.	Jones, N.C.

Karsten	Murphy, Ill.	Saylor
Karth	Murphy, N.Y.	Schadeberg
Kastenmeier	Myers	Scherle
Kazen	Natcher	Scheuer
Kee	Nedzi	Schneebeli
Keith	Nelsen	Schweiker
Kelly	Nichols	Schwengel
King, Calif.	Nix	Scott
King, N.Y.	O'Hara, Ill.	Selden
Kirwan	O'Hara, Mich.	Shipley
Kleppe	O'Konski	Shriver
Kluczynski	Olsen	Sikes
Kornegay	O'Neill, Mass.	Skubitz
Kupferman	Ottinger	Smith, Calif.
Kuykendall	Patman	Smith, Iowa
Kyl	Patten	Smith, N.Y.
Kyros	Pelly	Smith, Okla.
Laird	Perkins	Snyder
Langen	Pettis	Springer
Leggett	Philbin	Stafford
Lipscomb	Pickle	Staggers
Lloyd	Pike	Stanton
Long, Md.	Poff	Steiger, Ariz.
McCarthy	Pool	Steiger, Wis.
McClory	Price, Ill.	Stubblefield
McCulloch	Price, Tex.	Sullivan
McDade	Pryor	Taft
McDonald, Mich.	Pucinski	Talcott
	Purcell	Taylor
McEwen	Quie	Teague, Calif.
McFall	Railsback	Tenzer
Macdonald, Mass.	Randall	Thompson, Ga.
	Rees	Thompson, N.J.
MacGregor	Reid, Ill.	Thomson, Wis.
Machen	Reid, N.Y.	Tiernan
Mahon	Reifel	Udall
Mailliard	Reinecke	Ullman
Martin	Reuss	Utt
Mathias, Calif.	Rhodes, Pa.	Vander Jagt
Matsunaga	Riegle	Vigorito
May	Rivers	Waldie
Mayne	Roberts	Walker
Meeds	Robison	Wampler
Meskill	Rodino	Whalen
Michel	Rogers, Colo.	Whalley
Miller, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.	White
Miller, Ohio	Ronan	Whitener
Mills	Rooney, N.Y.	Widnall
Minish	Rooney, Pa.	Williams, Pa.
Mink	Rosenthal	Wilson, Bob
Minshall	Rostenkowski	Winn
Mize	Roth	Wolff
Moore	Roudebush	Wylie
Morgan	Roush	Wyman
Morris, N. Mex.	Roybal	Yates
Morse, Mass.	Rumsfeld	Young
Morton	Ruppe	Zablocki
Mosher	Ryan	Zion
Moss	St Germain	Zwach

NAYS—28

Brinkley	Lennon	Satterfield
Burleson	Long, La.	Stephens
Colmer	McClure	Stuckey
Davis, Ga.	Marsh	Teague, Tex.
Dorn	Montgomery	Waggonner
Edwards, La.	O'Neal, Ga.	Whitten
Flynt	Passman	Wiggins
Gathings	Poage	Williams, Miss.
Hansen, Idaho	Pollock	
Henderson	Rarick	

NOT VOTING—68

Abbitt	Evins, Tenn.	Quillen
Abernethy	Fountain	Resnick
Adair	Frelinghuysen	Rhodes, Ariz.
Annunzio	Gialmo	St. Onge
Arends	Gubser	Sandman
Barrett	Gurney	Sisk
Bates	Hagan	Slack
Battin	Halleck	Steed
Bell	Hanna	Stratton
Bingham	Hardy	Tuck
Bolling	Hébert	Tunney
Bray	Heckler, Mass.	Van Deerlin
Broomfield	Jones, Mo.	Vanik
Brown, Calif.	Landrum	Watkins
Cahill	Latta	Watson
Cederberg	Lukens	Watts
Clausen, Don H.	McMillan	Willis
	Madden	Wilson, Charles H.
Daddario	Mathias, Md.	
Dawson	Monagan	Wright
Dickinson	Moorhead	Wyatt
Diggs	Multer	Wydler
Dingell	Pepper	
Eshleman	Pirnie	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Bates.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Battin.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Tuck.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Vanik with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Slack.
Mr. St. Onge with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. PASSMAN 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.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter regarding the conference report just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY TO CONSIDER AND WAIVER OF POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST A BILL MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Tuesday next or any subsequent day next week to consider a bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1968 and that all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein be considered as waived.

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, if this bill is brought up, as to whether there will be adequate time for debate and whether the time will be divided on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. MAHON. I would like to say to the gentleman that I will be glad to work with the gentleman from Ohio, the ranking minority member on the Appropriations Committee, and agree to an equal division of the time. A time for debate will be provided which should be reasonably agreeable to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I understand that this is a supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman from Ohio will yield further, this would be the supplemental appropriation bill, 1968, which would consist principally of appropriations for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, can the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] give us some idea as to what other supplementals are included in this request and as to whether this represents a large supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. MAHON. It will be a relatively small supplemental appropriation bill. I have asked the executive branch of the Government not to send down any supplemental requests which are not direly needed, and as I understand it, we shall have no supplemental requests at all, other than the requests that came before us in January, but which have not been previously funded through an appropriation bill. There might be some emergency items about which I am not aware.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, if I may ask one further question of the distinguished gentleman from Texas—and this is a particular query—why do we waive points of order?

Mr. MAHON. Our particular reference is to whether or not the House passes upon the economic opportunity conference report on Monday. It could hardly clear the Congress and be signed by the President of the United States short of a few days. We would hope that we could hasten the consideration of the supplemental bill. It is out of our desire to adjourn this Congress next week that the request is being made. I am making this request so as to expedite the adjournment of the Congress and after full consultation with the leadership of the House.

Mr. BOW. I appreciate that statement on the part of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, but I am trying to inquire as to what is contained in the bill upon which we are asked to waive points of order.

Mr. MAHON. It is the Office of Economic Opportunity, and that is the only agency involved.

Mr. BOW. Can the distinguished gentleman from Texas tell the Members of the House what some of the items are upon which the waiving of points of order are called for?

Mr. MAHON. Of what?

Mr. BOW. The waiving of points of order?

Mr. MAHON. Certain items contained within this bill are subject to a point of order, the entire appropriation for the antipoverty bill will be out of order until the President signs the authorizing bill.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman from Texas means that the authorization bill would not be signed by that time?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am glad that point has just been clarified. As I understand it, the reason for waiving points of order is because the authorization bill for the Office of Economic Opportunity will not have become law through the signature of the President at the time specified? In other words, that is the only reason that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] asks to waive all points of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Ohio will yield further, the gentleman from Michigan is correct. This is the only reason for the request. There is nothing else that I can envisage in the appropriation bill where a point of order might obtain.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES IS NOT ALONE IN RESISTING COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the charges frequently heard from those who criticize our efforts in supporting the struggle of the people of South Vietnam against Communist aggression is that we are alone in assisting this effort—that the world in fact condemns us for it.

One of the leading statesmen of that part of the world is Mr. Keith Holyoake, the Prime Minister of New Zealand. New Zealand, as you know, is rendering both economic and military assistance to the Republic of Vietnam. On November 27, Mr. Holyoake issued a major statement on the subject of Vietnam. The Prime Minister defined the question at stake in very lucid terms and gave the reasons why New Zealand answered the call. He stated:

> The stark fact is that Hanoi does not want peace except on its own terms.

The Prime Minister concluded his address with this thought:

> The South Vietnamese have shown that they overwhelmingly reject the Communist plans for the future of their country and they have firmly indicated that they wish to follow the path of free democratic government.
>
> Certainly the stage has been set for new efforts to further the social revolution which is under way in South Viet Nam and to pursue the search for a negotiated settlement of the conflict. If only the North Vietnamese will face up to the startling changes which have occurred in South Viet Nam this could be a turning point in the long struggle for peace in Viet Nam.

Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Holyoake, like our own President, very much wants peace in Vietnam. But, he is under no illusions as to who is preventing it.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. 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. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week and any information in general or otherwise that the gentleman can give us concerning the program for next week and any other matters of interest to the Members.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we have no further legislative business for this week. It will be my intention to ask unanimous consent to go over from tomorrow until Monday.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1967

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 7977, THE POSTAL REVENUE AND FEDERAL SALARY ACT OF 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in order to be able to answer the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, fully, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House on the bill H.R. 7977 have until midnight Saturday night to file a conference report on that bill, the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, could the distinguished majority leader tell us whether or not this conference report is ready for filing, or whether indeed the conference has been concluded?

Mr. ALBERT. The conference has not been concluded, and this request of course will be moot unless the conference is concluded by that time.

Mr. HALL. And the request is for filing it by midnight Saturday night?

Mr. ALBERT. Midnight, Saturday night. The only reason for this request is to make this conference report eligible for consideration in the House on Monday.

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

Mr. HALL. Could the distinguished majority leader, Mr. Speaker—continuing to reserve the right to object—advise us as to whether or not there is additional programing for Monday, at this time, before the gentleman asks his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. ALBERT. I will be glad to withhold the unanimous-consent request until I make a further announcement.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we will announce the legislative program as far as we are able to do so in formal form tomorrow, and notices will be sent out as usual by the whips, but for the edification of the Members we do expect important conference reports on Monday, and these include:

S. 2388, which is the Economic Opportunity Act amendments; H.R. 7977, which is the Postal Revenue and Federal Salaries Act of 1967; and probably also H.R. 13510, the military pay bill. And if we get to it, H.R. 6167, the ship loans bill.

Then I would advise further that, pursuant to the agreement reached on the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the supplemental appropriation bill will be programed sometime after Monday, that is, Tuesday through the balance of the week. Also on sometime Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday, the conference report on H.R. 4675, which is a tax matter, and sometime on Tuesday or Wednesday, the conference report H.R. 12080, the Social Security Amendments of 1967, will be considered.

And this announcement, of course, is made subject to all of these conference reports being ready by the time indicated.

Mr. Speaker, I would state to the Members that the reason we are endeavoring to move on these is, of course, we are looking forward and hoping that we will be able to adjourn this session of Congress late next week.

There is a continuing resolution out of the Committee on Appropriations and also others to come. I am just mentioning those that we know about at the present time.

I also wish to announce to the House that the Speaker of the House has advised today that it will be our purpose on adjournment to adjourn to reconvene on January 15.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 7977, TO ADJUST CERTAIN POSTAGE RATES AND RATES OF BASIC COMPENSATION IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I renew my unanimous consent request made on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] that the conferees on the bill, H.R. 7977, adjusting certain postal rates and basic compensation of Federal employees, have until midnight Saturday night to file a conference report.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the information that has been brought out, I gladly withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

ONE MAN CAN AFFECT GOVERNMENT SPENDING

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the question is often posed: "What can one man in the Federal Government do to help cut unnecessary spending and economize in Government?"

Indeed, it sometimes seems futile.

But I was pleased to read of "one" such man in the New York Times Monday. And I think the story can serve as a parable to those who sometimes wonder if indeed one man can correct a part of this huge machine called Federal Government.

John Wills Tuthill, the U.S. Ambassador to Brazil, is the man I am speaking of. Instead of continuing to accept the traditional practice of proliferating the staff of his mission, he has recommended a cutback.

As yet we have no real knowledge of what this cutback will mean in savings to the American taxpayer, but the Times' article said that the reduction of personnel may be as high as 300 and that this would result in a savings of $7.5 million.

I think we owe John Wills Tuthill a debt for speaking out. And we owe him a debt for effectively managing the operation of our Embassy in Brazil. It appears that the State Department intends to see what can be done in cutting other unnecessary manpower and costs in our other Embassies around the world, and I commend this move most heartily.

Here is a man who is doing his job and more. I wish we had more like him.

At this time I would like to include for the information of my colleagues the story from the Times:

UNITED STATES TO CUT MISSIONS ABROAD—STATE DEPARTMENT IS MOVING TO REDUCE PERSONNEL

(By Benjamin Welles)

WASHINGTON, December 3.—Early last summer John Wills Tuthill, the United States Ambassador to Brazil, noticed amid his daily influx of telegrams, airgrams, reports and memorandums a request from an agency in Washington for a survey on "bats and noxious birds" in Brazil.

For Mr. Tuthill it was the final straw in a steady escalation of programs that had expanded the personnel in the American Embassy in Rio to nearly 1,000 United States citizens and more than 1,000 Brazilian employes.

Since then, Mr. Tuthill has had the offending request framed, and Secretary of State Dean Rusk has authorized a review of United States programs—new and old—in Latin America.

To start, Mr. Tuthill will invite to Brazil representatives of the State and Defense Departments, the agency for International Development, United States Information Service and other Federal agencies and ask them to cut their staffs in Brazil by a third to a half.

"Every United States Government employe overseas costs the taxpayer an average of $25,000 per year," said a senior State Department administrator. "In Brazil alone, Jack Tuthill's personnel cuts may come to 300 people—about $7.5-million in savings."

Mr. Tuthill is due to report here soon, and while his recommendations are still secret there is little doubt that they will be heartily approved at the highest echelons of the State Department.

In fact, some officials predict that Mr. Tuthill's "Operation Topsy"—so named because the staff in Rio "just growed," like the character in "Uncle Tom's Cabin"—will be copied in a dozen or so other major United States Embassies.

In London, Paris, Rome, Bonn, Moscow, Mexico City, New Delhi, Manila and Tokyo the United States missions each have about 1,000 United States citizens.

A fifth represent the State Department; the rest are sent by 34 Government agencies ranging down to obscure bureaus that request—and virtually always get—surveys on such specialized topics as "bats and noxious birds."

In the 119 United States Embassies, the Ambassador is the head of the entire "country team," as the American representatives are known. This authority was established by President Kennedy soon after taking office.

Every year, under the Ambassador's supervision, each Federal component of the country team—State, Defense, Central Intelligence Agency, and so forth—estimates its requirements in money, manpower and other resources for the year ahead and the reports are submitted by the Ambassador to the State Department.

In Washington, however, Secretary Rusk's authority over the other Federal agencies operations abroad is far less clear. Until recently they have drawn their programs and sent their personnel to join the overseas missions with virtual authority.

An experienced administrator said:

"Even now any enterprising bureaucrat can get a program started overseas by getting a State Department airgram [official air-mail letter], asking for some study or other and getting the right number of signatures on it.

"But we're moving in to stop that. We're not only going to cut back excess personnel overseas but we're going to weed out unproductive old programs and screen requests for new ones."

This global house-cleaning was proposed before President Johnson's recent call for trims in Federal expenditures to help his tax bill in Congress.

It stems, essentially, from the President's National Security Action Memorandum 341 of March 4, 1966—known colloquially as a "Nassum"—which reasserted for the Federal bureaucracy the over-all authority of the Secretary of State in foreign affairs.

ADVISER TO JOHNSON

Mr. Rusk prefers to concentrate on serving as President Johnson's foreign affairs adviser, and he tends to leave the running of the State Department, and particularly its relations with other agencies, to his subordinates.

However, Nassum 341 created machinery for coordinating foreign affairs and this, in turn, is beginning to have far-reaching results.

Mr. Rusk has appointed Under Secretary of State Nicholas deB. Katzenbach chairman of the seven-member Senior Interdepartmental Group, which is made up of senior officials from Defense, the aid agency, U.S.I.A., C.I.A., the White House and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Once weekly they meet to coordinate overseas policy. And, barring an appeal to the White House, the State Department now calls the shots.

Similarly, the five assistant secretaries of state who are responsible for various global areas preside over Interdepartmental Regional Groups—lower-level meetings of officials from the Federal agencies operating abroad.

The State Department's "primacy," therefore, is slowly beginning to extend, in fact as well as theory, throughout the Government machinery.

Under Mr. Katzenbach's supervision the department in recent months has taken steps to tighten its control over Federal operations abroad and to cut much of the "fat" from overseas programs.

COLOR TV SETS STILL EMITTING HIGH LEVELS OF RADIATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Public Health Service today is issuing a report stating that many of the GE color television sets which emitted high levels of radiation in Pinellas County, Fla., have not been properly adjusted and are indeed still emitting levels of radiation above the recommended levels.

The report is the result of a joint effort of PHS and the Pinellas County Health Department. The two groups surveyed 131 color sets manufactured by General Electric. The sets tested were of the model which was called back because defective parts were causing excess radiation to be emitted.

Yet of the 131 sets tested, which were supposed to have been corrected, 28 percent were still emitting excess radiation.

We do not know what correlation can be drawn from this survey as applied to the other 100,000 sets which had defective parts. But the sets tested in Florida, which still were defective, used parts which are also used by other manufacturers.

At this time, I would like to quote from the PHS report:

The high voltage settings and leakage from high voltage rectifier tubes observed in the survey suggest the need to reevaluate levels of X-radiation exposure from sets of other manufacturers. We have asked the Electronic Industries Association to review the X-radiation emission situation for the entire industry. The Public Health Service will extend its investigations to include an evaluation of radiation emissions from sets of other manufacturers.

I think this report should reinforce our concern over the potential health hazard which is involved here. I have introduced legislation which would remedy the situation and I ask that my colleagues join with me to see that this legislation is acted upon immediately.

For today's report released by the PHS once again points out the need for radiation control legislation. But the problem which faces us is not limited to X-ray emissions from color television receivers. Rather, we are continuously being bombarded by increasing amounts from many electronic devices. Another problem area, which should be given

equal concern, is that of the unnecessary overexposure to X-radiation by improperly trained technicians, oftentimes using defective diagnostic devices.

I would like to call my colleague's attention to my remarks found on page A5958 of the daily RECORD for December 5, 1967. Within my remarks is the text of a speech by the first deputy commissioner of the New York State Department of Health, delivered at a recent national conference on the licensure of X-ray technicians. I believe that it clearly points out the great need for radiation control legislation; and yet it concerns not color television, but the use of X-ray devices by the medical professions.

As the PHS continues to keep me advised of their progress, I will, from time to time, endeavor to keep my colleagues informed. For surely, a problem of such significance to the national health demands the concern of the Congress.

THE CARDINAL SPELLMAN LEGACY IN WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS, BY RICHARD C. GARVEY, MANAGING EDITOR, THE SPRINGFIELD DAILY NEWS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the late Francis Cardinal Spellman, a native son of Massachusetts who from modest beginnings rose to become one of the great princes of the Roman Catholic Church, a friend and adviser to Popes and Presidents of the United States, and the spiritual shepherd of millions of Americans serving in the Armed Forces over the last quarter century.

Cardinal Spellman was a patriotic American and a great churchman who was always concerned for the sick, the poor and the unfortunate. He was warmhearted, generous and a man of great humility who dedicated his life and energy to the principle of equal justice for all.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of Cardinal Spellman is a great loss to his church which he loved, to his country which he cherished, and to people throughout the world of every race and creed who benefited from his great works and charity.

The people of Massachusetts have special memories of Cardinal Spellman, and particularly those from the Roman Catholic Diocese of Springfield embracing my congressional district. I include with my remarks an article from the Springfield Daily News of December 5, written by Richard C. Garvey, the distinguished managing editor of the newspaper, entitled "Cardinal's Legacy: Spellman Gave Us a Bishop."

CARDINAL'S LEGACY: SPELLMAN GAVE US A BISHOP

(By Richard C. Garvey)

The links between Western Massachusetts Catholics and the Archdiocese of New York were, for more than a century, more apparent than real. During recent years, the bond formed has been less obvious but more meaningful. That is a part, small only by comparison, of Francis Cardinal Spellman's legacy.

EARLY FRIENDSHIP

The evidence of early friendship between Springfield and New York Catholics is impressive.

—Springfield's first Catholic church was largely the labor of love of a New York City Catholic, Eliakim Parker Scammon.

—The archbishop of New York came here to consecrate Springfield's first bishop in 1870.

—New York's (and the country's) first cardinal stopped en route from Rome to his own archbishopric to visit friends in this diocese. It is recorded here, if not in New York, that Cardinal McCloskey's first blessing was given, not in St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York, but in Holy Name Church in Chicopee.

—The Sisters of Providence, when they came to this region from Canada, went to New York City to get the contributions needed to support their earliest works at Ingleside.

However, all of these events were more coincidental than symbolic. They were threads, usually unconnected, and never forming a planned design.

FRIENDS FOR YEARS

Cardinal Spellman came to Springfield in 1949 to preside at the requiem Mass for the Most Rev. Thomas M. O'Leary, third bishop of Springfield. That the cardinal and bishop had been friends for many years was not well known here, and documentation of this friendship did not publicly appear until several years after the bishop's death when the Rev. Robert I. Gannon, S.J., in his biography of the cardinal, referred to one of Msgr. Spellman's visits with Bishop O'Leary here, and quoted from their correspondence.

When Bishop Spellman had gone from his native Massachusetts to become New York's archbishop in 1939, the Rev. Christopher J. Weldon, a priest only 10 years, was serving as a curate in a Manhattan church. Under the guidance of his new archbishop, Fr. Weldon advanced rapidly during the next decade, although almost half of it was spent as a Navy chaplain during World War II.

PROMOTED TO DIRECTOR

In 1947, Cardinal Spellman named Fr. Weldon as assistant director of archdiocesan charities. Before the year ended, Fr. Weldon was promoted to director, and named a papal chamberlain by Pope Pius XII.

When Msgr. Weldon marked the 20th anniversary of his ordination, he was already a domestic prelate and a member of the Board of Consultors advising the cardinal in the administration of the huge archdiocese. Three weeks later, Bishop O'Leary died, and the cardinal considered his new consultor to be a worthy and highly qualified successor to the cardinal's late friend.

HEADS CAMPAIGN

Msgr. Weldon not only served as director of the complex archdiocesan charities system, and headed the campaign to raise millions yearly for its support, but he also was the cardinal's aide throughout the archdiocese, and his companion on trips within the United States and abroad.

Oftentimes, the monsignor's work poured out of the cardinal's orderly briefcase which traveled with him everywhere. Other times, there was surprises, such as when Msgr. Weldon was quickly drafted as interpreter for the cardinal's major press conference in Paris.

RELEASES ASSISTANT

It would have been reasonable for the cardinal to insist that this uniquely trained monsignor should remain in the archdiocese for which he had been ordained. It would even have been understandable if the cardinal, then in his 60's, had personally retained his consultor's services, instead of offering them to a diocese which is not even within the cardinal's responsibility as metropolitan of the New York Province. However, he released his assistant and personally consecrated him as Springfield's fourth bishop.

Tributes are being paid to the late cardinal for his services to the church, the country and the world, but this little corner we call Western Massachusetts can add its tribute for the generous spirit which he showed us in 1950, and which labors vicariously for us yet.

THE DENVER POST OUTLINES WITH CLARITY THE HOPES AND POSSIBLE DESPAIR OF THE MODEL CITIES PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Denver Post outlined with great clarity the hopes and possible despair of the model cities program.

The people of Denver were delighted to find their city among those chosen to participate in the multifaceted attack on the root causes of urban blight. But, with hopes raised high and programs ready to go forward the spectre of inadequate funds has cast a shadow on plans for the future of the model cities program. The Post has described the obligations of Congress to our cities and the seeds of disaster that lie in our neglect of urban problems. I commend this editorial to all Members of the House:

MODEL CITIES: BIG CHANCE FOR DENVER

The announcement that Denver has made the select list of 63 cities qualifying for the Model Cities program is, Mayor Tom Currigan said Thursday, "exciting and rewarding" news.

The prospects are indeed exciting; we hope they are rewarding. Mayor Currigan deserves commendation for Denver's success.

Certainly there can be a multi-million-dollar reward to the city for Currigan's enterprise in working up Denver's winning entry in a nationwide competition among hundreds of cities. We have some misgivings, though, about whether there is as much enterprise and commitment to this program on the national level as there is in City Hall.

There are two great attractions about the Model Cities program which inspired Currigan to put aides to work night and day for several months, preparing Denver's winning proposal.

First, Model Cities offers a city for the first time the opportunity to attack in one comprehensive program every defect, every problem, people have in a disadvantaged neighborhood.

Sociologists have long known that when you try to remedy one problem at a time in a poverty neighborhood, other worsening problems linked to the one you are attacking may prevent success in the one you are working on.

They have long thought that if a city could ever figure out all the many things that need fixing up in a poverty area, and fix them up in coordinated fashion all at once, the city would have a chance to make a real

impact—to change the lives of the people in that neighborhood permanently for the better.

This is the big chance Model Cities offers. This is why Currigan and mayors all over the nation have been so excited about it.

The second great attraction is the financing—the most generous, on paper, of any federal program for cities. Not only is the federal government to provide funds on an 80–20 matching basis when the work starts. The participating city also will be eligible to receive an additional grant of up to 80 per cent of the 20 per cent the city contributes for additional programs it finds needed within the area for which no federal funds otherwise would be available.

Right now, all that Denver is getting is $223,000 to turn its winning proposals into detailed, coordinated, working plans. Then Denver and the other cities involved will have to go back to Congress for the actual working money.

This is where we have misgivings. All systems are go at City Hall on the planning job. Task forces of citizens from the target areas and city officials are set up and some of them already at work. We have little doubt that within a year Denver will have plans ready to fund and put into operation.

We can only hope that, when Denver is ready, Congress will be ready with the money. On this year's congressional record of niggardliness to the cities' poverty areas, the prospects are not too bright. Funds for Model Cities itself were cut by the House from about $600 million to $312 million. Other worthwhile urban programs were cut even more.

When Denver and other cities come in with their final Model Cities plans, looking for money, Congress had better be ready. These plans are going to raise hopes among millions of people for whom hope is usually in short supply. There could be hell to pay if those hopes are dashed.

A GUIDE FOR THE PERPLEXED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I noticed, a few days ago, in the Air Force/Space Digest, an article by Amrom H. Katz, a senior staff member of the Rand Corp., with wide experience in working his way through the rough waters of the bureaucracy. He put into words eight maxims which are worthy of review. I believe, as he does, that when we stop confusing the issue we will get more out of the woods. I recommend your review of "A Guide for the Perplexed," that follows:

A GUIDE FOR THE PERPLEXED—OR A MINIMAL/MAXIM-AL HANDBOOK FOR TOURISTS IN A CLASSIFIED BUREAUCRACY

(By Amrom H. Katz)

(NOTE.—Mr. Katz is a regular contributor to Air Force/Space Digest. His by-line last appeared here in the June '67 issue with the article "The Short Run and the Long Walk." A senior staff member of the Rand Corporation, he is widely recognized as an expert on such matters as arms control and reconnaissance. The views in this article are those of Mr. Katz and should not be interpreted as reflecting the views of the Rand Corporation or the official opinion or policy of its governmental or private research sponsors.)

Some fifteen years ago, after more than ten years of life as an entrenched bureaucrat and not-too-civil servant behind the lines in the Air Force's Aerial Reconnaissance Laboratory at Wright Field at Dayton, Ohio, I was assigned, and was able to successfully carry off, the role of guide, adviser, and philosopher to a group of younger associates.

I had been struck over the years by the continual recurrence in the jungles of bureaucracy of patterns of conflict, concealment, collusion, confusion, and corruption. Thus, when I was faced with the problem of providing guidance and insight for younger, softer-skinned, and wondering associates (all of whom had less experience and success than I in fighting city hall), I found it necessary to produce a set of maxims which wrap up most of the more obnoxious aspects of life in a bureaucracy.

These observations proved of considerable use to the group. In fact, they described about ninety-eight percent of the situations that later arose.

Most organizations evolve methods, systems, and a competence which relate to the organization itself. They evolve procedures as well: goals and discipline which, though always identified as facilitating the organization's end product, usually take precedence over the end product and, after a while, *become* the end product.

If not a major objective, then certainly a major result of much organizational machinery is to attenuate, filter, refract, and distort the line of (in)sight between a question and an answer. This produces the *"understanding gap,"* a gap which preceded and outlives the "bomber gap" and the "missile gap." This understanding gap was and remains more important than more publicized gaps.

The objective of the serious worker may be simply to understand why and how he is stymied. More often the serious worker really "wants to get something done." Understanding these maxims should satisfy the first group and serve as a necessary precondition to eventual success for the second group. You have to know what's biting you before reaching for a remedy!

The worker who insists that what he really wants are guides to getting things done, not mere explanations of his dilemma, may not be entirely happy or satisfied with these maxims. He will have to wait for another paper devoted to "Getting the Job Done."

Please remember that these maxims were developed to describe the situations I encountered in *my* orbiting. If they seem applicable to other government agencies, to large business organizations, to large nongovernmental nonbusiness groups, this is unintended, but probably not entirely coincidental. Organizations take on and develop similar garb and customs independently of each other.

It is interesting, and just a little sad, to see how new organizations, with shining escutcheons and high hopes, oft made up of rebels and refugees and defectors from older organizations, gradually take on the crust, the bureaucratic symptoms, the organizational *apparat, raison d'être*, and style of the older organizations.

The deficiencies, ineptitudes, and roughness of new organizations are often explained away with, "Don't criticize them. They're just getting started." This reminds me of a remark once made about the United States: "The US is the only country in the history of the world to go from barbarism to decadence without an intervening, civilization." Similarly, organizations should not go directly from infancy to senility without going through maturity.

A reformulation of Gresham's law is needed to explain this phenomenon (in economic theory, this law states, "Bad money drives out good money"). For a bureaucracy, the law states: "Bad habits drive out good habits."

My first five maxims were compiled in 1950, and I've found no reason to modify them. Maxims Six through Eight were developed in the last few years.

Maxim One: Where Are the Calculations That Go With the Calculated Risk?

All of us who go to briefings have heard brave men declaim: "We're going to take a calculated risk." Do you ever see any of the calculations? All we see is the risk. A long look into a big dictionary helps. There we find that the exact sense of the phrase "calculated risk" is "deliberate risk," or "understood risk." "Calculated," however, has come to be associated with numbers, actuarial science, and worse yet, systems analysis.

Webster's New International yields:

"cal'cu lat'ed . . . Adapted by calculation, forethought, or contrivance to accomplish a purpose; hence, loosely to produce a certain effect; fitted; adapted; suited. 'Calculated to injure rather than benefit society.'—Goldsmith."

According to this definition, a calculated risk is adapted by contrivance to accomplish a purpose, clearly ensuring that there really is a risk!

So, a *calculated risk* is simply a deliberate risk. But most unsuspecting audiences feel that somewhere there is a set of calculations that justify the risk. Interrupting a speaker with Maxim One will usually derail him. If you want to stop a speaker, try it on him! He is probably unaware of the alternate meaning of the word.

Maxim Two: Inventing Is Easy for Staff Outfits. Stating a Problem Is Much Harder. Instead of Stating Problems People Like to Pass Out Half-accurate Statements Together with Half-available Solutions Which They Can't Finish and Which They Want You to Finish.

All organizations have staff level groups, higher headquarters, front offices, planning groups, and similar collections of high-level busybodies, who bug everyone below them with problems. Problems, stated as such, would be OK. It's the problem accompanied by incomplete solutions that makes a mess. The way people fight to get on staff positions, in the front office, or in higher headquarters, you'd think they'd be glad to abandon the screwdriver. No, they insist on continuing the low-level work. It's truly amazing how seldom *problems* alone are stated.

When someone's half-completed brainstorm is passed down from on high, you can be sure that if it could have worked, or been finished, it would never have been passed down. I wish these guys who wanted high level jobs would work at them. There are enough people down below!

Maxim Three: Every Organization Is Self-perpetuating. Don't Ever Ask an Outfit to Justify Itself, or You'll Be Covered with Fact, Figures, and Fancy. The Criterion Should Rather Be, "What Will Happen If the Outfit Stops Doing What It's Doing?" The Value of an Organizaton Is Easier Determined This Way.

Anyone who has ever asked an organization, or an element of one, say a division, section, branch, or unit, "What do you do?" knows that a long and often emotional briefing will follow. They'll prove their indispensability by charts, directives, regulations, and job descriptions. One usually wonders how the world ever got along *before* this organization was created!

Sometime try asking the reverse question, "What would happen to the (. . . Air Force, Department of Defense, U.S., corporation, company . . .) if your organization were abolished?" This is a very embarrassing question. Save it for the moment of truth, savor it, guard it, don't use it prematurely—for when *this* bomb is dropped the game is usually over!

Also, be very cautious. This question may be turned around and tried on the questioner!

Maxim Four: Try to Find Out Who's Doing the Work, Not Who's Writing About It, Controlling It, or Summarizing It.

When organizations get rich, when there's much money coursing through the arteries of the organization, then the number of people *talking* about work increases rapidly, without a proportional increase in the number of people *doing* the work.

I will never forget a case in point. Back in the lean postwar years of the Air Force, there was one man in the Pentagon who concerned himself with the affairs of one laboratory out at Wright Field. Whenever the higher staffs of the Air Force had questions about this laboratory and its projects, this chap handled them. He took care of budgets, projects, and related paperwork. But then a huge and powerful organization was interposed between Wright Field and the Pentagon. This was called the Air Research and Development Command, and was situated in Baltimore. Our solitary man from Washington moved to this new organization and set up shop with fifteen or sixteen helpers.

Now questions, forms, problems started flowing to the laboratory at Wright Field, and paper started flowing back. Much conversation was generated. By the way, to keep up with all this activity, the one chap in the Pentagon was replaced by about eight or nine, who kept busy dealing with the sixteen in Baltimore. After a while, the laboratory at the bottom of the chart did little but fill out forms, answer questions, and prepare summaries, tables, and charts! That became the work!

Of course, when there was only the one fellow in the Pentagon to deal with, he couldn't generate this much work. He worked hard, perhaps ten hours per day, but he did sleep.

This illustrates the *inverted pyramid* effect. Down at the bottom is a project engineer, a worker, or a scientist. Above him, as if created by administrative fission, are layers and levels of organizational boxes—units, sections, branches, groups, departments, divisions, commands—all of them filled with bosses and chiefs. All these people spend most of their time talking about the poor engineer and what he's doing at the bottom. This guy could drop dead, and the sheer internal momentum and inertia of the system would carry on conversation about him for two years before the absence of new work would be detected!

It is a genuine struggle, but one worth the effort, to get to the chap who knows what he is talking about from firsthand information. The dilution and errors of fact occurring in second- or thirdhand information doesn't prevent people from presenting it as their work!

Maxim Five: Watch Out for Formal Briefings. They Often Produce an Avalanche. (Definition: A High-level Snow Job of Massive and Overwhelming Proportions.)

Large numbers of beautifully colored charts filled with detail are often a giveaway for a briefing with low content. In principle, a briefing is supposed to convey information succinctly, painlessly, and at minimum wear and tear on the audience. But not all briefings serve this end. When there is really nothing to say, when the work is inferior, when lack of effort requires camouflage—then the prescription calls for expensive, detailed charts with many words, figures, and graphs.

Genuine ideas are so rare—and so easily described and recognized—that burying them in a multichart briefing guarantees their loss. So be suspicious; perhaps no ideas are being presented.

If a briefer wants to put over a fast one, he will schedule a briefing directly after a heavy lunch, and then show slides. The hour and the darkness will always cause severe attrition among the audience.

The most suspect briefings are those which put several speakers on stage at the same time. Sentence one is said by the chap on the left, sentence two by the one on the right, etc. Often several slide projectors are used simultaneously. You are so bewildered and bemused by the mechanics of the presentation that you may not notice that no information is being conveyed.

Maxim Six: The Difficulty of the Coordination Task Often Blinds One to the Fact That a Fully Coordinated Piece of Paper Is Not Supposed to Be Either the Major or The Final Product of the Organization, But It Often Turns Out That Way.

The gradual elevation in importance of two-dimensional paper over the three-dimensional subjects and objects the paper is about was almost inevitable. If one is in an organization whose direct visible output is a paper, whose daily activities are the production and coordination of a paper—it would take a strong-minded rebel to resist.

The reason it is so hard to get a paper coordinated is easy to understand. First, these "papers" may be policy directives, statement of doctrine, guidance documents, etc. Second, "coordination" means getting agreement (the jargon for this is "concurrence") among all groups whose agreement is necessary. The paper is mailed from one office to another, usually dwelling and ripening in each office for a long time. The real problem is this: It usually takes only one "no" to stop something, but near unanimous agreement to do it.

It is clear that if a "yes" is as likely as a "no," the chance of getting one "no" greatly exceeds the probability of a couple of dozen "yeses." You can always bet that throwing a single tail with a coin is much more probable than throwing two dozen consecutive heads!

Thus it happens that a career of several years can be spent in coordinating documents, and perhaps pushing one all the way through, fully coordinated. So, small wonder that, to those in a paper-centered headquarters organization, it appears that the major product is paper.

We know that this isn't really the case. The paper is or should be about real objects and procedures, all located elsewhere—at Cape Kennedy, Vandenberg AFB, or a SAC base.

Nonetheless, paper procedures, forms, and documents multiply. One type of document, which may seem to have endurance, value, and long life, can be eliminated in a flash and be replaced by several new ones. Even such evidence fails to deter those who, genuinely interested in the real world, are hypnotized by paper work and revel in coordination as a way of life.

Maxim Seven: Most Organizations Can't Hold More Than One Idea at a Time . . . Thus Complementary Ideas Are Always Regarded as Competitive. Further, Like a Quantized Pendulum, an Organization Can Jump From One Extreme to the Other, Without Ever Going Through the Middle.

All of us who have tried to sell a new idea or project which is complementary to an existing one know that it is like storming a well-defended fort. The defenders of the entrenched idea feel insecure and threatened by a new idea, even when the new idea is not competitive with one being defended. The bigger the organization, the more firmly the single idea is held, the better it is defended, and the harder a new idea—and its proponents—are assailed and rejected.

But when a new idea finally triumphs, the older one is completely rejected. Thus we see big organizations behaving like a jerky pendulum—quantized in two end positions. The organization doesn't swing smoothly from one position to another. It jumps instantaneously and unpredictably.

Maxim Eight: Try to Find the Real Tense of the Report You Are Reading: Was It Done, Is It Being Done, or Is It Something to Be Done. Reports Are Now Written in Four Tenses: Past Tense, Present Tense, Future Tense, and Pretense. Watch for Novel Uses of Congram (CONtractor, GRAMmar), Defined by the Imperfect Past, the Insufficient Present, and the Absolutely Perfect Future.

In the good old days it took you no more than a day to read a report. This golden period ended perhaps a dozen years ago. I may have been naïve, but I don't recall that then I ever seriously doubted the facts in a report I was reading. If someone said *he* did something, I believed him. I never thought that the report had been cribbed from other reports, or that it reproduced others' data without check.

But in those days reports were fairly thin; the 500-page report, let alone the 5,000-page report, was not yet born. Then there appeared an innocent-looking invention, which I believe has done more to corrupt our lives and drive us to bifocals than anything else since World War II—spiral binding! Before this insidious invention became popular, reports were stapled, thus limiting their thickness. But the new plastic binders permitted writing long reports, for they could be opened flat. Then the disease of multivolume reports became epidemic; many project reports got to be a foot or more thick!

The airlines used to have a test fixture at the weigh-in counter. It carried the note: "If your bag fits in here, you can carry it aboard the airplane." I had a similar gadget in my office: "If your report fits in here, I'll read it; if it doesn't, the hell with it." This go, no-go gauge was made partially obsolete by the insidious introduction of multivolume reports.

Despite being printed, these reports are frequently unwritten. Instead of being a literate, interesting summary of work, they are a compilation of data charts, held together by dull English. It is easy to be persuaded that some reports are written by a machine. If only we could get them *read* by a machine! Perhaps the machine could also tell us the correct tense of the report: Was the work done, is it being done, will it be done, or is it in pre-tense?

The huge contractors, the big projects, the requirement for detailed proposals before a contract is awarded, have resulted in a new art form—*proposal writing*.

Proposals are sometimes prepared in answer to a request—in response to which several contractors may prepare proposals. Sometimes a contractor gets an idea for something he thinks should be done—and prepares an *unsolicited* proposal.

Into the proposal—often a thick, expensive production—the contractor can pour his best talent, his finest literary efforts, his dreams, his hopes, his optimism. Here the proposed project reaches its highest peak; here we see the promised land! And so it remains, unless the contractor is awarded the contract. Then the constraints of the real world set in, and changes, deviations from the proposal, have to be made.

Back to the proposal language, which I call CONGRAM (from CONtractor GRAMmar). Dealing as it does in the dividends of a golden future, CONGRAM must reflect the errors of the past, highlight the inadequacy of the present, and point to the bright and glorious future. The basic tenses of English grammar are shunted aside; for them are substituted the elements of CONGRAM; the *imperfect past* (used to describe the deficiencies of the past, about to be corrected via the new proposal), the *insufficient present* (to justify the presentation of the new proposal), and the *absolutely perfect future* (to describe what will happen when the proposal is accepted and acted upon). Some worry about the future emergence and spread of George Orwell's "Newspeak." CONGRAM is already here!

Travelers to foreign lands need and use handbooks on the local customs, geography, and history. So do residents of vast bureaucracies. I hope these maxims hitherto passed along by word of mouth and in smuggled private printings to friends, will be of use to a larger audience.

L. B. J. AND THE AMERICAN NEGRO

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, Roy Wilkins, one of the most distinguished students of race relations in this country, has written a perceptive article on Lyndon B. Johnson and his historical role concerning the Negro American.

Writing in the New York Post last week, Wilkins said:

> The inescapable truth is that no President in history, with the possible exception of Abraham Lincoln, has done more for the . . . Negro citizen.

Wilkins pointed out something we in Congress should all know, that President Johnson won many of his civil rights battles against very vocal and stanch opposition. For centuries, as Wilkins notes, every institution in our society conspired to maintain segregation and discrimination.

When another President might have been content to rest with the knowledge of having passed the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964, President Johnson pressed on to move the Voting Rights Act of 1965 through the Congress. He then proposed new laws to combat discrimination in housing, in jury trials, and in other areas.

Amidst the cries of black power from extremists, and the cries of resistance from the white community, the enormous strides which President Johnson has helped the Negro achieve are being overshadowed by propaganda.

The opportunity record of the Johnson administration is clear. Never has so much been tried in so short a time for the submerged poor and deprived of the Nation. Never have so many economic and social opportunity programs been initiated by any one President—Franklin D. Roosevelt notwithstanding.

Mr. Wilkins is correct when he chides his readers not to write civil rights books from yesterday's headlines. Let us look at the record. And the record of L. B. J. is a proud record.

The following is the Roy Wilkins article from the New York Post of December 2, 1967, entitled "L. B. J. and the Negro":

L. B. J. AND THE NEGRO

(By Roy Wilkins)

Before the LBJ situation gets any bloodier and dirtier it might serve such logic as remains among the emotional partisans in the political arena to recapitulate, in part, the President's performance on civil rights for Negro citizens.

Regardless of one's opinion of the Johnson Administration's foreign policy, the inescapable truth is that no President in history, with the possible exception of Abraham Lincoln, has done more for the generality of Negro citizens.

Most students of race relations realize that the principal task is the building of a nonracial climate of opinion. Although our nation has been overtly and covertly racist since the first Africans were brought here as slaves in 1619, there has been a continuing unofficial citizens' effort since that date to combat the racist majority.

This majority, until very recent decades, had the official support of the U.S. Supreme Court, the Congress, the Presidency, organized religion, the press, the business community, public and private school systems, colleges and universities, local, state and national governments, 99 per cent of the legal machinery and, naturally, all law enforcement bodies, including the police.

One of these days, instead of civil rights books written from yesterday's headlines, someone will write the story of the magnificent courage of the Negro himself in this bricks-without-straw struggle. The chief goal was to get the race affirmatively included under the constitutional guarantees affecting every citizen. The chief step toward this goal was to get a President of the U.S. to assert the rights of the Negro as a human being and as a citizen and to propose legislation to establish these as a national policy.

Lyndon B. Johnson, entering the White House nine years after the historic Brown decision of 1954, told a solemn joint session of the Congress on Nov. 27, 1963, that the civil rights bill must be enacted. If he had doodled as had the states on implementing the Brown affirmation of constitutional equality, we would have today no national policy in legislation. The Voting Rights Act followed in 1965.

It is a justifiable criticism to state that civil rights legislation has been enforced spottily, but the necessary role of the Presidency in the overall enterprise has not been shirked.

At a time when California had turned back the clock on fair housing with the notorious Proposition 14, LBJ was proposing a national housing law. Rebuffed by the Senate in 1966, he presented the same proposal to Congress in 1967. In contrast, JFK's advisers had been fearful of white opposition in the South and in Northern suburbs and had held up his executive housing order two years.

President Johnson's fair employment enforcement has not had a happy time, but he has never shrunk from the nettle, including the foot-dragging in the federal establishment.

With all its insufficiencies, imperfections and harassments, more hundreds of millions of dollars have gone into the anti-poverty program among Negroes than all the states have appropriated for this and related purposes in the past 30 years. The Johnson education acts have been vital to the Negro population.

Negro Americans, then, are a far piece from the June 1932 plea to a deaf Hoover, "Speak, Mr. President, speak!" That plaintive cry underscored the importance of a committed and articulate President as a weapon in shaping public opinion.

Lyndon B. Johnson has kept a pledge of nonracial opportunity and decency. Because this pledge is clearly understood in academic and intellectual circles as well as in the unreconstructed sections of the white South (and either belittled or combatted), it would be the irony of ironies if the black beneficiaries were to be confused by the appealing distortions of the professors and the sloganeers.

VITAL CONGRESSIONAL REFORMS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been drawn to an editorial in the St. Louis, Mo., Globe-Democrat on November 27, 1967, entitled, "Vital Congressional Reforms."

This editorial comments on the resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 578—introduced by my colleague from Missouri, the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, and cosponsored by myself and Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, to extend the life of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress beyond its present expiration date of December 31, 1967.

It is my understanding that discussion of action on this resolution took place during at least two meetings of the Rules Committee, but that the Rules Committee failed to report the resolution. Of course, I have no inside information on the attitude of the majority leadership of the House, but I think it is a fair inference from the absence of action that the majority leadership lacks "enthusiasm" both for congressional reform and for the continuation of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

While I realize there probably will be no House action before adjournment of the first session of the 90th Congress, I hope that congressional reform can be made the first order of business when the second session convenes in January of next year.

I understand the Senate, by the adoption of Senate Resolution 188 on Thursday, November 30, 1967, has kept the matter in status quo by extending the life of the Special Senate Committee on the Organization of the Congress to the end of January 1968 and funding the expenses of the committee with an appropriation of $10,000.

As we all know, my colleague from Missouri, the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, has long been a champion of congressional reform and is currently the ranking Republican House member of the the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. I am pleased that his hometown newspaper the St. Louis Globe-Democrat has recognized Representative CURTIS' efforts to modernize the Congress and, therefore, I am pleased to insert the text of the editorial at this point in my remarks:

VITAL CONGRESSIONAL REFORMS

Fighting for much-needed congressional reform, Representative Thomas Curtis of Missouri has introduced a House Concurrent Resolution to continue the Joint Committee beyond its present expiration date of Dec. 31.

Congressman Curtis is attempting to salvage the proposed Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967, which cleared the Senate in March and has since languished in the House. He stresses the importance of his resolution by pointing out that "action on the continuation of the Joint Committee will be a test of the intentions of the House with respect to congressional reform."

We concur with Mr. Curtis. The House membership is on trial.

This vital piece of legislation is long overdue. For one thing, the measure would tighten the loosely-written lobby registration laws. In the broadest sense, it proposes sweeping modernization of archaic procedures, aimed at improving the efficiency of the legislative branch.

Congress is in need of re-establishing its faith with the American voter, who experiences a growing discontent with its nonsystematic ineptitude. Passage of congressional reforms would be a step toward organized and responsible government.

EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK: AN ANNIVERSARY AND AN OBLIGATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today's 20th anniversary of the dedication of Everglades National Park will be marked by appropriate ceremonies in which Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall and many conservation groups will participate.

The occasion calls for celebration to mark a development which was many years in making. Destruction of the area's wildlife and other resources had for years been a source of deep concern to every conservationist familiar with what was taking place in the Everglades, and it was to be assumed that proper protection would be provided once the U.S. Government took possession of this phenomenal landscape and environment unmatched anywhere else in the world.

President Harry S. Truman dedicated Everglades National Park on December 6, 1947. At long last the rare birds, the flowers, and the crocodiles residing in this habitat of almost 1½ million acres in southern Florida would be safe from the predations of selfish and careless men. So everyone believed.

On the contrary, the 'glades has gone downhill since the Federal Government took over. Lack of water management is the reason, as Roger W. Allin, superintendent of Everglades National Park, explains in the October issue of Parks & Recreation, the official publication of the National Recreation and Park Association. His statistics emphasizing the decline in the population of wading birds during the past two decades alone are evidence enough that Uncle Sam has failed miserably as custodian of a wondrous repository that needs to be maintained in its natural state for the enjoyment of the multitudes who visit the area now and in the future.

Mr. Allin presents a brief but shockingly informative analysis of what is happening to the Everglades. He describes the problem and the relatively simple answer to the decline of a celebrated natural heritage. Congress must acquaint itself with the story of the Everglades, and Congress must insist that the Corps of Engineers cooperate fully with the National Park Service and the State of Florida in insuring necessary supplies of fresh water at all times to sustain the living beauty of these surroundings.

I submit Mr. Allin's article for your close attention:

INADEQUATE WATER SUPPLY THREATENS EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK

(By Roger W. Allin)

Everglades National Park is an important part of our national and individual heritage in a world where natural beauty is a rapidly dwindling resource. It provides a colossal display of tropical vegetation and wildlife, as well as an opportunity to experience a unique tropical wilderness that is now enjoyed by over a million persons annually.

The Congress authorized the establishment of the Everglades National Park by Act of May 30, 1934. In this piece of legislation both Houses saw the park as it appeared in the report of December 3, 1930, by Secretary of the Interior, Ray Lyman Wilbur, to the Congress. And reference was made to Wilbur's report in the Act in which the Congress provided that the Everglades ". . . shall be permanently reserved as a wilderness . . ." and that no development ". . . shall be undertaken which will interfere with the preservation intact of the unique flora and fauna and the essential primitive natural conditions now prevailing in this area."

This park was created to perpetuate unique, aquatic-based ecological systems. There are 150 species of fish (including the tarpon, snook, mangrove snapper and sea trout), 47 species of amphibians, 42 species of reptiles (most notably the crocodile and alligator) and 12 species of mammals in the park that are either marine in character or mostly dependent upon aquatic habitats or aquatic foods for their continued existence.

But it is the 89 species of aquatic dependent birds—including the roseate spoonbill, reddish egret, wood ibis, great white heron and the bald eagle (all on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's rare and endangered species list)—that in most cases appear of primary interest to the public. These beautiful creatures largely inhabit the coastal mangrove edges of the park or the Keys of Florida Bay, and feed on the small fish, crawfish and aquatic food animals produced in the park's aquatic environment.

The key to the maintenance and protection of these species, and indeed of nearly all of the notable wildlife populations in the park is the annual cycle of inundation of the 'glades and the resulting enormous fertility created within these warm, shallow aquatic environments. As fresh water is received into the park from the north and the east, it moves slowly (about 500 yards a day) southward across the 'glades before reaching the estuarine areas of the coastal waters. Because the park is almost table flat (a gradient of 8 feet in 45 miles) this inflow spreads out over the park in a thin film a few inches deep, forming broad expanses of marsh and swamp. As it slowly flows through the sawgrass and hammocks it picks up nutrient, and immense quantities of insects, small fish, fresh water vertebrates and invertebrates come to life, multiply, and flourish. These smaller life forms are critical elements in the base of the food chains which have created and sustained the unique species of fish, birds and wildlife presently found within the park.

DECREASED HYDROPERIOD

Historically, the park had a hydroperiod (the time the 'glades were covered by a shallow surface film of water) of approximately nine months each year. But today, canals and levees in the Lake Okeechobee area and the flood control and drainage systems north and east of the park are diverting normal seasonal excess waters to the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico, and the park's hydroperiod lasts for no more than five months and covers a smaller area than formerly.

Less fresh water from the north and a reduction in the length of time surface water lies on the land results in reduced growing periods for aquatic organisms, thus lowering the amount of aquatic food produced in the park. It is axiomatic that lower productivity will adversely affect park bird and animal populations.

Man has a less than notable record of protecting the wildlife resources of this area. In the last 30 or 35 years—long since the epoch of plume hunting, from which the 'glade birds were able to recover because their habitat was intact—there has been an alarming decline in wading bird populations. From the best estimates available, the combined populations of wading birds in this area had more than 1,500,000 breeding adults in the mid-30's; less than 300,000 breeding adults in the mid-40's and a maximum of 50,000 breeding adults in the 1950–1962 period. Today there is no question but that these declines have resulted from the cumulative effects of drainage and drought upon the Everglades.

Alligators have shown a similar decline. One researcher has stated that alligator populations have suffered more than a 95% decline since the early 1920's. An important element in this loss is the drying effect of reduced hydroperiods. With longer dry periods semi-aquatic and woody vegetation encroach into the 'gator holes, filling them with brush and organic matter, leaving the alligators without deep water pools or food to withstand even normal spring dry periods.

These 'gator holes, also, are places where bass, gar, and bream (sunfish) survive the spring dry period and are thus available as brood stock to repopulate the 'glades when the summer rains and flows from the north again spread water over the land. When brood stocks of adult fish life and other aquatic organisms are plentiful, and explosive repopulation of the 'glades is possible. But, with protracted drought and the drying of the shallower survival holes, some of the brood stocks die and this capacity to repopulate the aquatic environments during the summer and fall is reduced.

FRESH WATER REDUCTION

Of equal importance to maintaining natural conditions within the park—and this is the basic responsibility given us by the Congress—is the effect of reduced volumes of fresh water upon the estuarine environment of the park. About half of the total area of the park is made up of coastal bays, estuaries, their sloughs and tidal flats. Overland fresh water flows from the north eventually reach these coastal zones and modify the salinity according to the seasonal variation in fresh water availability. Reduction of flow by drought and diversion works have tended to create hypersaline conditions (over 55 parts per thousand total salts) in portions of these coastal environments (most notably areas within Florida Bay) resulting in a marked reduction of forage fishes, juvenile sport and commercial fishes, and the commerically important tortugas pink shrimp. These fishes and shrimp now spend vital periods of their life cycle in the estaurine waters of the park. From a reduced fish and shrimp production there also results a decline in the ability of estuarine areas to act as a feeding source for the birds resident in and around the bays.

Yet, another ecological change, which is occurring and which can be traced to reduced overland flows, is the acceleration of woody plant succession within the 'glades area of the park. Poisonwood, buttonwood, willow and other woody plants are becoming established in areas which formerly were pure sawgrass 'glades. The seeds and sprouts of these species were once "drowned-out," but now are able to become established and form a new and different community at variance with the historical ecology of the area. This change in vegetative cover affects transpiration, soil formation, direction and rapidity of water flow, sunlight penetration and water temperatures, and speciation and abundance of aquatic insects, invertebrates, and vertebrates produced within the region undergoing these changes. These ecological changes cannot but cause further changes in the bird and animal populations that live, nest or feed within this environment.

The wildlife losses resulting from anticipated ecological changes, and the relation of these losses to specific volumetric reductions of inflow have not yet been determined in quantitative terms; but it is the opinion of many biologists that unless the park's hydroperiods can be restored, the productivity of the 'glades will continue to be lowered, its wildlife carrying capacity will continue to be reduced, and thus the park, the people of the nation and the future generations will suffer a loss of a part of their heritage.

Man's technological ability to change his environment may be outpacing his ability to predict precisely and quantitatively the effects of such changes.

PROPER WATER MANAGEMENT NEEDED

The central and southern Florida flood control project *can* be planned, constructed and operated to make full use of the water available in south Florida. This important natural resource must be conserved and managed to benefit all of the potential users—the farmers, the cities and the park—by practicing total utilization water management rather than limiting planning and practice to removing "excess waters" during the rainy season, in the face of knowledge that the area will suffer drought a few months later. More than enough water falls upon the watersheds which traditionally have served the cities of the east coast and Everglades National Park to satisfy adequately the needs of all the users, including the park. There has been wasted to sea an average of over two-million acre feet of water annually from the project. (An acre foot of water per day is approximately ½ cubic foot per second or 225 gallons per minute.) One must conclude that there is currently a surplus of water—but if surpluses are not stored, there will certainly follow periods of drought which might otherwise have been relieved.

South Florida needs proper water management. As long as fresh water is being diverted and drained away from the historic everglade drainage routes, it will be difficult for many to comprehend why these waters could not have been made available to preserve the natural biological conditions and balances which are the essence of this great national park. It is the responsibility of all agencies concerned with the planning, construction and operation of this project—and the public at large—to see that this precious resource is not wasted.

QUESTIONS RAISED

The Everglades problem can be seen as a wide-ranging issue of many facets, for it is a question of whether a great national resource, Everglades National Park, which belongs to all of the people of the country, and indeed to the world, will be sustained. It is a question of whether recognition will be given House Document #643 (the authorizing document of the central and southern Florida flood control project, which stated that the project would "assist in restoring and maintaining natural conditions within the national park." It is a question of whether existing policies regarding the expenditure of Federal funds for water development projects, as defined in Senate Document #97, will be observed in the planning and operation of the project. This document states: ". . . care shall be taken to avoid resource use and development for the benefit of a few or the disadvantage of many . . ."

Parks are for people. The birds and alligators which have sanctuary and are protected in Everglades National Park are but vehicles through which this park provides enjoyment, satisfaction, education and delightful experiences to over a million people each year. This national park is part of a magnificent system of preserves which protects selected, outstanding and unique landscapes and life systems, that are in fact national treasures of great significance and are of lasting value to our culture and civilization—to be saved for this and future generations to enjoy, unspoiled by man. The impairment or destruction of an element of this system is a serious consideration. We must remain adamantly opposed to any proposal that would cause change to the basic resources of the park or that would threaten the park's value to the public.

Some progress is being made in satisfying the very complex problem of maintaining desirable ecological conditions within the park. In addition to the interim agreement reached last year between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, The National Park Service, and the State of Florida, regarding the provision of minimum flows from the project into the Shark River drainage of the park, agreement was also reached within the past few months which will protect the park's eastern panhandle from the threatened intrusion of salt water from an open canal. This agreement provides for the continuance of fresh water flows to maintain the wildlife in this portion of the park. Both of these agreements will remain in effect until a study now being conducted by the Corps of Engineers of the long-range water needs of the park is completed. This study, scheduled for completion this fall, is expected to reveal needed changes in project planning, construction and operation to permanently satisfy the park's water requirements. It is anticipated the Corps' recommendations will include storing surplus waters and provide for the necessary works to route these waters to their historic watercourses in Everglade National Park.

In the last few years it has become obvious that despite its size, Everglades National Park does not control its ecological destiny. If the park does not receive adequate water from the central and southern Florida flood control project, there can be only one predictable conclusion—the end of this unique biological wilderness and the loss of the values which commended Everglades National Park's establishment as an element within America's national park system.

A YOUNG MARINE IN VIETNAM TAKES HIS OWN POLL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received a most interesting and compelling letter from one of our fine young marines in Vietnam, Cpl. Travis W. Powell, of Texarkana, Tex. As you will note from his letter, Corporal Powell has taken a poll of "a little over 200 marines" and found that 197 were in favor of escalating the bombing. His remarks about demonstrators in the States are also illuminating.

This sincere, forthright, and convincing document from a young man whom I believe to be a typical east Texan is offered as a thought-provoking and valuable insight to the attitude of our fighting men in Vietnam. I would like to add that I am personally proud that Corporal Powell is my countryman, and that I have the privilege of being his Congressman.

The letter follows:

NOVEMBER 30, 1967.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I know that you are a busy man, but I thought that I'd drop you a line from over here, where the action is. The reason for doing this is to let you know how some of us feel. What made me sit down and write this letter to you? In an article from a little paper that we get over here, recently I was reading where the students of the University of Texas were having a demonstration against the war in Viet Nam. One of the signs read, Back our men in Viet Nam, Pull them out, or words to that effect. If it had been any other State, it would have been different, but my own home State, well that is something else. Maybe these people all need to be put in the service to see what it is like. I'd venture to say that a group of men in a single unit, company, branch of service, or whatever; is one of the tightest groups, that you'll ever find. In the service you have no poor or wealthy, smart or dumb, or black or white. You all stick together and try to do the job to the best of your ability. If all these people want to help, if they don't want to or are ineligible to come in the service, the least that they can do, is not be causing trouble stateside, and really try to back their fellow countryman.

Just to show you an example, there was and I guess that there still is a large question on whether to bomb North Viet Nam more, about the same, or stop completely. I took a poll of a little over 200 marines around my area and from the field. It turned out that 197 of the men said to bomb it more, and three men were undecided on whether to bomb it more or to stop completely. However, all the men agreed that if we stopped bombing, that all our troops should be pulled out; the reason for this is the men feel that by not using all your powers to their fullest extent, except the "big bomb," is like fixing a fight. You are only using part of your abilities, meanwhile you (the boxer) are taking hits. In this case, which is a lot more serious, instead of a punch, a lot of those demonstrators' kinfolk, ole buddies, friends and their friends' friends, that are members of one of the branches of the Armed Forces of the United States is dying. That is also the reason for not wanting to stay the same, either get in or get out. I guess that's all for now.

Now for a little about me that you might be interested to know, plus maybe being able to help me. My last name, Powell, it might have sounded familiar to you from around *our* hometown. I am from Texarkana, Texas, and graduated from Texas Sr. High in 1966. Your nephew, Robbie, and I are good friends; we went to school together ever since the third grade. We write each other every once in a while. The reason for me saying that my last name might sound familiar is because my father and five of his brothers and families still live in Texarkana. You might know a couple of them, Lester has Camp Texarkana on Lake Texarkana along with one of his closest friends Sherwin Massey. Another one of my uncles, Troy, is a small cattleman out on Richmond Road; he gets letters from you or let's say from your office quite often.

I am a supply man with a 3042 mos. They say over here that it is critical. I joined the Marine Corps for one reason, to come over here and fight for what I think is right. As soon as I graduated from boot camp and found out that I had a supply mos, I tried to get it changed and failed. From San Diego, I came home on leave, then went to North Carolina for Supply School. I tried to get it changed again and it failed. The only reason why I haven't written you sooner, was because I was told that after you got over here that it would be different and that I would be fighting, no matter what my mos was. I volunteered for Viet Nam at Camp Lejeune, went home for twenty days, and have now been over here four months. I am in the Danang area, other than one rocket and mortar attack we received, which had one (1) killed in action and forty-three (43) wounded in action, six of whom were good friends of mine from Supply School, I have seen no other action at all. I've never seen a VC or a NVA other than at the local POW Camp and have yet to fire my rifle.

I graduated from boot camp as Platoon Honorman, field expert with the rifle, and made Pfc. meritoriously. I made L/Cpl. meritoriously out of Supply School and just recently made Corporal. I came in on 29 Nov. 1966 and made Corporal, which is a Non-

Commissioned Officer, in less than a year, which is supposed to be pretty good. I have a 4.8/5.0 average on my proficiency/conduct marks, respectively. I think the reason for my quick promotions is because I try to stay squared-away and I do my job to the best of my ability. I think that I was put in the Supply field because of some tests that I took. I might have the, let's say smarts to be a supply man, but am slowly cracking under the pressure of doing something that I can't stand, and me forcing myself to do it without causing trouble. I feel, since I've hunted, fished, camped-out, hiked, or stayed in the outdoors all of my life, that I can better serve my country by putting me in the field. I work hard at whatever I do, but naturally a man can work harder at something he likes.

I came in the Marine Corps wanting to be a machine gunner on a helicopter or just a plain infantryman. Since I've been here I've tried to get into either of the above, but no one will help me. They think that because the Marine Corps says you do this, that you do it. Well, I guess that that is right, but even the Marine Corps makes a mistake or two. Some people can do some things and not others. I don't have the patience to sit behind a desk, and type, or in a warehouse, but I can sit all day not moving, waiting on a bear to come by me, and as far as feelings go. I had rather kill the enemy before I had a bear. A bear can be useful, but the enemy can't. When I talk about enemy, I mean enemy, not all Vietnamese people. Since I've been over here I've met some pretty decent people and I try to help them as much as possible. I've gotten several packages from home and when I get a chance I buy candy and little things at the PX and give it to the kids. I try to teach them English and in return pick up a little of their language. A lot of the men don't treat the people very kind, but I try as hard as I can. They don't realize that we have to leave a good impression and to make friends with these people, and the demonstrations back home don't help. I think if the people back home knew what it was like, and could see the progress that we have made, that they'd understand why we don't want to pull out. Sure we want to get home and see our loved ones, but we don't want to leave all these people here helpless and subject to communism.

About my problem, if you can help me I'd appreciate it very much. It would have to be something definite, not just a letter to my Commanding Officer. If that's all you can do I had just as soon that you forget about it. I liked to stay squared-away and on good terms with my superiors, but a letter to them would definitely hurt my standings and would help in no way. I don't know how hard you'll try on this but I'm sure if you wanted to you could help me. I was just leaving Texarkana to come over here on the day of your wife's funeral and am sorry about it and not being able to attend I did see President Johnson at the airport. I don't know if you'd even think of going that high, but if so, I know he could do something. The Commandant of the Marine Corps, Mr. Wallace Green, has a copy of my record book on file; you might want to look through it. It might help.

From when I graduated from high school until I joined the Marine Corps, there was a period of six months. During these six months I worked at D & Z as a Quality Control Inspector, and I inspected ammunition. I was trying to do my part for the war; I didn't feel that it was enough, so I joined the Marine Corps; I still don't feel that I'm doing my part. I know that only about 30% of our men are on the lines and the remaining 70% are in the rear supporting the men up front, which is my present job, but the job just isn't for me, like I said earlier, it is slowly getting to me. I've held off as long as I can, so please try to do something, before I start getting hard feelings aroused.

My first request, an mos change to Helicopter Machine Gunner, I could take "on the job training," instead of going to the school. If not that, my second request on mos change to infantryman. I would need to be brushed up on some of the function of the infantryman, although I stay up-to-date on what I can. This could be accomplished by sending me to jump school and warfare school in Okinawa, or by "on the job training," which is best sometimes. People are sent to Okinawa for several schools from here, so it wouldn't be much trouble.

I will be twenty years of age the 18th of Dec., if I was old enough, I'd put in for a field commission for second lieutenant, and request an 03? ? mos either infantryman or machine gunner. I am planning on extending for six months over here and will if I get what I'm hoping for, plus I hope to be making Sergeant within the next few months.

Thank you for listening! !

Respectively yours,

Cpl. TRAVIS W. POWELL,
U.S. Marine Corps.

U.S. REPORT FINDS GLOOM IN VIETNAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the publication this morning on page 1 of the New York Times of an article by Bernard Weinraub, dateline Saigon, December 5, and headlined "U.S. Report Finds Gloom in Vietnam" raises some interesting questions. Nowhere in the article is the source of the report identified, nor is there an explanation as to the circumstances under which it is being distributed within the U.S. mission in South Vietnam. It is said to be "A weekly report privately drafted and distributed within the U.S. mission in South Vietnam," and is described as a two-page document, headed "Provincial Attitudes" covering a "1-week period from November 26 to December 2."

The New York Times further indicates that—

The document is marked for "limited distribution" at the U.S. mission but is not classified.

The lack of further information in the New York Times about the source of the article or the circumstances under which it is being distributed raises questions of journalistic responsibility when at least 15 column-inches are devoted to repeating discouraging reports on attitudes among the South Vietnamese. This information, having been given the coverage it now has, calls for a full explanation by U.S. State and Defense officials as to what the weekly report is, who drafted and distributed it, to what extent the pessimistic views reported are accurate in view of their conflict with recent statements by Ambassador Bunker and General Westmoreland, and why, if the information was for internal purposes, it was not classified and distributed as an official document rather than passed around unofficially?

I am today addressing these inquiries to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense and asking for answers. When they are at hand, I shall be happy to bring them to the attention of the House.

I include the article which I have previously referred to, at this point in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 6, 1967]

U.S. REPORT FINDS GLOOM IN VIETNAM—ASSERTS MANY IN SOUTH FEEL AMERICANS ARE DELIBERATELY PROLONGING THE CONFLICT

(By Bernard Weinraub)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, December 5.—A weekly report privately drafted and distributed within the United States mission in South Vietnam portrays American officials posted in the provinces as gloomy about the war and the mood of the South Vietnamese people.

The two-page document, which was distributed today, says that there has been "an increasing tempo of VC terrorism and propaganda and, in some circles at least, a strange drift from reality regarding the U.S. role in Vietnam."

The report says that numerous Vietnamese now feel that the United States is "deliberately prolonging" the war and that "many Vietnamese believe that Americans in Vietnam have been so dominant, especially in the direction of the war, that the very sovereignty of Vietnam is threatened."

ONE WEEK IS COVERED

The report, headed "Provincial Attitudes," covers a one-week period, from Nov. 26 to Dec. 2. The document indicates, however, that American officials in the field were meeting long-range—and growing—problems with the South Vietnamese.

The report discussed the Vietnamese attitude toward Americans, the South Vietnamese Government and army and the Vietcong.

"The theme that recurred most often was the continuing rise in VC terrorism and propaganda," the report said. In most cases, the aftermath appeared to be a declining confidence in the South Vietnamese Government's defense capabilities.

The report says that this theme was especially prevalent in the III Corps area, the section of the country around Saigon, and the IV Corps area, the Mekong Delta.

On the propaganda front, the report says, Vietcong cadres "enter hamlets escorted by armed squads, scatter leaflets, indoctrinate the people or, in the more secure hamlets, operate a portable speaker at the edge of town"—usually with "upsetting" results for public morale.

The document, quoting the final paragraph of a report from the Mekong Delta, added: "Unless the [Government] of South Vietnam is able to demonstrate visibly and convincingly that it is truly dedicated to the interests of the people, republic [the Thieu Government] will have no more support than any of its predecessors."

While American officials in recent weeks have produced optimistic public statements on the war effort and pacification, they have not dealt with the mood and the attitudes of the Vietnamese people. Over the last few months, however, officials in Saigon have noted an anti-American mood, especially in the Saigon newspapers.

The document is marked for "limited distribution" at the United States mission but is not classified.

DRAFT LAW CRITICIZED

A main complaint of Vietnamese, the report says, is against a new mobilization law that lowers the draft age from 20 to 18 and tightens deferments. The document indicates that many Vietnamese feel that the draft measure was spurred by United States pressure.

In Saigon, the document notes, a member of the new House of Representatives was reported to have said that the measure had been designed to "calm American public opinion because the American people do not take kindly to the mobilization of Americans for combat in Vietnam."

The document adds: "Another legislator reportedly said, 'Why should our young men be drafted to serve U.S. interests?'"

Discussing what it termed the "strange drift from reality regarding the U.S. role in Vietnam," the report said that in the III Corps area a "group of 12 middle-aged citizens" felt the mobilization law had been enacted at "the behest of the Americans, whose real aim is 'the extermination of as many Vietnamese as possible.'"

A GUINEA PIG

One of the group was then quoted as having said: "Our country is a guinea pig for the testing of new U.S. and Russian weapons."

In the IV Corps area, the report says, there was "a rumor heard among the educated elite" that the United States was deliberately prolonging [the war] in order to provide an outlet for its surplus production."

The report adds: "A Marxian argument, perhaps, but it does have currency among people who ask why else would a powerful nation like the U.S. not exert its maximum force.

"To counter this with the argument that it's a Vietnamese war falls on deaf ears, as many of these people feel it is now a war between the U.S. and the Communists."

The document said that there had been vehement protests against the partial mobilization decree scheduled to take effect Jan. 1. The law orders more rigorous study of all types of deferments, including those for academic, religious and professional reasons. All specialists needed for military service, such as doctors and engineers, will be subject to the draft until they reach the age of 45.

"Although most youths do not want to join the army," the report says, "they want even less to join the VC—but the only reason given is the harder life of the VC."

The document adds that the possibility of mobilization "had provoked hopes that the war may soon end, but almost all [youths] see it as continuing indefinitely."

"The hope for peace, when expressed often reflected a dim conception of external forces beyond one's control," the report says. "Thus, from Binhthuan in II Corps it was reported that the people believe the Americans will send more troops to Vietnam next year to end the war sooner and help the campaign of President Johnson for re-election to the Presidency."

"As in Saigon, where some military personnel and workers were heard to critize the GVN [South Vietnamese Government] for allegedly undercutting Hanoi's cease-fire proposals," the report says, "there were those in the provinces who were aware that peace-feeling was a finely balanced thing."

"A businessman in a provincial town in the II Corps area, the central highlands and lowlands, was reported to have complained: 'What kind of peace negotiation is it when President Thieu sends a letter to Ho Chi Minh and at the same time increases troop strength [via the partial mobilization decree]?'"

A RESPONSIBLE CHOICE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the National Observer of October 23, 1967, carried an article regarding the program of the National Urban League to help Negro veterans returning from Vietnam in their return to civilian life. By establishing a Veterans' Affairs Office and assigning coordinators to eight major cities, the league hopes to be of assistance to veterans in preparing for their future in the mainstream of civilian living. It is believed that the returning Negro servicemen can be America's greatest opportunity for progress in civil rights, if planned for and properly directed.

Now contrast this responsible approach with the new program outlined by Martin Luther King in the New York Times article of yesterday, December 5, entitled "Dr. King Planning To Disrupt Capital in Drive for Jobs." As reported by the Times, King plans an extended campaign of massive civil disobedience in Washington next year to force Congress and the administration to provide "jobs or income for all." He also stated that Negro militants including the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the various factions of the peace movement will be invited to participate, but that all participants in the protests must pledge nonviolence for the duration. King's goal is "massive dislocation" of the Capital "until America responds" to the needs of its poor.

This is certainly a strange position for Martin Luther King. He is either incredibly naive or indulging in a clever form of demagoguery. Having done quite a bit of research on Mr. King's record which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 4 of this year, I believe he is anything but naive. The case of King's takeover of the Chicago tenement in February of 1966 is a good case in point.

At that time King led three civil rights organizations in assuming "trusteeship" of a six-flat tenement house without court authority or permission of the owner. He proposed to collect the rents which would be used to clean and renovate the building. When asked if he considered the action legal, King stated, according to the Chicago Tribune of February 24, 1966:

> I won't say that it is illegal, but I would call it supralegal (above the law). The moral question is far more important than the legal one.

Fortunately for the forces of law and order, a circuit court judge found a legal issue involved and enjoined King and his associates from entering the building, interfering, or collecting rents from the tenants.

As in other cases, King made clever use of the English language. He emphasized that this action was not a takeover, but simply a "trusteeship."

With regard to the proposed dislocation of Washington, Dr. King uses scare words, threats or warnings of impending trouble to create the necessity for his action. But he absolves himself of any responsibility for possible violence by using the term "nonviolence" and requesting a pledge of nonviolence from participants. It is certainly not prudent nor responsible to invite the radical anti-Vietnam peace groups to participate without considering the possibility of ultimate resort to rioting and lawlessness. If violence does erupt and laws are broken, King has a trump card: "Often an individual has to break a particular law in order to obey a higher law."

The comparison of the Urban League's program for helping returning Negro servicemen with that of Martin Luther King's disruption program emphasizes that there is a positive, responsible approach to the pursuit of civil rights aspirations. Of the two choices cited above, I believe the overwhelming majority of American citizens will have no difficulty whatsoever in selecting the right one.

I include at this point the article "Dr. King Planning To Disrupt Capital in Drive for Jobs," from the New York Times of December 5, 1967:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 5, 1967]

DR. KING PLANNING TO DISRUPT CAPITAL IN DRIVE FOR JOBS

(By Walter Rugaber)

ATLANTA, December 4.—The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. announced plans today for an extended campaign of massive civil disobedience in Washington next year to force Congress and the Administration to provide "jobs or income for all."

The internationally known Negro civil rights leader said a force of 3,000 demonstrators, trained in nonviolent techniques, would seek "massive dislocation" of the capital "until America responds" to the needs of its poor.

Dr. King said the protesters, recruited in 10 major cities and five rural areas, would begin a "strong, dramatic, and attention-getting campaign" in early April. He indicated that the Capitol and the White House would be among the targets.

In a news conference here, the winner of the Nobel Prize for Peace acknowledged that the ugly mood of many Negroes in the nation's slums made the campaign "risky," but he asserted that "not to act represents moral irresponsibility."

Dr. King advanced the view that "angry and bitter" people would respond to nonviolence "if it's militant enough, if it's really doing something." He promised to spend three months in training the initial force of 3,000.

"These tactics have done it [won civil rights advances] before," Dr. King said, "and this is all we have to go on." Continued inaction by the Federal Government, he warned, would bring down "the curtain of doom" upon the nation.

For some time, Dr. King has been talking generally about the dislocation of Northern cities "without destroying life or property." Such efforts, he has said, can channel rage from destructive rioting to more "creative" ends.

The Negro leader committed himself most firmly to the idea of dislocation during a speech in August to the annual convention of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. He is president of the Atlanta-based group.

Then, last week, Dr. King and the leading members of his staff chose Washington as the target and mapped other aspects of the projected drive during a meeting at Frogmore, S.C. In a statement issued today, Dr. King said:

"America is at a crossroads of history, and it is critically important for us, as a nation and a society, to choose a new path and move upon it with resolution and courage.

"It is impossible to underestimate the crisis we face in America. The stability of a civilization, the potential of free government, and the simple honor of men are at stake."

Dr. King said that "a clear majority in America are asking for the very things which we will demand in Washington," but he added that the Government "does not move to correct the problem involving race until it is confronted directly and dramatically."

The Negro leader's mood seemed deeply pessimistic. He said the confrontation in Washington was a "last desperate demand" by Negroes, an attempt to avoid "the worst chaos, hatred and violence any nation has ever encountered."

A number of details concerning the new drive apparently remained unsettled. Dr. King said the areas from which the demonstrators would come had not been chosen, although Mississippi and New York have been mentioned. Some of the protesters may march to Washington, Dr. King said.

THE FORMS OF PROTEST

An aide to the civil rights leader said that financial needs would present no problem. The protesters would camp out, he indicated, and "soup kitchens" might be organized for them at various churches in Washington.

While Dr. King avoided detailing the forms of protest that might be used, other sources suggested transportation tieups, school boycotts and appearances at major Government installations in the capital.

One aide, citing the high incidence of infant mortality among Negroes, said another tactic might be to tie up Washington hospitals with waves of sick youngsters. Such action, he said, would be useful as well as dramatic.

Dr. King said he hoped the new campaign would involve representatives of the non-Negro poor and "all Americans of good will." An aide added, however, that the drive would need more or less permanent demonstrators, "not college kids down for a weekend."

Negro militants, including the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, will be asked to participate, Dr. King said, but all participants in the protests must pledge nonviolence for the duration.

Dr. King said the peace movement would also be invited to participate, on the grounds that many believe domestic poverty cannot be successfully fought until the Government withdraws from the war in Vietnam.

TIME TO DISSENT FROM THE DISSENTERS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, responsible dissent will always have a respected and guarded place in our American society. But dissent, or any comment, requires that the person responsible, be responsible. Those who dissent from our position in Vietnam are too often guilty of wishful thinking and too often neglect to determine—or avoid consciously—the simple facts.

So many attempts have been made to present the true picture of Vietnam and so much documentation has been compiled that no one can plead ignorance.

The exasperation of so many millions of Americans with those who consciously or unconsciously give comfort or encouragement to the enemy in Vietnam through their unsubstantiated charges was expressed recently by the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Joseph A. Scerra.

Commander Scerra put out a call to all Americans to "dissent from the dissenters." He states:

It is high time some of the amateur diplomats, professional politicians, armchair generals and would-be Presidents in our nation be reminded that their continuing harsh and distorted criticism of America's continuing stand against aggression in Vietnam is harmful to the success of our mission and to the security of our nation.

As an example, the irresponsible dissenters like to avoid the entire ugly issue of the enemy, his nature and his methods and plans for suppression of South Vietnam.

I can only ask how the dissenters would justify surrendering South Vietnam to barbarisms such as have already taken place. Here is a sampling of what we are fighting against and what we are asked to forget or ignore by the irresponsible dissenters. These are headlines of the atrocities by the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong.

One reads: "17 Women and Children Die in Massacre." This is not an isolated, accidental incident of bombing but the beginning of an account of how the Vietcong overran a refugee camp and slaughtered in cold blood.

Who denies the terror campaign against the population in South Vietnam during the preelection weeks.

Where is the sincerity of men who force the American public to read headlines such as these: "Viet Reds Execute Two U.S. Civilian Flyers," or, "Fleeing Pilot Had To Watch Red Pursuers Behead Pal," or, "Reds Execute Six Wounded Marines" or any of the scores of other statements of atrocities which tell the same inhuman disregard for life. They are summed up in one additional headline: "Cong Terror Stalks Viet Countryside."

These are only a few of the examples from but one corner of the picture. But they are the facts. Irresponsible dissenters fail to mention these items but they are quick to shout unsubstantiated charges of wholesale slaughter by American napalm.

I must agree with Commander Scerra that it is time for the American people to make their will known. While the many who dissent have the guaranteed right to do so, each American also has the right and responsibility to make his will known when it comes time to dissent from the dissenters.

I include the commander's remarks at this point:

IT'S TIME TO DISSENT AGAINST THE DISSENTERS

It is high time some of the amateur diplomats, professional politicians, armchair generals and would-be Presidents in our nation be reminded that their continuing harsh and distorted criticism of America's continuing stand against aggression in Vietnam is harmful to the success of our mission and to the security of our nation.

It may not be their intention, but these self-appointed experts of international military and political strategy are providing false hope and misleading comfort to the enemy. They—no less, and perhaps even more, than the so-called anti-war demonstrators—are actually helping to prolong the war rather than to shorten it, as they so zealously claim is their objective. Their expressions of dissent and protest provide the North Vietnamese with a reason to believe they can achieve the victory our men in uniform are denying them on the battlefront through a split in our ranks on the home front.

The divisive antics of the peaceniks, beatniks and draft card burners can perhaps be blamed on ignorance or immaturity. It is difficult, however, to find any excuse for the increasing tendency of certain members of Congress and other elected officials to assume they somehow have acquired a special insight and wisdom which qualifies them to render better judgments on policies and actions than the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State or the Commander-in-Chief.

Never in the history of our nation has there been a greater need for national unity and support of our constituted leaders. The withholding of traditional bi-partisan Congressional support from the President in the conduct of foreign policy can only serve to undercut his bargaining strength with our enemies and diminish his stature among our friends.

Our military leaders report that our military position in Vietnam has improved considerably in recent months. We have gained the offensive and the enemy has sustained crippling losses in men and materials that have destroyed his ability to effectively continue his course of aggression. However, although the North Vietnamese can find little comfort in the trend of the war itself, they have only to read the statements of some of our Senators and Represenatives to find reason to believe they can outlast our will even if they cannot outgun our fighting men. Almost daily, a Member of Congress furnishes the enemy with fresh signs of what he can easily misinterpret as a weakening of our staying power.

It is difficult for our enemies to understand that America's freedom to debate and dissent does not mean a lack of resolve to honor our commitments. We Americans respect the right of the individual to dissent. But too often the enemy quotes the words of our debaters and dissenters in their newspapers and on their broadcasts as a means of bolstering the sagging morale of their own fighting men.

It is indeed unfortunate that the pressure that our guns and bombs bring to bear on the enemy in an effort to lead him to the negotiating table in response to the President's repeated requests for peace talks is continually negated by the words of the dissenters in the U.S. Congress.

Some of the dissenters say we should halt our bombing of North Vietnam. Yet they do not ask that the enemy provide any assurances that he will respond with a comparable deescalation in military activity, or that he will not use the occasion to build up his weaponry and manpower so that he can launch new offensives and kill more of our American troops.

Some of the dissenters want to restrict our military activities to the defense of isolated enclaves. Yet they do not explain how this will help the South Vietnamese achieve freedom for the people outside these limited areas or how this will help resolve the conflict.

Some of the dissenters even call for a complete withdrawal of our troops. Yet they do not say how we can explain this abrogation of our commitment to the other small nations of the free world who look to us as a bulwark against Communist aggression.

The dissenters do not have a monopoly on a desire for peace.

What the dissenters in Congress and elsewhere seem to forget is that the Administration has tried halting the bombing of North Vietnam a number of times, but they have all gone unheeded by Hanoi.

The Administration has repeatedly offered to hold unconditional negotiations with the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong but all overtures have been rejected.

The Administration has honored cease fire

agreements during certain holiday observances, but the enemy has used them to infiltrate our lines and reinforce his positions.

The Administration has conferred with every interested nation and used every available channel, including the United Nations, in its efforts to find some method for bringing about a meaningful cessation of hostilities.

Peace, unfortunately, cannot be achieved merely by making speeches on the floors of Congress or by holding demonstrations in the streets of our cities. And peace cannot be brought about by one side alone.

The enemy must be made to realize that he cannot achieve his goals of expansion and domination by military aggression. He must understand that this nation is committed to the defense of freedom in South Vietnam and that this nation honors its commitments. He must not be permitted the luxury of drawing succor, no matter how unjustified, from the misleading statements of the dissenters within our midst.

We do not need another pause in the bombing of North Vietnam to convince Hanoi of our desire for peace. We tried that, and it didn't work.

What we need to try now is a pause in irresponsible dissent to demonstrate our strength of purpose and unity of spirit.

President Kennedy said "The cost of freedom is always high but Americans have always paid it. And one path we shall never choose, and that is the path of surrender or submission."

The path to a just peace is the one where we present a united front to the enemy, so that he will not fail to recognize the futility of his aggressive course of action.

I, therefore, personally call upon our Senators and Representatives to support the Administration in fulfilling its pledge to support our fighting men in Vietnam and to work for a just and honorable peace in Vietnam.

At the same time, I urge every member of the V.F.W. and every American citizen to embark on the most massive letter writing campaign in the history of this nation. I urge that he write his own Senators and Congressman to adhere to our traditional Constitutional procedures for the conduct of war and foreign affairs and to support—not hamper—our Secretaries of State and Defense and the President of the United States in the conduct of their awesome tasks. You should also send copies of your letters to the White House, so that our President will know his countrymen stand behind him in this hour of trial.

I have never asked the members of the V.F.W. to write their Congressmen for any specific purpose before, but I do so now because I feel the need is critical. Let your Senators and Congressman know how the veterans of this nation feel about our commitment in Vietnam.

If he supports the Administration's stand in Vietnam, let him know how much you appreciate it. But if he has been among the dissenters, let him know that now is time for our nation to stand together in its defense of freedom and its quest for peace.

WILL NORTH VIETNAMESE REFUSE TO DELIVER CHRISTMAS PARCELS TO CAPTURED MILITARY PERSONNEL?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, United Press International this morning carries a story by Donald May which raises the question of whether the North Vietnamese Government will refuse again this year, as they did last year, to permit the delivery of Christmas parcels, now in their hands, to captured U.S. military personnel sent by their families.

The story says that Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Nitze has expressed his concern over this question.

I share that concern.

At this season of the year—the season of good will—it is particularly appropriate that man's treatment of his fellow man be in accord with the spirit of the holidays.

I earnestly hope and pray that the North Vietnamese Government will recognize this, will respect the spirit of the season, abide by the humanitarian principles of warfare governing the treatment of prisoners, and permit the delivery of these small gifts from their loved ones to our unfortunate servicemen. To do otherwise would be grossly inhumane, deliberately cruel, and violative of the recognized international practices in warfare.

I include the text of the UPI article in the RECORD:

PRISONERS

(By Donald H. May)

WASHINGTON.—Families of U.S. servicemen held captive in North Vietnam have mailed them Christmas packages, it was learned today.

The families were waiting to see whether the parcels would be delivered by North Vietnamese authorities. Last year Christmas packages sent by prisoners' relatives were returned undelivered.

Small parcels have been sent this year by a number of wives, children, and parents who acted individually and used the regular mails.

Defense Department officials kept out of it but were obviously interested in the outcome.

Within the Pentagon, Deputy Defense Secretary Paul H. Nitze sent a memorandum to the Department's prisoner of war policy committee asking to be kept advised of what happens.

Nitze's memorandum said: "Last year the Government in Hanoi inhumanely refused to deliver Christmas packages to the prisoners of war. Renewed refusal by Hanoi to permit delivery of Christmas parcels would be yet another distressing violation of the Geneva Convention."

The 1949 Geneva Convention on prisoners of war provided for mail privileges and the right of prisoners to receive packages.

North Vietnam signed the Convention in 1957, but did so with the reservation that it would not apply to those guilty of "war crimes" as defined in the Nurenberg trials. Hanoi maintains that the U.S. prisoners are "war criminals" because they took part in what it calls the "illegal" bombing of North Vietnam. Most of the prisoners in the North are pilots.

North Vietnam has never furnished a list of prisoners, as called for in the convention, and the U.S. Government is not sure how many there are. The Pentagon lists 226 U.S. servicemen as currently captured, and all but a few of these are believed to be in North Vietnam.

Another 688 Americans are listed as "missing" in the war.

The number of Americans held prisoner by the Vietcong in the south is believed to be a great deal smaller than in the north. But their plight may be more desperate because the Vietcong have poor facilities for keeping prisoners. Some relatives have sent packages to servicemen believed to be prisoners in the south.

The Defense Department Prisoner of War Policy Committee was set up in September to give advice concerning captured or missing servicemen. It is headed by Paul C. Warnke, Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs.

DMSO: STILL THE PERSECUTED DRUG—PART V

Mr. HUNT. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the Food and Drug Administration and its Chief, Dr. James Goddard, are presently under fire from many quarters for high-handed, arbitrary, slow, and often poorly considered handling of drug regulation.

In recent months, Dr. Goddard and his agency have aroused the public's ire by attempting to regulate sale of vitamins and food supplements. Dr. Goddard has lambasted candy cigarettes, while advocating that marihuana be stricken from the list of narcotic drugs and put under the less stringent Dangerous Drug Act.

A backlog of new drug applications trapped in bureaucratic redtape has, in some cases, held up marketing of important new medications for as much as 2 years. Yet in some other cases drugs whose effects are not fully known have been allowed commercial status—that is, artificial sweeteners and the much-touted birth control pills.

In no case, however, has the action of the FDA and Dr. James Goddard been so arbitrary, capricious, whimsical, and, indeed, two faced, than in the case of the lumber derived solvent, DMSO, found, without question, to have therapeutic value.

This drug has been more thoroughly tested in the United States and throughout the world than any in recent memory. Thousands of clinical experiments attest to its safety and efficacy in the treatment of skin and joint diseases, including some forms of the deadly crippler arthritis.

Yet because some experimental lower animals were found to have developed changes in the lenses of their eyes after receiving overwhelmingly massive doses of this drug, often orally—not the clinical method of application—the FDA suddenly and utterly withdrew DMSO from clinical testing. This action was taken after over 2 full years of rigorous clinical tests had been allowed—2 years in which not one major side effect of the drug was noted by the hundreds of doctors and thousands of patients involved in that testing.

DMSO is now on the market commercially in Germany and Austria. Still not one major side effect in humans has been detected. And, still, because of both the stringent restrictions placed on experimenting doctors and the harsh, virtually impossible, protocols for a clinical research program placed on drug com-

panies with regard to DMSO, the FDA effectively bans clinical testing of this drug.

Credibility is a phrase bandied about quite often these days. Nowhere in this Government, however, has credibility been so totally debased and eviscerated as in recent actions and nonactions by the Food and Drug Administration.

Since the FDA seems determined to continue in its present course, adrift in the sea of redtape and foundering on the rocks of bureaucratic inaction and arbitrary decision, one possible solution has been put forth that might mean an end to the tribulations inflicted on DMSO and other meritorious new drugs.

This solution would be to place new drug investigations under the National Academy of Sciences, taking this power totally away from the FDA. This organization is eminently more professionally qualified to carry out and administer such a program than is the FDA.

The Food and Drug Administration has proven what a poor job it can do. Perhaps it is time to let another agency try.

Perhaps the facts point the way to reorganization of drug testing regulation through legislation in order to unplug the bottleneck of confusion and malfeasance now rampant in FDA handling of new drugs.

The following letter and articles indicate only partially the magnitude of the furor created by the FDA not only over DMSO, but also over almost all new drug applications.

Action is sought; action is warranted; and action must be taken. If not action by the FDA, then action by the Congress itself.

AUGUST 22, 1967.

ROBERT M. HODGES, M.D.
Director, Office of New Drugs, Bureau of Medicine, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Food and Drug Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. HODGES: Thank you for your reply of August 10th in connection with a letter I had written to Mr. Paul A. Pumpian.

I appreciate the fact and the privilege that my daughter could still have DMSO, subject to the willingness of both a drug concern and the doctor in meeting the requirements as set forth by the Food and Drug Administration. I am quite well versed in the requirements of the Food and Drug Administration as they pertain to the use of DMSO since I have had lengthy conversations with Dr. Arthur Scherbel of the Cleveland Clinic and a personal consultation with Dr. G. Boost of Syntex Laboratories in Palo Alto.

Because of the long usage I have made of DMSO for my daughter, I have received many articles concerning it. Among those I have received is a scholarly one from Don C. Wood, Ph.D., Head of the Research Department of Providence Hospital, Portland, Oregon. Rather than to give the impression that statements I might make would be ones of my own learning, I am enclosing a copy of a letter which Dr. Wood wrote to Senator Long. To me, this certainly reinforces my thought that the entire DMSO controversy should be turned over to the National Academy of Sciences. Dr. Arthur Scherbel of the Cleveland Clinic has indicated to me that DMSO is one of the safest, most effective drugs he has ever known in medicine. This certainly is not the position the Food and Drug Administration has been taking.

I recently read an article in connection with the approval by the Food and Drug Administration of a drug for the prevention of influenza wherein it mentioned that there was practically no margin of safety in man (Doctors Enders and Sabin), whereas on the other hand, with DMSO there has been shown to be a great margin of safety in man. From this it appears that the Food and Drug Administration is putting more emphasis on animal data than on human data in the DMSO matter and seems to be de-emphasizing human data in the matter of the drug for influenza.

It would appear to me that the Food and Drug Administration is using a double standard when it comes to new drugs, especially as it concerns DMSO. From various articles I have read in medical periodicals, it appears that studies are being accepted for other drugs that are being refused for DMSO. It seems only reasonable that perhaps the last dozen drugs that the Food and Drug Administration has approved should be turned over to the National Academy of Sciences, together with all the data obtained on DMSO, to let them determine whether double standards are being used.

I can readily realize that you receive many individual letters from laymen such as me and I can see how perhaps many might not have competent scientific reasoning back of them. I cannot see, however, how the Medical Section of the Food and Drug Administration can constantly apparently ignore letters from individuals such as Dr. Don C. Wood. I would certainly hope that first of all you are a doctor and not a politician, and certainly it has been my understanding that the Hippocratic oath carried with it more than evasive action.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

[From Medical World News, Aug. 25, 1967]

POINT OF VIEW: ARE THE NEW DRUG RULES AN "APOTHEOSIS OF ABSURDITY"?

(By Dr. Morris Fishbein)

Next week marks the Food and Drug Administration's deadline for comment on its new regulations for labeling and advertising drugs prescribed by physicians. The proposed regulations, which were first published in May, seem to go far beyond previous requirements.

When an advertisement suggests how the product shall be used or suggests a dosage or contains any claim as to safety or effectiveness, it must also provide a summary of side effects and contraindications. A reminder advertisement is permitted, which may contain only the name of the drug, dosage form and ingredients, and information relative to the manufacturer or distributor, but no recommendation or suggestion regarding use, dosage, safety, effectiveness, "or other quality" of the drug. Another section elaborates in detail what is meant by the terms "side effects," "contraindications," and "effectiveness." The limitations on these terms are emphasized, intensified, and reemphasized. Indeed, the detail reaches so far as to require that advertisements for a drug offered as an antibacterial must name the types of infections and microorganisms for which the drug is effective clinically.

"Fair balance" is demanded between claims for safety or effectiveness and information relating to limitations on safety or effectiveness. As proof of positive claims, there must be "substantial" evidence. The advertiser cannot claim advantages for a drug without simultaneously disclosing pertinent disadvantages. He must not "publish articles" if these articles fail to include reference to other articles citing side effects. The advertiser must not refer to articles that fail to disclose the extent to which the claimed results may be due to placebo effect or concomitant therapy.

The detail in which the judgment of the reader of an article is guided in deciding whether or not the article is authoritative and dependable or false and misleading or outside the limitations considered desirable by the FDA is unheard of in previous governmental regulations. In the section on "fair balance," the paragraphs on evaluation of statistical material seem to go far beyond the ability of any except the most profound statisticians. Clinical investigators may find themselves completely baffled.

ALL IMPLEMENTING FACTORS

Any advertisement or statement that proposes a variation in dosage greater than that authorized in the approved package labeling would be subject to challenge.

Advertisements are controlled with reference to the number of pages and the size of the page. The exact area and space of the summary are stipulated. One paragraph demands that information related to side effects and contraindications shall be presented with "a prominence and readability reasonably comparable with the presentation of information relating to effectiveness of the drug, taking into account all implementing factors such as typography, layout, contrast, headline, paragraphing, white space, and any other techniques apt to achieve emphasis."

Even beyond this, the advertiser is instructed as to the use of borders, headlines, the relationships of facing pages, and explanatory directions as to where to look for the side effects and contraindications. The regulations make clear that every type of advertising is covered by these stipulations. And in a still more comprehensive paragraph, even film strips, sound recordings, and scientific exhibits are covered.

Should a manufacturer wish to discuss a drug in a motion picture or a film strip with audio or visual labeling, and should this method of presentation make it difficult to satisfy the stipulation for lists of side effects and contraindications, the statement must be made that printed matter will be distributed covering what is not in the audiovisual material. Exhibits must include a panel on side effects and contraindications, and other panels will have to tell the viewer that the side-effects panel is on view.

As a medical editor with some 54 years of experience, the proposals included in these regulations appear, if I interpret them correctly, to be beyond any reasonable attempt to protect either the medical profession, the publishers, or the advertisers against the hazards associated with the use of prescribed pharmaceuticals. These regulations represent an invasion of medical practice and medical education that is wholly unwarranted in the present state of medical science.

Prescription drugs are limited in sale and purchase to those qualified and licensed. If physicians are competent to diagnose disease and to direct the patient as to his course of living for the protection of his health, they should be considered possessors of sufficient knowledge and judgment to be aware of the benefits and hazards associated with the pharmaceuticals they recommend.

LICENSE AND RESPONSIBILITY

When a physician is granted a medical degree and is located to practice, he assumes the responsibilities associated with such education and licensure. Apparently, the FDA is convinced that its obligation under the law is to spell out the limitations on his prescribing, in terms so positive, so blatant, so meticulous, and so inescapable that he will henceforth practice only within the exact borders that the FDA may determine.

Despite the painstaking detail of the stipulations, the FDA's wording is still frequently far from specific. In addition to "safety" and "effectiveness," there is a reference to "other quality" of a drug, which is a phrase so all-embracing as to defy definition. The FDA assumes the authority and ability to interpret any illustration as to its meaning. Obviously its officials think they can decide whether or not the face of a person shown in a picture indicates the severe pain of a headache or of menstruation, the anxiety associated with the fear of death or the loss of business.

The regulations demand a bibliographic service better than those of *Excerpta Medica* or MEDLARS. Apparently they insist that every reference in the total medical literature be found. The advertisers cannot quote a recognized authority without indicating that there are other recognized authorities that differ with him.

The previous animadversions on statistical studies, in the light of current debates among statisticians, make these paragraphs represent the apotheosis of absurdity. If I read it correctly, one of these paragraphs says, in highly complicated and abstruse language, that one cannot emphasize a medical opinion unsupported by statistics acceptable to the FDA. Even among experts in advertising typography, there is no unanimity of opinion on the effectiveness of borders, headlines, and other technicalities, which the proposed regulations seem to take for granted.

When the amended Food and Drug Act was under consideration, many doubted the ability of the FDA to pass on questions related to the effectiveness of drugs. Some even hesitated on questions of dosage, toxicity, and side effects. I am not aware that anyone involved in medical editing, practice, or education imagined that the development and interpretation of the law and regulations would carry the bureaucracy into such infinitesimal absurdities. Even a slight awareness of the history of previous legislation and regulations would suggest that what is here attempted will simply breed more and more of the same, until the mountain of minuscule stipulations finally disintegrates by the very weight of its particles.

DR. FISHBEIN SUMS IT UP

The ultimate effect of the FDA's proposed new regulations governing prescription-drug advertising is to cast doubt on the ability of physicians to make any individual judgments about drugs and to remove from the physician both the responsibility and the right to practice that his license confers upon him. It puts on the advertiser a demand for projecting every conceivable facet of information, which I am sure is quite beyond any manufacturer's or advertiser's compliance.

As an editor, I resent the concept that any federal bureau can dictate every nuance of every type of printed, audio, or visual presentation—even if it had sufficient qualified personnel to undertake the necessary monitoring.

I doubt that physicians realize the difficulties in which they are placed by these regulations. Anyone who wishes to bring any sort of suit for malpractice or damages against a physician could cite the material in the advertisements under control of the bureau as representing an established standard of information and practice.

[From Drug & Cosmetic Industry, August 1967]

THE NEW IMPERIALISM: GROWING POWER FOR THE FDA

(By Donald A. Davis, editor)

An old and respected military axiom reads something like this: "It doesn't make much sense to expend a major effort to attempt to take an objective you probably cannot hold." These days this repeatedly comes to mind as the Food and Drug Administration extends its regulatory activities into new domains.

Over the past two years, with the help of a too willing Congress, the FDA has gone far beyond the rather limited scope suggested by its name. The Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Law, the Fair Packaging and Labeling Law, the Child Safety Law, coupled with an extensive re-evaluation of the agency's more traditional spheres—drug safety and efficacy, food contamination and processing procedures, cosmetic safety—seemingly have threatened to push the agency to the limit of its manpower and financial resources. Added to this has been the agency's new role in law enforcement, with hundreds of agents in the field tracking down the sources of narcotics, pep pills, and other habit-forming drugs.

To this observer the major drawback to this diversification of activity has been a lack of attention to detail. Such matters as the vitamin labeling hassle, the actual writing of the provisions of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Law, and similar problems either go unresolved for too long, or seem to get lost in the shuffle.

A good case in point is vitamin labeling, which was discussed in a major article in this magazine last month. Ever since Commissioner Goddard issued his edict suggesting vitamins are really "not necessary" to the normal American diet, it's a safe bet that those Americans who consider themselves well informed have at very least curtailed their consumption of these products. The FDA's long delay in setting a date for public hearings has deprived the manufacturers and retailers of vitamins of their "day in court"—their chance to tell the public how important these products are to every-day health. The impression remains that, partly because the agency's attention has been diverted elsewhere, the vitamin labeling problem has been handled in a slap-dash way that inevitably will put a serious crimp in future industry-government relations.

This erratic attitude toward regulation continues into other areas. The FDA's ideas on the advertising of ethical drugs and on the advertising of analgesics are clearly stated, whether or not everyone agrees with them. But these ideas need to be carried to a conclusion before opening up new areas.

Obviously, part of the problem associated with the FDA's seeming inability to establish priorities, to work out a pattern of alarm-sounding/law writing/holding-of-hearings, is Commissioner Goddard's propensity for jumping from crag to crag. As was the case with President Kennedy, his idealism far outstrips the political (or in this case the regulatory) realities of the situation. The problems may exist, but the way to attack them is not with a wild cavalry charge, but with the hard-slugging effort of the foot soldier.

The most effective and painless way of achieving goals in any regulatory situation is to do it with the cooperation of the industry being regulated. To win such cooperation the FDA must discard its erratic behavior in favor of a more calm, less publicity-conscious, more reasoned approach to regulation and policy.

[From the American Family Physician, August 1967]

THE IMAGE OF THE FDA

In a mid-1966 speech, FDA Commissioner James L. Goddard said that the FDA had surveyed 4,200 drug samples in 20 major therapeutic categories and all collected by FDA field offices. He added that 7.6 percent of the products tested "deviated to a material extent from declared potency." On the basis of this survey, Dr. Goddard concluded that "one out of every 14 drug units manufactured is violative just on potency alone." If true, this would be an alarming bit of news and it was of more than momentary interest to the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. The PMA immediately set out to learn more about the FDA survey—and this brings us to the point of this editorial.

We would expect that a copy of this survey would be instantly available to the PMA. We would be hard put to name an industry that is more concerned with quality control than the pharmaceutical industry, represented by the PMA. Certainly a letter to the FDA, asking for a copy of the survey results, should merit an immediate, positive response.

Accordingly, the PMA wrote to the FDA—on August 22. Said the FDA, in its reply, "We . . . will be in touch with you later." On August 25, the PMA wrote another letter—and received a similar reply. On October 17, the PMA wrote a third letter stating, "We believe it is most important to obtain meaningful information on the performance of drug manufacturers of various kinds, so that mutual efforts can be put forth by the industry and the FDA to raise the level of quality of the drug supply as high as possible." From the FDA—no answer.

On December 1, the PMA wrote its fourth letter to Dr. Goddard and asked specifically about the nature of the survey's sampling technique or design, the source of the samples, the lot or control number of the products found to be subpotent and the method of analysis. Again, no answer.

Meanwhile, in an October 29 speech, a deputy undersecretary of HEW referred to the elusive survey and added that "the study was not a model of careful design anyhow." This must have already been suspected by members of the PMA staff.

During all these months, the FDA was distributing news releases—citing the survey's "results." In the words of PMA President C. Joseph Stetler, the FDA kept "replaying the same tired number game which it started June 8"—almost eight months earlier.

Finally, on February 1, the PMA received a brief letter and a list of the products examined by the FDA. The letter did not include (a) the lot or control numbers requested by the PMA or (b) any of the other information requested in the four letters written by the PMA.

This is a sad story—and there's a sequel to it. On March 16, almost a year after Dr. Goddard's first mention of the survey results, *he himself* told the Pharmaceutical Wholesalers Association that the survey "cannot and should not be projected for the industry." This strikes us as being a direct about-face, executed by a top-level government official who had earlier concluded that "one out of every 14 drug units manufactured is violative just on potency alone."

We have earlier taken a dim view of the FDA's apparent willingness to promote its views in the public press. We do not question the FDA's right, or the right of any man or agency, to tell its story in a manner it alone prescribes. But we seriously question the merits and propriety of indicting an industry publicly—and then denying that . . . .

[From the Hospital Tribune, Aug. 28, 1967]

EXCLUSIVE: THE FUTURE OF FDA—I: NEED FOR REORGANIZATION FOUND IN NEW APPRAISAL

(By Joseph D. Cooper, Ph. D., professor of government, Howard University; adjunct professor of government and public administration, the American University, Washington, D.C.)

On July 6, 1967, in Washington, D.C., before a packed audience of drug industry officials, Dr. Dennis Cahal, medical assessor of Britain's Committee on Safety of Drugs, explained how new drugs are approved in his country. He told a fascinating story of how some really tough decision making goes on within a framework of regulation that is entirely voluntary, without force of law. This system, he said, yields final decisions on major submissions—approvals, of course, because the others are withdrawn—usually within three months. Minor submissions or supplemental applications are disposed of within a few days. The work of his permanent secretariat is done by nine professionals and 16 auxiliaries and clericals. The committee and its three subcommittees meet once a month, serving without pay.

This report to America was most timely, because at this very moment top officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are studying what, if anything, to do about the future organization of the Food and Drug Administration in the light of plans for reorganizing the over-all depart-

ment along Pentagon lines to include a subsidiary Department of Health.

Of course, Dr. Cahal had much more to say, not relevant to this discussion of FDA's future. One year ago, in England, I was privileged to ask Dr. Cahal most of the same questions put to him by his Washington audience. The essence of his most recent remarks can be found in the articles I wrote for MEDICAL TRIBUNE last year (August 22 to September 19, 1966). In the concluding article I drew inferences for the future organization of the FDA.

Now, one year later, much has occurred in the United States with implications for the FDA future. The consumer protection movement has become stronger, especially in the political sector. Both the FDA and industry have had some experience in dealing with the efficacy review panels of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, which have been examining drugs approved by the FDA prior to the passage of the Kefauver-Harris Act of 1962. Increasing attention has been given to manufacturing and quality controls in the light of the national debate on generic prescribing. The country, the medical profession, and the industry have had one more year of reacting to the dynamic leadership of FDA Commissioner Dr. James L. Goddard, who probably introduced more change in the regulation of drugs within the past year and a half than his predecessors had since passage of the 1938 Food and Drug Act.

OPEN DIALOGUE WANTED

The time is ripe for open dialogue. The future of the FDA is not a matter solely for the bureaucratic and political judgment of the elders of the HEW in consultation with key members of the Congress and the Executive Office of the President. For one thing, HEW is now a party at interest in the outcome of FDA decisions. It has an economic interest in the approval of drugs from the standpoint of efficacy, in the light of its responsibilities for Medicare and Medicaid. It has a program interest in having new drugs—and potentially devices—approved in the light of its heavy investments in medical research and development.

From the standpoint of practicing physicians, it has never been more timely to get into the debate, for upon its outcome may depend the extent to which professional medical practices are to be centrally dictated, covering availability and choice of drugs and determination of dosages.

To put this discussion into perspective, I suggest that the value of anything the FDA does in the drug area, as well as how it is organized and staffed, must be measured from the standpoint of how doctors are helped or hindered in their practice of medicine. We are concerned here mainly with prescription drugs, whose availability and use are controlled for the patient through the medium of the physician. In a broad sense, the effectiveness of FDA operations should be measured in terms of effect upon public health, but practically this might be an exercise in counting angels on a pinhead.

EFFECT ON PRESCRIBING

How do we know whether tougher reviews of ethical drug advertising and insistence upon fair balance in describing the advantages and disadvantages of a drug will make any or much difference in prescribing practices and public health? How do we know whether prescribing practices will be altered or improved by imposing a generic name on a label every time the brand name is used? How do we know whether a master drug compendium, kept current through a revision service and occupying a 5-foot shelf, would help or hinder a physician in his own practice of medicine? How do we know whether FDA's Bureau of Medicine is overstaffed or understaffed or whether adding more people would help or hinder the drug review process and ultimately help or hinder the physician in his care of patients? And so on.

Such questions may have been asked in the past, but they certainly have not been answered. The fact is that no one knows the answers. From a political standpoint it may not be important to know, for the politician may be concerned only with assuring a constituency that *something* is being done.

Ever since its creation in 1906, in another form, the FDA has grown by addition of responsibilities and staff. Always the question has been: What must be done to strengthen the FDA? Present projections call for even more growth. While Congress, before 1962, occasionally cut back on FDA appropriations for purely political reasons, no one seems to have asked seriously whether we could have a more effective FDA through cutting back on its staff operations. To do so would, of course, call for major reconstructions of philosophy and technique. It is at least worth considering, and I so propose. In a crude way of putting it, one can obstruct the progress of the meal by having too many functionaries in the kitchen, all doing seemingly worthwhile things.

AN ANACHRONISM

In my articles last year I said that the FDA is an anachronism in an age of science. New concepts of organization and decision making are needed. The FDA cannot really be strengthened from within. It cannot assemble within its own walls the technical competence needed to make judgments on today's drugs, let alone the much more complex products it will be called upon to review in the future. The fact is that the greatest competence is to be found in the laboratories of the major drug companies and leading medical schools. The FDA does occasionally attract competent people, but they do not stay. Many join for reasons of convenience in the absence of other alternatives. The FDA does not offer an atmosphere or career ladder for creative advancement and recognition in the various areas of scientific and clinical judgment in which it desperately needs expertise. Whatever else might be done to improve FDA organization, the upgrading of its scientific posture is a must.

[From the Hospital Tribune, Sept. 11, 1967]

EXCLUSIVE: THE FUTURE OF FDA—II: A SINGLE DRUG AGENCY URGED UTILIZING REFERENCE PANELS

(By Joseph D. Cooper, Ph. D., professor of government, Howard University; adjunct professor of government and public administration, the American University, Washington, D.C.)

In reviewing my conclusions concerning the organization of the Food and Drug Administration published in MEDICAL TRIBUNE last year, I find little to change, other than to add and explain. The comments which follow are based on interactions after publication and on discussions held since then with scores of authorities.

The first problem to be faced is that of scope. Should there continue to be a single agency with responsibility for regulating foods, drugs, cosmetics, and hazardous substances, with the possible addition of medical devices? Are these still a homogeneous assortment requiring common direction, or have we reached a stage of scope and sophistication in the medical area which requires that it be separated out for independent attention?

The time is perhaps ripe for change by both exclusion and inclusion. The main distinguishing feature between prescription drugs and all the other objects of current FDA control is the intermediary role of the physician, who is FDA's main client. The counting of rat droppings in grain elevators, the checking of weight fill in cereal boxes, the labeling of the potential hazards of tear-gas guns, and the control of food color additives, among other duties, all call for different judgmental processes.

The scope of a Federal drug agency should include only drugs and biologicals now under the control of the National Institutes of Health, Division of Biologics Standards. (No such transfer should be made, however, unless other upgrading proposals are adopted to assure maintenance of a viable scientific environment for DBS.) If over-the-counter drugs are kept within the scope of the Federal drug agency—for they need not be—then it should be complete, including the transfer out of the Federal Trade Commission of responsibility for policing advertising of generally available drug products.

Nondrug responsibilities could go into an environmental health agency, with the possible exception of foods, which might also be so disposed or might be reassigned to the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Trade Commission.

The important point is that drug responsibilities alone are of sufficient magnitude to warrant the full-time attention of the overall drug authority. I wonder if the public even thinks of food when it identifies with the FDA, whose news headlines predominate in the drug area almost exclusively and whose Congressional investigations are similarly skewed. Instead of bureaucratic growth, I propose bureaucratic devolution.

This proposal might not accord with aspirations in some circles for an expanded structure of consumer protection. Without detracting from the importance of the latter, I suggest the difficulty of housing all consumer-protection activities under one roof, for they are disseminated among many different Federal departments and agencies. Nor does it necessarily follow that all consumer-oriented activities within HEW need be under integrated direction. Again, the drug situation is different because of its involvement of the whole medical-scientific community in addition to the existence of the physician as intermediary client.

SHOULD FUNCTION INDEPENDENTLY

Ideally, the drug agency should be completely divorced from the interested influence of HEW, functioning as an independent agency. This would minimize the possibility of political interference with aspects of the professional practice of medicine, apart from influences on its organization stemming from various Public Health Service programs in addition to Medicare and Medicaid.

All agencies cannot be independent, however, so an alternative would be to accord the drug agency a semiautonomous status, as was done in Britain. When its Committee on Safety of Drugs was created, the Government decided for about the same reasons given above that it would avoid influencing drug decisions in view of the economic leverage of the Ministry of Health. The latter, therefore, merely provides secretariat support. It does not enter into decision making in any way.

Whatever the arrangement, I return to the organization format proposed in my earlier articles. The drug agency would be headed by a board of commissioners who could be full- or part-time (although its chairman should probably be full-time), whose membership would be drawn from medical scientists, medical practitioners, and social scientists. The commissioners would be appointed by the President, without Senate confirmation, from among nominees proposed by accredited professional bodies. The commissioners would establish policies and standards, issue regulations, take appeals on decisions of advisory panels, appoint an agency administrator, and evaluate staff.

Actually, decision making on professional matters, including new-drug applications, would be vested in reference panels which would operate somewhat along the same

line as NIH study sections. To the extent practicable, these might be organized along therapeutic specialty lines. Membership of the reference panels would be nominated to the Board of Commissioners by professional bodies. Their qualifications would be investigated and submitted to the board by its own secretariat, which would be independent of the administrator. The decisions of the panels would be published in the Federal Register and would automatically become binding unless appealed by any aggrieved party at interest, as administratively defined, including the administrator, the latter on advice of the Bureau of Medicine. The bureau would provide work-up services for the panels. It would also dispose of minor submissions, under delegation, when these would not have to go forward to the full panels. The last is an important point. The FDA has not made any distinctions in its published statistics as to minor submissions and major new submissions—which call for, or should receive, entirely different processing.

VESTIBULE PERIOD SUGGESTED

In the work-up of cases, the Bureau of Medicine, cut loose from the legalistics which now so heavily dominate proceedings, would put them through an initial vestibule period, during which informal conferences would be held with manufacturers to assure that all needed information for prompt decision making has been submitted. Such informal reviews should be without commitment to any parties, both as a means of speeding the movement of the file and as assurance that the Government would still be free to request additional data submissions.

One of the problems with the present regulatory setup, which is not in the public interest, is the arms-length dealing of two adversaries, warily seeking to catch or evade the other, with respective legal resources in depth. The public pays for this through increased costs on both sides as well as through deprivation of the use of occasionally important drugs. The probability of correcting this is not very great under present procedural arrangements. Some big change is needed, such as the reorganization proposed here or a new regulatory philosophy, or both. I choose both.

Furthermore, the approval of new drugs must be linked more closely to the stages of clinical experience. The approval of a new-drug application is presently a formal gesture subject to revocation in the event of bad conduct reports. Approval must still be regarded as an important action, not lightly retrieved, but the emphasis should be on tentative approvals at the earliest stages of clinical trial, broadening out progressively in line with clinical experience, properly monitored and reported.

The use of reference panels will provide a buffer zone in the relationships between government and industry. Presently, drug companies avoid any open, critical expression for fear of reprisal.

CUTBACKS IN PASSENGER TRAIN SERVICE

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, people in communities all over our Nation, particularly in the Midwest where travel distances are vast, are concerned about cutbacks in passenger train service, and we feel that these cutbacks are the result of arbitrary and capricious rulings of the Post Office Department in removing mail service.

Resolutions have been introduced in both the House and the Senate regarding this matter. I was the author of one, House Concurrent Resolution 351, introduced May 18, 1967, calling for the Secretary of Transportation to make a full and complete investigation and study of the potential of rail transportation for passengers and mail, and that the Postmaster General should continue all existing arrangements for railroad mail transportation until such an investigation is complete.

Just recently, the Fargo City Commission passed a resolution regarding this matter and sent it to me so that it may be put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of all of the Members of Congress. I include the resolution at this point in the RECORD:

CITY OF FARGO, N. DAK., RESOLUTION

(Resolution adopted protesting discontinuance of Northern Pacific Mainstreeter and Great Northern trains Nos. 11 and 14)

Whereas, The Northern Pacific Railway officials have announced their intention to discontinue the Mainstreeter and Great Northern Railway officials have announced their intention to discontinue trains No. 11 and 14; and

Whereas, This discontinuance poses a serious threat to the economy of this area.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the Fargo City Commission does hereby register a strong protest to the proposed discontinuance of railway service to this area, as proposed by officials of the Northern Pacific Railway and Great Northern Railway, as detrimental to the public interest.

Be it further resolved, That this Resolution be inscribed upon the permanent Minutes of the Fargo City Commission and Certified Copies of same be forwarded to the Congressional Delegation, requesting them to consider the Commission's previous Resolution that there be a study in depth of the railroad system and that no discontinuances or terminations of services be permitted until such a study has been completed.

TAX AND SPENDING ISSUE

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it is my custom to send my constituents periodic reports on my activities in Congress and on the more pressing issues facing this body. Such a report is being sent out this week and I insert it in the RECORD at this time:

The big item of discussion in our nation today, second only to the struggle in Vietnam in importance to all of us, is the tax and spending issue.

This Congress has attempted to keep spending within the bounds of prudence. This effort, of course, has been made especially difficult because of the credibility gap that exists in the present Administration. For instance, economists tell us the proper time to increase taxes was early in 1966 when the economy was booming. At that time all of the new Great Society programs, calling for massive spending, were trotted out by the Johnson Administration and phony statements minimizing the deficit were issued, giving the illusion that these new programs could be funded without additional taxes. This helped to hasten their approval by the lopsided majority the Administration controlled in Congress.

Many Members who voted for these programs felt that we could afford them. I feel certain that if they had known the truth they would have voted against them.

Immediately after the election, the President presented $14 billion in supplemental appropriations requests and the budget, far from being balanced, ended with one of the largest deficits in years.

This year, we saw the same tactics used as the President once again underestimated the deficit in his budget. The "crunch" came in August. After the House had already acted on 13 of the 16 major appropriations bills (making significant cuts in all of them), the President made what he called "significant revisions" in his budget and predicted a deficit of over $28 billion.

Because many Members of Congress are convinced that the deficit was deliberately and badly underestimated originally, resistance to the President's request for a tax increase stiffened. Rep. Wilbur Mills (D-Ark.), the highly regarded Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, spoke for many of us when he said: "What many of us fear is that tax increases now make more revenue available for expenditure programs in the future." It won't do much good to increase taxes if the money isn't used to cut back the deficit.

Those who continue to insist that the budgetary problem is the result of the situation in Viet Nam totally ignore the fact that while defense expenditures are up 67% since 1960, non-defense spending has increased 104%. All of this cover up and deception has further complicated the matter.

Many knowledgeable economists tell us that the timing is not right for a tax rise now. The recent increase in the Federal Reserve discount rate to 4½% and anticipated further increases will result in higher consumer credit costs. This in turn reduces the demand for new houses, new industrial plants, automobiles, farm machinery and other consumer durable goods.

Today's economy at best is soggy. Our industries are operating at only 84% of plant capacity. Unemployment stands at 4.3%, the highest point in two years. The average work week declined in October and last month saw a smaller than usual increase in employment. It's almost unheard of, but it looks like this Administration is succeeding in having an inflation and a recession at the same time.

Superimposing a tax increase on the dampening effect of high interest rates could plunge our economy deeper into recession. Thus enactment of the surtax by Congress at this time appears even more unjustified by the economic risks such action could entail. First, domestic spending has to be cut back to at least last year's level and possibly further. Secondly, immediate action has to be taken to put our international payments into balance, thus reducing the accumulation of American dollars in foreign hands that may be converted into gold.

A tax increase before these two conditions were remedied would fail to meet the problems facing us.

NO ONE CAME CLOSE TO CLARE HOFFMAN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, among the editorials which appeared at the time of the death of Clare E. Hoffman, one published by the News-Palladium at Benton Harbor, Mich., is outstanding.

I include it at this point:

NO ONE CAME CLOSE TO CLARE HOFFMAN

There would be room for debate if Southwestern Michigan were to seek to name its most powerful preacher, its greatest athlete, its most accomplished artist, its greatest teacher, its most productive industrialist, its outstanding lawyer or doctor.

But there can only be one answer to this question: who was the most colorful politician with the biggest image among his constituency and the greatest loyalty from it on election days?

Clare E. Hoffman who died Friday night at age 92 stands out like a skyscraper in the open prairie. No one else even comes close. Elected to Congress in 1934, he served 14 consecutive terms, 28 years until he voluntarily retired in 1962.

During that time, everyone in the six-county Fourth Congressional district was aware of him as they had never been aware of a legislative representative before or since. He not only had a personality and character that attracted nationwide attention, he personally knew thousands of his constituents. He was a tireless worker and campaigner. His range of activities with and on behalf of his constituents was probably three or four times greater than that of average congressmen, more than an ordinary man could undertake—or stand.

He brought great talents to his job. He was learned in the law and experienced in its practice. He was articulate, well read and intelligent. These talents plus a sharp wit made him the most feared member of Congress in parliamentary debate. On the campaign trail in this midwestern district, he was like an eagle among pigeons. Observing Hoffman debate an election foe, the late Supervisor Charles Blumrich of Benton Harbor, commented:

"One of Clare's idle thoughts would crack ————'s brain."

Added to all Hoffman's quickness was great showmanship. More than one reporter for this newspaper saw him turn a desultory meeting of 25 or 30 at some vacant store into a singing, cheering rally the likes of which are all too few these days.

Perhaps because he started his business career at $1 a day for 11 hours work, because he labored hard for all he earned, Hoffman was a rugged individualist. He was tagged, and rightly so, a conservative Republican. Not even political enemies impugned his integrity, yet he drove many Democrats and some liberal members of his party to a frenzy. They scorned him as a throwback to the McKinley era.

He readily admitted that no major legislation carried his name. But he prided himself on the work he did in three major areas: government reorganization under the Hoover commission; the armed services unification act, and the Taft-Hartley labor act. President Dwight Eisenhower and ex-President Herbert Hoover formally expressed their thanks to Hoffman for his work in these areas.

Still, through the mass news media, Hoffman must have come through to the public strictly as an "aginner." He was accused of being even more conservative than his normally Republican district. How, then, did he win his great hold on the loyalty of the district's voters?

First, there were probably a great many voters who felt personal admiration for a man who had the courage to row against the current.

Second, he was utterly honest. His political philosophy was the opposite of Lyndon Johnson's "government by consensus." He threw his independent beliefs from the rostrum into the teeth of CIO rallies; the crowds booed his statements but cheered him when he walked out of their halls. He never claimed "misquotation" for words that later proved unpopular.

Third, he would turn Heaven and earth to help a constituent find his way through the maze of government bureaucracies, regardless of the constituent's politics. He went to bat for his people with a vengeance; and even hostile bureaucrats jumped rather than risk his scathing exposure.

Fourth, and perhaps most importantly, he was—in private—a charming man. Congressman Barratt O'Hara, Chicago Democrat born in Benton Harbor, had this to say when Hoffman retired in 1962:

"More often than not Clare and I have been on different sides of issues (but) I have never known a kinder heart."

This was the side of Clare Hoffman that came through when he hunted or fished with dirt farmers, when he took extra hours to explain a complicated subject to a cub reporter, when he jollied a hard-working housewife in some remote hamlet, when he drove his small Plymouth down country roads to visit an ailing friend.

The Congressional Record for July 1962, notes that when Hoffman's intention to retire was announced, one colleague said: "They don't hardly make them like Clare any more." And another added: "When the good Lord made Clare Hoffman, He broke the mold." And still a third added: "He is a man who has to be recognized by all who know him . . . as an extraordinary man."

Indeed, he was.

A FULLER KNOWLEDGE OF DEVALUATION OF THE POUND

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the devaluation of the British pound sterling on November 18 by about 14 percent was a major event for international economic policy, and it came at the end of a long period of struggle by the British Government to create, through an economic austerity program, a healthy balance of payments.

The Wall Street Journal has made a major contribution toward better understanding of the most recent devaluation of the pound by putting the event into the context of world monetary history during the present century, and by a factual economic account of the most recent devaluation. A news roundup article, titled "Previous Pound Devaluations in 1949, 1931 Resulted in Contrasting Economic Trends," in the November 20 edition provides an excellent brief history of previous devaluations—including the 1933 U.S. devaluation by 41 percent. It is valuable also because it makes clear that the recent British efforts to control chronic balance-of-payments deficits through an austerity program were actually bearing fruit. According to the Journal:

The austerity measures and massive aid from other countries (begun in July 1966) enabled Britain to make considerable headway in cutting its payments deficit, and by early this year the nation appeared headed for some semblance of economic stability.

Early this year, in fact, government ministers were freely predicting a sizable surplus in the nation's balances of payments for 1967. The nation's currency reserves were steadily rising as funds pulled out of London in 1966 started flowing back.

This progress was reversed by several factors. Among them, the Journal says, were the Mideast crisis and the stoppage of traditional British oil supply sources which required purchases of higher cost oil from other sources; the dock strike; and high interest rates in the United States, which tended to make investment in the United States more attractive to international "flight" capital. These unfavorable forces were all brought to the front by the October trade figures which showed a substantial deficit, the natural result of the dock strike magnified by statistical reporting peculiarities.

The final result, with the addition of certain psychological factors affecting international confidence in the pound, resulted in devaluation.

The Wall Street Journal article referred to follows:

PREVIOUS POUND DEVALUATIONS IN 1949, 1931 RESULTED IN CONTRASTING ECONOMIC TRENDS

The British pound has been sharply devalued twice before in this century. The two devaluations were followed by contrasting economic trends.

From 1819 until 1931, Britain stood ready to pay $4.86 in gold for each pound note. In 1931, however, the government went off the gold standard and decided to abandon the fixed rate, letting the pound seek its own level. The pound quickly fell to about $3.50. By 1949, the value had climbed to $4.03, but, faced with high postwar production costs, Britain went to a fixed rate of $2.80—the rate that prevailed until the cut to $2.40 over the weekend.

The 1931 cut was followed in the U.S. by an extension of the declines in business activity and prices that had been going on since 1929, and by a growing wave of bank failures. These resulted from a run on the U.S. dollar, with Americans drawing their money out of banks and buying gold with it, while foreigners sold property in the U.S. and transferred any dollars they had into other currencies.

The outcome was the bank holiday of March 1933, when newly elected President Franklin D. Roosevelt closed the banks temporarily and stopped the U.S. Treasury from paying out gold for dollars. Later that year, the dollar was devalued 41% by raising the price of gold to $35 an ounce (where it still stands) from $20.67.

DIFFERENCES IN BRITAIN, TOO

After the 1949 British devaluation, however, a U.S. recession in business that had begun late in 1948 continued only another couple of months. At that time, a lengthy uptrend began.

In Britain, too, the aftermath of devaluation was different on the two occasions. Wholesale prices rose about 7% in a few months in late 1931, but then fell back again. In 1949, prices of raw materials jumped about 16% in a few weeks, leveled off for awhile, and then began a new uptrend.

The difference between the two situations seems to be that a world economic downtrend was under way in 1931 that the devaluation helped aggravate; but in 1949, the great postwar recovery, which the world has enjoyed most of the time since then, was about to get under way. Apparently the pre-

liminaries to the 1949 devaluation and its immediate consequences were mildly deflationary, but the general forces of recovery were stronger.

DIFFERENT BACKGROUND

The two devaluations themselves were based on somewhat different monetary backgrounds, though both were forced by runs on sterling, in which people who held funds in London sought to withdraw them.

The 1931 move reflected a basic inability of the British banking system to pay its foreign depositors on demand, because the deposits had been lent in Germany and elsewhere with repayment not due for years. The 1949 devaluation—together with devaluations that occurred in other nations at the same time—was aimed mainly at curing relatively high production costs, economists say. They note that the devaluing nations had been weakened economically by World War II, whereas the economic system in the U.S. had been strengthened in spite of the war.

The widespread opinion that the 1949 devaluations were needed was what caused the run on sterling, rather than any weakness in Britain's banking structure.

In one respect, both devaluations had the same effect. They stimulated production of gold because its price rose in terms of British and other currencies.

THE ROLE OF THE MIDEAST WAR

The decision over the weekend to devalue the pound—which came as no surprise in business and financial quarters in either the U.S. or Britain—stems basically from the failure of British exporters to earn enough to pay for the nation's important needs. (Devaluation tends to encourage exports by making them cheaper in world markets and to restrict imports because they become more costly.) The immediate cause of the devaluation was the Mideast War and the closing of the Suez Canal.

After the 1949 devaluation, there was a monetary crisis as early as 1951, and there were others in 1955, 1957 and 1961. Each time, the threatened devaluation was avoided by the adoption of stiff austerity measures in England, such as credit restrictions, limitations on dividend and wage increases, and boosts in interest rates. These measures were designed to hold down purchasing power and thus limit imports. Money was borrowed from the International Monetary Fund to buy pounds from currency speculators in foreign exchange markets.

Crisis struck again in late 1964. Britain had amassed a huge deficit in its international balance of payments—the difference between what a nation spends, lends and gives away abroad and what it takes in from foreign sources—and this caused a heavy drain on the nation's reserves of gold and currencies freely convertible into gold. These reserves, which had risen as high as $3.3 billion a few years earlier, fell to $2.3 billion at the end of 1964. (The payments deficit in 1964 totaled almost that much—$2.1 billion.)

DRASTIC STEPS IN 1964

Late in 1964, the Labor government, which had narrowly captured control in the October elections, took drastic measures to save the pound. It borrowed heavily from the International Monetary Fund and also from a group of 10 central banks of other nations. It posted a 15% surcharge on imports, and increased personal and corporate taxes. It also increased the Bank of England's discount rate—which influences all other interest rates in the nation—by two percentage points to 7%, the highest in modern times until this past weekend's increase to 8%. The purpose of the rise in the interest rate was to attract investment funds from abroad.

(Labor Party leaders said the moves were necessitated by bad leadership during the reign of the Conservatives, who had been in control for more than a decade prior to the 1964 elections. "Nineteen-sixty-four was a year of reckoning for a decade of mistaken policies and false pride," said James Callaghan, who currently is Chancellor of the Exchequer. The Labor government also implemented the two previous devaluations.)

But the moves did little to help the national economy. The pound came under frequent pressure through the early months of 1965, and the nation had to make big inroads into its reserves to support the pound in the foreign exchange markets. Some headway was made in cutting the massive $2.1 billion deficit in the balance of payments, but domestic spending and import spending continued high. A new wave of price increases, followed by substantial wage boosts, added to inflationary pressures and the government's troubles.

Thus, in April 1965 the Labor government introduced Britain's first tax on capital gains. It also stiffened the corporate tax structure. This helped. The payments deficit for all 1965 was more than halved, to $991 million, even though the surcharge on imports was cut to 10% from 15% and the bank rate was lowered to 6% from 7% during the year. Britain also made arrangement for new borrowings that year, and by the end of 1965 its currency reserves were up to $3 billion from the $2.3 billion of a year earlier.

The reserves grew further until they hit a high of $3.6 billion in February 1966. But then they began to melt away. A British seamen's strike that began in mid-May and lasted seven weeks aggravated the outflow, and by the end of June the reserves were less than $3.3 billion.

Despite new lending agreements, the pound began to weaken in foreign exchange markets early in July last year. In mid-July, the bank rate went back up to 7%, instalment buying was severely restricted, wages and prices were frozen for six months and dividend increases were barred for 12 months.

The austerity measures and massive aid from other nations enabled Britain to make considerable headway in cutting its payments deficit, and by early this year the nation appeared headed for some semblance of economic stability.

Early this year, in fact, government ministers were freely predicting a sizable surplus in the nation's balance of payments for 1967. The nation's currency reserves were steadily rising as funds pulled out of London in 1966 started flowing back. The discount rate was cut to 6% from 7%, with two half-point cuts in February and March. It was cut a further half point, to 5.5% on May 4.

But in June the economy ran into new trouble when the Middle East war flared up. The Arabs refused to ship oil to Britain, and the Suez Canal was closed by the fighting. This forced the United Kingdom to pay increased prices for imported oil—just when its excess of imports over exports, its major problem, had begun to shrink. In addition, rising interest rates in the U.S. generated an increasing flow of money out of Britain to New York.

Foreign exchange dealers reported mounting pressure on the pound, and it remained under pressure throughout the summer and into the fall. Two half-point increases in the bank rate, to 6.5%, occurred within a three-week period, but the rises were completely ineffective. Last month, the nation had a trade deficit of $465 million, up from $305 million in September.

The massive trade deficit sparked a serious run on the pound. By late last week, London financial markets were thrown into what was described as their "worst confusion in a generation." In a desperate, eleventh-hour effort to save the pound, the Bank of England on Friday threw in hundreds of millions of dollars from Britain's gold and currency reserves to stem the flood of selling.

But dealers in the foreign exchange, stock and commodity markets reported near panic conditions as traders around the world scrambled to get out of sterling and buy up gold, silver and a wide range of other commodities.

Friday, says a foreign exchange trader, "was the most desperate day I can remember."

THE AMERICAN PAPER INDUSTRY'S POSITION ON FOREIGN TRADE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, as a congressional delegate to the recent trade negotiations under the 1962 Trade Expansion Act, I had occasion to examine the problems of international trade in the pulp and paper sector. I became impressed during my study with the vigorous, aggressive exporting activity of the American paper industry and their excellent prospects for future trade growth, prospects which were furthered by the Kennedy round of trade negotiations.

In this respect it is of interest to me that the American pulp and paper industry, through its trade association, the American Paper Institute, has taken a firm position in favor of an expanding trade policy and against new trade restrictions.

This policy is expressed in a recent letter from the president of the American Paper Institute, Mr. James L. Ritchie, which follows:

AMERICAN PAPER INSTITUTE,
New York, N.Y., November 28, 1967.

Subject: Foreign trade policy.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: Because of concern aroused by the so-called "wave of protectionism," as manifested by the introduction of numerous bills seeking restrictions on imports, the American Paper Institute—representing 245 manufacturers who produce over 90 per cent of the nation's pulp, paper and paperboard—has adopted the following foreign trade policy statement:

"Since the passage of the first reciprocal Trade Agreement Act of 1934, the United States has played a major role in the progressive liberalization of international trade. The agreements reached in the Sixth or Kennedy Round of Gatt Trade Negotiations will bring tariff barriers of the major trading nations to relatively low levels. The constancy of the position of the United States since 1934 has resulted in a willingness on the part of other industrial nations to also reduce tariff barriers on a reciprocal basis.

"The United States paper industry has confidence in its ability to compete with the rest of the world. It has favored trade liberalization not only on the ground that the expansion of international commerce will help the United States paper industry but does in fact promote the most effective use of the world's human and material resources and increase the economic welfare of the United States along with that of other nations.

"Any attempts to revert to a policy of protectionism, and to avoid agreements the United States reached in the Kennedy Round will further contribute to this country's inflation and result in massive retaliation by our GATT trading partners which in turn could make a shambles of our large export business. We believe the momentum of trade liberalization and expansion which has been

developed through the constancy of our country's position must not be allowed to falter or be pushed back by protectionist legislation."

I hope that should any protectionist legislation come before you in this or the next session of Congress, you will give careful consideration to the potentially damaging impact on our nation's foreign trade should Congress now back away from the leadership this nation has given to trade expansion over the past thirty plus years. The recent devaluation of the English pound makes it even more imperative that we expand our exports in the years ahead to assure a healthy balance in our nation's trade.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES L. RITCHIE,
President.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF DR. ERIC WYNDHAM WHITE, DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is 20 years old this year. The General Agreement is a treaty signed by over 70 countries which provides an extensive body of rules and precedents for international trade practices.

In 1947 the General Agreement was only a half step toward the creation of international fair trade rules and orderly world trade. It was intended as a remedy for the international trade disorders that had preceded the Second World War. The key element of this post war trade stabilization effort was to have been the International Trade Organization—ITO—which never came into existence. Thus the GATT, merely a multinational treaty, has been called upon to fill the larger role that was intended to be served by the International Trade Organization.

From its inception GATT has been directed by Dr. Eric Wyndham White, first Secretary General and then Director General of the GATT. Through his 20 years of service Eric Wyndham White has gained an unrivaled international reputation for his astute effectiveness, his political acumen and his knowledge, which have enabled him to make GATT one of the most important international organizations.

Eric Wyndham White has now announced his resignation as Director General of the GATT and his intention to direct his energies to other pursuits. Last week in Geneva at the meeting of the ministers of the major GATT member countries a new Director General was chosen. Mr. Olivier Long, presently Swiss Ambassador to London, will assume Dr. Wyndham White's post as Director General next year.

GATT has indeed come to the end of an era and with the departure of Eric Wyndham White the challenges that confront it in a new period will seem as difficult. His contribution to world economic growth and stability is unmeasurable. Even more important is that, through striving to create a viable set of ground rules by which nations conduct their international trading relationships he has furthered international peace by diminishing the economic tensions that are often the root causes of armed conflict.

It is with these achievements that those of us who have witnessed his work, as I have since 1956 when I first participated in a GATT trade negotiating session at Geneva, have been so impressed. It is with the memory of these achievements that we regret deeply the resignation of Eric Wyndham White. I am inserting in the RECORD following my remarks an editorial from the New York Times of November 11, entitled "International Civil Servant":

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVANT

Eric Wyndham White has served as head of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) since the very inception of this important international agency nineteen years ago. We regret his determination to leave his post at the end of this year, but we are grateful for the unique contribution that he has made to the world's well-being the last two decades.

Mr. Wyndham White is the very model of a modern civil servant—a truly international civil servant. He took a six-month "temporary" leave of absence from the British Foreign Office in 1948 to help set up the fledgling GATT. He remained to guide its members through a series of incredibly intricate and intensely political negotiations which have opened the avenues of commerce ever wider, and thus added immeasurably to world prosperity.

"International institutions are as effective as the governments which constitute them," Mr. Wyndham White has said. He underrates his own importance, his own distinguished talent for meshing infinitesimal detail with global strategy, and for making disparate national interests work together. He has been sitting on a hot seat for all these years and is still respected—and, more important, trusted—by rich and poor nations alike.

JOHN MORTON OUTLINES THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS POSITION

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, last week I attended hearings held by the Subcommittee on Roads of the Senate Committee on Public Works.

I was privileged to present to that fine subcommittee an old friend and constituent of mine, John O. Morton, New Hampshire commissioner of public works and highways. Mr. Morton, in addition to his New Hampshire duties, was recently honored by his election as president of the American Association of State Highway Officials.

It was in that capacity that Mr. Morton appeared before the subcommittee last week to outline AASHO's positions and recommendations on highways. I present here, for the benefit of my colleagues, the most thoughtful statement of Mr. Morton:

THE STATEMENT OF JOHN O. MORTON, PRESIDENT OF AASHO PRESENTED BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, NOVEMBER 30, 1967

Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the Committee, I am John O. Morton, Commissioner of Highways for the State of New Hampshire, and am speaking here today as President of the American Association of State Highway Officials.

We, the State highway departments, have the primary responsibility for planning and building Federal-aid projects, including those in the urban areas, and we are completely cognizant of the influence of highways on all phases of urban development.

I am accompanied by our Executive Director, Mr. A. E. Johnson, and Mr. J. Burch McMorran, Commissioner of Transportation for the State of New York, who heads our very important Committee on Urban Transportation Planning, Socio-economic and Environmental Factors.

Mr. McMorran's Committee has been dealing with all of the areas included in his Committee's title since its inception. At our Association meetings, his program has included presentations and participation by outstanding city planners, economists, sociologists, federal, state and county officials, representatives of all of the various design professions, and other specialists involved in the nebulous and complex urban picture.

His Committee has done much to improve understanding and to cross-fertilize thinking between the various disciplines and agencies.

We will all be available to answer any questions that your Committee might have, and we will be happy to obtain any additional information that we can supply for the record that you may think desirable.

First of all, the State highway departments want me to express their feeling that these hearings that you are holding is one of the finest things you have done. We compliment your Committee, for this will provide a forum for the several groups to present their case, and will give your Committee an opportunity to look at the entire picture. We quote from the notice of the hearings that your distinguished Chairman first announced on October 16th, at our recent Annual Meeting in Salt Lake City.

"The highway is a catalyst changing everything it touches. This is true in rural America, as well as in urban America, but the urban highway, by reason of density of population and concentration of economic and social values, has a far greater effect on environment."

This is a correct statement to which we subscribe completely, and it properly sets the stage for your hearings.

These hearings, we believe, are appropriate for the following reasons:

1. We have sufficiently advanced in the urban highway program that you should analyze and evaluate progress.

2. In hundreds of urban areas, urban highway projects have been satisfactorily completed and are serving the public. A complete look should be taken at that side of the picture.

3. In some few instances, special and controversial problems have arisen and there is need to explore the reasons and the solutions in these cases.

4. To take a look at the interaction between highways and urban development, and to identify and quantify as many of the indirect benefits as possible.

5. To study the proper role of other design and planning professions than the highway departments, as well as that of the economists and the social scientists.

6. To determine the proper role of local officials and local people in the planning and design of projects.

7. To review the performance of those who

have the prime responsibility, accountability and authority in the program, and to determine if there is any tendency to fragment authority.

8. To look at emotional charges and anticipated adverse affects that have been voiced regarding urban highway projects and see if they are valid or not, based on projects that are completed and in use.

9. To evaluate the results of the two Planning Requirements in the Federal statutes, which are the Planning Requirement of the Act of 1962, which became effective on July 1, 1965, and the Section 204 Requirement of the Demonstration Cities Act, which became effective on July 1, 1967.

10. To develop some guidelines and considered legislative judgment to guide professional engineering and planning judgment as to the value to be given for some of the generally intangible indirect benefits of the highway influencing urban development and social factors as they are reflected in additional costs.

HISTORICAL SEQUENCE OF THE STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS' INTERESTS IN URBAN HIGHWAYS

We believe that a review of the historical development of urban highway programs will refute charges that the highway departments are rurally-oriented and insensitive to urban values and problems.

When the basic and organic Federal-aid highway program was first enacted in 1916, the reasons for it generally were as follows:

1. Most of the paved roads in the United States were in towns and cities, and extended along main street into the adjacent rural area for a short distance, where it terminated abruptly. There was a need to fill in the pavement between these cities to get the traffic out of the mud and dust, and to tie the country together with a primary system of highways.

2. To encourage the establishment and building of major highway routes across state lines.

3. To provide adequate roads for land service and rural mail delivery.

As a result, the highway program started as a rural program, for that was where the problems existed, and established the current myth that State highway departments are *rurally-oriented*.

The highway program hardly got started when it was interrupted by World War I, so the highway program really started about 1920.

It was again interrupted in 1930, by the big depression of that period. A considerable amount of our existing primary system network was built in that ten-year period.

Highway work was revived through certain emergency programs in 1933, and we were moving along fairly well when it was stopped again by World War II, in early 1942.

During this nine-year period, much more of the existing primary system was built.

In 1943, the State highway departments, because of their close contact with traffic problems and needs, realized that urban traffic was becoming critical, and we promoted the Federal-aid highway program becoming a balanced program with money earmarked for urban projects on primary system extensions, and for providing for projects on a Federal-aid secondary system.

It was also evident to the State highway departments, through our extensive planning operations, that as soon as World War II was over, that urbanization would start in earnest and continue to further complicate highway transportation problems in our growing urban areas.

In 1944, Congress enacted the ABC Program, AASHO, at that time, had pressed for a billion dollars a year in Federal aid to keep highway needs from increasing too rapidly above available facilities.

It was as late as the Act of 1954, however, before we reached the all-time authorization of $700 million a year. We would like to say for the record that the total Federal aid provided for the first forty-year period, from 1916 to 1956, totaled only $9.7 billion, or about 10 percent to 12 percent of the total that the several State highway departments spent for highway construction.

More than that total amount is now provided in a two-and-a-half year period.

After World War II, the highway program started up again in 1946. However, it was not at a rate to keep pace with increasing traffic needs, and there was definite need for a nationwide system of freeways.

In 1954, during the formative period of the Interstate highway program, the State highway departments endorsed such a program and insisted that the urban sections of the system were essential parts in the face of insistence by General Bragdon, who headed the White House Planners, that the Interstate System should be like the German Autobahn and only skirt the environs of the city and not go into them.

As far as urban highways were concerned, there was a major bright spot in 1954, when the National Committee on Urban Transportation was formed, with the Automotive Safety Foundation and the Bureau of Public Roads serving as major sponsors, along with some minor ones.

AASHO provided an advisor to this important Committee, and the Committee made use of the expertise and knowledge of a group of outstanding specialists contributing their time to turn out a set of manuals to guide the cities in the collection and use of data and information that could result in planning transportation.

In the early 1960's, a few cities volunteered to serve as pilot cities in the use of the manuals. Among these were Nashville, Tennessee, and San Diego, California, and the results were most pleasing.

Generally, however, at this time we found very few people in the field of city planning, or city officials who had any real knowledge of what was involved in the transportation planning process, and they had no mechanism for handling it.

In 1955, the State highway departments, through AASHO, supported the Interstate program and made it clear that the urban sections were very important parts of the system, for the origin and destination of much of the traffic was the rural areas, and that much of the central business district congestion was caused by traffic having to go through that area to go to some other part of the urban area because no adequate alternate routes existed.

The State highway departments had been involved in highway planning since the middle 1930's, and through our internal and external origin destination surveys, we had learned a great deal regarding the desire-lines of traffic and the pattern and density of traffic in and around urban areas. From this information evolved the pattern of beltways, innerloops, connecting radial highways, and through highways.

When the Interstate program was enacted in 1956, the State highway departments had been working on the design standards for several years. Within twelve days after the bill was signed, the highway officials met, adopted the design standards, submitted them to the Secretary of Commerce, and received his approval. The Joint AASHO-American Municipal Association Committee was also organized in 1956. The 1956 legislation made funds available for badly needed urban facilities.

In 1957, the Connecticut General Life Insurance Company of Hartford, Connecticut, sponsored a symposium entitled, "The New Highways: Challenge to Metropolitan Regions". It was held in Hartford from September 9th to 12th, and included about 400 people.

It appears to us that many of the conclusions of the symposium had been formulated in advance of the meeting, and we were disappointed in that regard. However, the major thing that developed from the symposium was a serious proposal that all urban highway work be deferred until city planning could be initiated in all urban areas, and progress to the point that the planner would approve all proposed projects. A two-year moratorium was advocated.

This was unacceptable to the State highway departments because of the time that would be involved to get the planning under way and ready to function. It was our opinion that it could defer badly needed urban projects up to ten years, and that many of these projects were so evident as to their location and design that the delay could not be justified, for they were needed to be in use as soon as possible to ease serious traffic congestion.

It is not generally understood, but the State highway departments had been doing much cooperative planning before it was an official requirement. It had been in the form of contacts with all affected public officials, planners, professional staff, and combined with the public hearings process.

While it was informal, it nevertheless was very productive and effective. No highway department was going to go it alone on a project of such importance without consulting with the appropriate local officials.

Very early in the program, we realized that there would be some problems arising from our mistakes, but it became very evident that we now had many people wanting to get into the act now that the program was so big, important, and glamorous, and involved so much money.

It was definitely attracting disciplines and professions that had taken little or no interest in highways previously.

We began to hear immediately from many instant and self-proclaimed highway experts, where they had not been in evidence before. There were a few people in each of these groups who did have some background and experience, and contributed constructively, but they were extremely limited in numbers.

We began to realize that the city planning profession was just actually reaching its majority, but it still lacked uniform accepted measures, values, and the like, and the planning varied greatly with the individual, and to a great degree, it was a matter of personal opinion or preference.

In 1957, AASHO issued its first policy publication on urban highway design, which we called the Urban "Red Book". It was the first publication to deal with geometric design requirements for urban highways to accommodate the physical dimensions of the vehicle, the design density and speed of traffic, and to fit the facility into the urban requirement.

The State highway departments had, by this time, through their twenty years of experience in planning, had learned to develop the theoretical desire-line of travel and to use this in combination with other controlling factors to determine a highway corridor.

These other controlling factors included such things as utilizing the highway location as a desirable line of definition between different types of land use, the avoiding of the severence of established communities and community services, to enhance economic development, and to lessen any adverse impact of the highway on social factors.

The State highway departments were not using the lowest and first cost in determining the highway location or design, but accepting reasonable increased costs so that the highway would be an attractive facility and a good community neighbor.

It is true that the State highway departments, over the years, had become rather conservative in spending the public's highway funds for those things that were difficult to evaluate as far as benefits are concerned. We refer to those intangible indirect benefits where proposed solutions can involve large sums of money and are sometimes matters of opinion.

We had found out that by locating urban

highways in corridors where property values were declining, that revitalization and renewal were brought about with increased tax values, and that the cost of right-of-way was usually much less.

We also found that such locations sometimes caused the most serious human problem side effects, the major cause of criticism against the highway program.

We were, at this time, in the process of evolving so-called urban design as it applies to urban highway and much of the most severe criticism directed against urban projects center around those that were already built or were in the right-of-way acquisition stage prior to the enactment of the Interstate program in 1956.

From October 5th through 9th, 1958, the First National Conference on Highways and Urban Development was held. It was called the Sagamore Conference.[1] By unanimous request of the sponsors, our Executive Director, Mr. A. E. Johnson, served as the General Chairman.

It brought together for the first time economists, officials at all levels of government, highway administrators, highway planners, transit people, city planners, and others, so that each would know of the capabilities of the other and the role that each might play in making the highway program best serve the public interest.

AASHO went to this Conference requesting and welcoming all constructive and responsible advice and criticism from those who could contribute to the success of the urban highway program.

All of the public official groups involved endorsed the Findings and Recommendations coming out of this first and landmark historic Conference, for they actually gave the first guidelines for the various levels of government and disciplines to follow.

As a direct result of the Sagamore Conference, Mr. Rex M. Whitton, then Chief Engineer of Missouri, proposed the creation of an AASHO Committee which was formed, and which he chaired for a time, and is the same Committee now chaired by Mr. McMorran.

An action program was initiated to follow up the Sagamore Conference in the form of a series of regional conferences, bringing together the same spectrum of people who had attended the Sagamore Conference. Again, we found wide variation in the thinking of the city planning group.

In June 1962, a Conference was held in Hershey, Pennsylvania, on the subject of "Freeways in the Urban Setting". It was for the purpose of discussing highways and amenities and to bring together highway planners and outspoken highway program critics which, at this time, consisted of city planners, architects and landscape specialists.

The State highway departments were not involved in this Conference in either the steering committee or the evaluation committee operations. However, we did agree with the general statements included in the Findings and Recommendations, but we did not endorse the results of the Hershey Conference for the following reason.

In the discussions at the Hershey Conference, it was again evident that the highway program had gotten so big that it was attracting many people for the first time. It appeared that some of these people wanted to establish and maintain a national identity by being a vocal critic, and others felt that the program was so big and so glamorous that they must have a part in it.

This was not universal, for there were some sincere and objective people involved in the Conference.

Most of the critics were unanimous in one point, and that was they should have a major role in the decision-making process in the program, but from there on, we were impressed and concerned that their individual views varied radically and diametrically, even between representatives of the same design profession or discipline, especially was it so in the case of the architects.

Again, in the Hershey Conference, we invited all constructive help that we could get.

In 1962, the Urban Transportation Planning Requirement was first included in Federal-aid highway legislation. We supported this to the fullest. In fact, this planning procedure was first born in our Joint Committee with the American Municipal Association in 1959.

We had proposed it as a voluntary operation for the several States and affected cities, but we soon realized that it would be far more successful if it were a legislative requirement.

The State highway departments supported this legislation, for they wanted comprehensive, cooperative, continuing planning and not just another planning study or report to be placed in some file or on some shelf to gather dust.

A city is a living organism made up of many cells of different land use types, some new, some in their prime, and some dying. A city is a continuous thing and its planning must be likewise. In fact, there is nothing happening in the city of today that is not natural, or should not have been anticipated in our complex society.

Our major problem is that we have not developed a governmental mechanism, or the planning and the financing to keep a city a healthy, living organism.

The State highway departments wanted to know that any project for which they were responsible in an urban area would definitely fit into the transportation needs of the city, and would enhance the proper urban development of the area.

This is the major motivation behind the State highway departments' support of the planning requirement.

We had been concerned for some time that there was little or no procedure for bringing all planning and proposed capital improvement programs for a metropolitan area together at one place where they could all be considered as to their interaction with each other and in particular, with highways.

We had become concerned, also, that in talking with many city planners and others at the urban level, they had little grasp of what the highway transportation planning might consist of and, in fact, in many of our early discussions with these people, they referred to it as "that planning thing."

We knew that transportation planning must be comprehensive and that it must start with land use planning and involve projection into the future. The interaction between land use planning and transportation is important and definite.

If a highway is built to accommodate the traffic requirements of certain planned land use and, for some reason, higher density land use does occur, then the highway can become obsolete or at least inefficient and transportation investments can be jeopardized.

In case transportation is inadequate, land use and the economic health of the affected area will certainly adjust accordingly.

The State highway departments had also felt that there was need for some responsible governmental mechanism consisting of elected officials who could speak for the entire metropolitan area in decision-making and pledging commitments because so many of the urban areas contained a multiplicity of small and separate municipalities, and there is need for someone to have authority and responsibility for those things which are area-wide in their application.

Some of our problems have been caused by vetoes on the part of some of these small and included municipalities.

As soon as the Planning Requirement of the Federal-aid Act of 1962 came into being, all of the State highway departments were made aware that it was their primary responsibility to see that it was carried out.

Within a reasonable time period, the planning process was instituted in all of the 216 areas affected by the legislation, and in the 15 areas subsequently added. There were some disappointments at the local level, for they expected that the planning process would develop projects for which someone would furnish the money.

When the planning process was started, AASHO, through its Committee now headed by Mr. McMorran, recommended to the Bureau of Public Roads that the cooperative feature of the planning requirement be executed through agreements with local governing bodies rather than with independent or quasi-governmental agencies.

This decision was based on the recognition of authority and the responsibility of elected officials to adopt plans and to implement programs.

The effort required by the highway departments to carry out their responsibility with local governments has been large. It has involved all of our Member Departments, except Alaska, Wyoming and Vermont, which have no urban areas falling within the population limits specified.

It has required much time and effort to execute the necessary intergovernmental agreements and to establish mutually acceptable administration arrangements to carry out the planning work.

The State highway departments believe that the planning program is extremely valuable, and that a very important by-product has been the increased dialogue between State and local officials, and the understanding and the necessity of adequate planning by local government officials.

In the affected areas, highway user funds are providing the major part of financing the development of plans for transportation within the framework of forecasts and plans for future highway development.

Housing and Urban Development, Section 701 funds, are utilized in the land use planning portion that is a prerequisite for transportation planning, but those funds are not available for transportation planning.

In 1964, AASHO, in its official Policy Statement, endorsed the multiple use of urban highway rights-of-way for utilizing space over, under and along the side of the highway itself for such things as housing, parking, shops, recreation, and the like, where such use is in the public interest, is financially feasible, and does not interfere with the primary purpose of the right-of-way taking.

On December 12th to 16th, 1965, the Second National Conference on Highways and Urban Development[2] was held in Williamsburg, Virginia.

Mr. E. H. Holmes, who heads planning in the Federal Highway Administrator's office, served as the General Chairman of that Conference by unanimous choice of the sponsors. It was a most successful Conference and the Findings and Recommendations coming out of it bears the historic-sounding title of the "Williamsburg Resolves".

AASHO and all of the sponsors of the Conference endorsed the "Williamsburg Resolves"

[1] The sponsors were the AASHO, American Municipal Association Joint Committee, the Committee on Urban Research of the Highway Research Board, and Syracuse University, with the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, the Automotive Safety Foundation, AASHO, the American Municipal Association and the National Association of Counties operating in a support role.

[2] The sponsors were the American Association of State Highway Officials, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, with the Bureau of Public Roads and the Automotive Safety Foundation serving in a supporting role.

and it has been recommended for implementation by all of the State highway departments.

AASHO went to the Williamsburg Conference hoping that there might be some answers found to identify, measure and place values on indirect benefits and other intangible things associated with the highway program. These might be cosmetics or other aesthetic features, in addition to what would produce an attractive highway, or location or design features brought about by the rather nebulous economic and social factors.

The State highway departments for years have used the so-called Road User Benefit Analysis to compare locations and designs. This process is, in reality, a cost effectiveness approach based on items to which value, measurements and costs can be assigned.

We had hoped at the Williamsburg Conference that we could get some guidance on how we might assign some costs and benefits to these many other things, some of which are indeterminate benefits and vary materially as to cost.

AASHO, through its National Cooperative Highway Research Program, that is administered by the Highway Research Board of the National Academies of Sciences and Engineering, have carried on a continuing research effort to get some answers to these rather important questions, and the work is still continuing.

It is felt by State highway administrators that because of some of the costs involved, and the lack of something definite to link benefits with these costs, that they would like to have something more rational than is presently available in approving affected projects.

There has been some limited work done in some of the State highway departments. In England, Mr. Colin D. Buchanan of the British Ministry of Transport has also worked in this area. However, Mr. Buchanan has not been able to assign any monetary values to these rather intangible benefits, but has actually come out with a sort of checklist and priority suggestion to which he has attached some empirical percentage values.

It now appears to us that many of these things will continue to be intangible and defy the assignment of measures and values and must finally be resolved by considered judgment, both at the legislative and professional level.

We do know that if we attempt to satisfy 90 percent of the people in planning and designing a project that is adequate for its primary purpose and is attractive, that our job is relatively simple. If we try to satisfy 95 percent, it becomes more complex and expensive, and at 98 percent, you run into controversy and you draw criticism from the so-called artistic and creative people. It would be absolutely impossible to build a project if you had to satisfy 100 percent of the people.

This was realized early in the history of public works programs when eminent domain proceedings were legislated.

The matter also arises as to how much of the cost of these rather indeterminate indirect benefits should be financed from highway user funds, and from what source should any additional costs be provided.

At this point, we would like to introduce for the record the reports of the Sagamore Conference, the Hershey Conference and the Williamsburg Conference, calling special attention to the Findings and Recommendations of each of the three. AASHO and the Bureau of Public Roads have endorsed the Findings and Recommendations of the Sagamore and Williamsburg Conferences.

In July 1965, AASHO, through its Planning and Design Policies Committee, which is made up of twenty Chief Engineering Officers from the State highway departments, and develops the major design policies for highways that are in use throughout the world, proposed a multiple-discipline team approach as an AASHO research project for that Committee to get some material for updating our Urban "Red Book".

The Executive Committee approved this proposal in which the team would be made up of private professional engineers, landscape architects, city planners and architects, to develop some guidelines, checklists and illustrations or examples that could be used in the development of urban design of highways covering the entire spectrum from the central city situation through suburbia to the rural environs outside the city, and to make the resulting highway a good neighbor to the communities traversed and result in an attractive and efficient facility.

We ran into some red tape in being able to use pooled research funds because of some of the procedures that had been established for handling such funds in the National Academy of Sciences, and, as a result, and to save time, Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton, volunteered to handle this research operation through the Bureau of Public Roads by the establishment of an Advisory Committee to him which would serve the same purpose that AASHO had in mind.[3]

Mr. Whitton selected his advisors in consultation with AASHO and Mr. Joseph Barnett, of the Bureau of Public Roads, and Secretary of the AASHO Planning and Design Policies Committee since its creation in 1937, and who recently retired from the Bureau, served as the liaison man with the Advisory Committee. In selecting these people, we were looking for outstanding leaders in their profession and people who had some experience with highways.

We understand that a draft of the report of this Special Advisory Committee has been submitted to the Bureau of Public Roads, but to date we have not seen it. We hope, however, that it will furnish us some valuable information from these outstanding specialists, in addition to that furnished by the State highway departments, that we could use in the new edition of the Urban "Red Book".

OBSERVATIONS, POLICY POSITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The State highway departments must continue to have the primary responsibility for Federal-aid urban highway affairs, especially as they apply to urban extensions of the State highway systems.

Urban extensions of the State highway routes must be considered, planned and constructed as part of an over-all State highway system.

The States have the experience, education, background, continuity, history of accomplishment, and other capabilities that are required to provide such a statewide highway transportation network.

Competence comes from education and experience, and the State highway departments have added city planners, landscape specialists, and other appropirate disciplines to their professional staffs as needed in the modern day operation. We have become multiple-discipline team departments.

Federal-aid highway funds, including urban, should be apportioned to the State highway authority and should not be complicated by urban highway funds being made directly available to the cities, especially as those funds apply to those highways which form the logical urban extensions of the State highway system.

In our study of future highway needs, we find that in most urban areas additional urban freeway construction, after the completion of the present Interstate program, will not be extensive.

State highway departments have never taken part in the competitive controversy between highways versus rail transit, for we have firmly believed that where any mode of transportation is needed and can be financed, it should be provided, and that the planning of those modes and the planning of highways should complement each other, and that they be coordinated not only through the planning and design, but in the operation of the facilities as well.

The State highway departments have deplored charges made by some of the rapid transit proponents, and especially their use of some of the so-called comparable capacities of the two types of transportation. We know for certain that even in the central business district of some of our largest cities, adequate highway transportation is essential for it is needed for the movement of goods and services which cannot be provided by some of the other modes, and it is needed for moving people as well.

This capacity must be adequate to handle all essential travel, if for some reason, other modes of transportation might be out of service.

We have, however, resisted any suggestions that highway funds be made available for optional use, such as financing other modes of transportation. It is very definite that even the most conservative estimate of highway needs far exceed highway financing that is in sight.

The State highway departments have a long record of accomplishment in know-how and in decision-making and in getting work under way and completed. This is a very valuable and often taken-for-granted capability. We are not only highway engineers, for the modern highway department is very big business and is a very complex operation. We have a wide range of experience in business management, fiscal control, economics, and the like.

It is our belief that the time is not here, nor will it ever arrive, when the cost benefit approach or economic feasibility measurements will be out of date. Proposals must be put into perspective and proper relationship with the overall funds that are available.

The State highway departments have long firsthand experience in knowing all sorts of problems surrounding highways because of their many years of grass roots contact with all segments of the public and business and with all levels of government.

The design of a highway is a continuous linear functional design and it must be such as to accommodate the dimensions of the vehicles using the facility, and to accommodate the design densities and speeds of the traffic. It must also be fitted into the natural human and other man-made controls and must be adapted to the land use planning for the area that it serves.

It must be controlled also by certain limiting grades and curvature if it is to function and it must extend on to its destination. In fact, it is entirely a different design procedure than that of the architects.

We have had much criticism from the architects as to the damage that highways do and that they do not match the architectural pattern of the area. However, we have observed that very often a new highway spawns a building program of considerable portions, and very often the new buildings that are developed side by side by different architects clash in their design and do not set a very good example.

Irregardless of charges that highway planners and engineers are insensitive to social, economic and aesthetic values, and that they are single-purpose people wanting to pave over the whole city, we have no such tendencies and we do take a sense of pride in our

---

[3] Michael Rapuano of New York City, Chairman, Landscape Architect and Engineer; Lawrence Halprin of San Francisco, Landscape Architect; Dr. Thomas C. Kavanagh of New York City, Structural and Highway Engineer; Kevin Roach of Hamden, Connecticut, an Architect; Matthew L. Rockwell of Chicago, City Planner and an Architect; John O. Simonds of Pittsburgh, Landscape Architect and Planner; Marvin R. Springer of Dallas, an Urban Planner; Harry B. Powell of Seattle, a Structural Engineer.

accomplishment in producing attractive facilities that fit harmoniously into the socio-economic structure.

Some of the factors that have caused controversial problems have been a sincere fear that the highway will encroach upon historic areas, parks, vistas, and the like, or that the highway would cause serious human problems, but in some instances, it seems to resolve itself as out-and-out opposition to highways presented in the most sensational, vocal and uncooperative manner.

In some instances, the administering federal officials could aid by keeping matters in proper channels and working through the State highway departments, instead of directly trying to passify the persons who represent a small, but vocal, minority.

Some of our critics have used the emotional and sensational approach and have actually taken the role of antagonists to highways. If their criticism is responsible and sincere, a great deal more could be accomplished by discussions and dialogue through the proper channels and the recourses that are available.

If a project is not needed, we certainly do not want to build it. If it is needed, then we should get along with it and consider all of the constructive help we can get.

Throughout the years we found, in our long experience, that when projects are well thought out, opposition soon disappears and adjustments result soon after the work is completed, and that the longer a project is delayed, the more it festers and the more problems it creates.

Some of the opposition is actually incited and spread and is based on false assumptions. Such was the case when the very beautiful Jefferson Memorial was being constructed here in Washington, D.C. Many ladies of the city, thinking that the new Memorial would spoil the beauty of the Potomac, worked hard to fill the footing excavations as fast as the workmen could make them.

It was not long before everyone decided this Memorial is one of the most beautiful in the world and enhances the Potomac setting.

In handling a program such as the big highway program, primary authority must rest with responsibility and accountability, and the final decision-making, therefore, must rest with the agency and its officials that have this role. Such authority cannot be fragmented and distributed to a committee or to the public.

The multiple-discipline or team approach can be helpful in many instances, utilizing such a procedure in an advisory or consulting capacity to develop a project.

We are watching with interest the team concept approach in Baltimore and Chicago, and will be watching as to its success, time required, the costs of their proposals, and the acceptance by the public of their recommendations.

We are concerned about an expressed attitude by the Department of Transportation to allow local people to pass judgment on location and design of projects. This would be a most effective way to stop the program.

We believe that the public hearing process, and people working through their elected local officials, is the proper manner for handling such things. We warn against anything that would fragment authority and complicate the approval of projects.

We ask that the Congress and the federal agencies not establish rules and regulations for the program based on solving the problems of the dozen or so controversial locations that have arisen, but to treat them as special cases. To do otherwise would unduly complicate the procedure that has successfully handled hundreds of satisfactorily completed urban projects.

We have gone to our State highway departments with four questions, as follows:

1. Do you have the necessary legal authority to handle the Federal-aid urban program?

2. Do you have the professional and technical capabilities for handling that program?

3. In general, do the cities over 50,000 population have an adequate governmental mechanism for handling the program?

4. Generally, do these same cities have adequate professional and technical capabilities for handling their part of the planning process in the highway program?

The answers to the first two were unanimous and definite "yeses".

The answers to three and four were generally "yes", but with some added comment. Some felt that improvement was needed in the form of an effective council of elected officials that could represent the entire metropolitan area in making decisions and commitments.

Also, several commented with regard to question four in the following way. Some cities do not have full capabilities at this time and have to either go for outside help, or depend extensively on the State highway departments. In going to outside assistance in the planning process, generally a "turn-key" job is the result and all too often, the city people themselves do not fully appreciate the significance of the continuous planning concept in such a manner that they can contribute effectively to making the planning process a continuous one.

We, of the State highway departments, recognize that we have made some mistakes because we have been doing a job, but we have learned as we have gone along. The urban highway program has evolved accordingly and we still have more experience in urban highways than any other group.

We ask everyone not to judge us on our older work and, especially that predating 1956, but to grade us on the basis of our present efforts.

In 1956, your Committee gave us some guidance as to how to handle cost connected with local service in the Interstate program. You very helpfully set out a guideline that equal consideration should be given to local service. Now this involved the addition of several access points and a corresponding increase in the cost estimate of the program, but everyone believes that it was a proper additional charge.

Now, we ask that you give us some guidance in these rather nebulous areas as to how much additional expenditures should be considered in the case of the indirect and intangible benefits of highways and their impacts on the socio-economic life of the city.

The cost of proposed solutions to some of the problems vary considerably, and what to consider and approve becomes a matter of considered judgment.

A State highway administrator does bear great responsibility when he is asked to approve a project that involves considerable additional costs above what is needed to supply an attractive and efficient facility for moving traffic, and especially if it is financed from highway user funds.

We realize that this is not going to be an easy job, but since it is practically impossible to put monetary values on these rather indeterminate benefits, it becomes a matter of considered judgment by those who are responsible for the program.

Some guidelines in the form of considered legislative judgment would be most helpful in helping us make proper engineering judgment.

We would hope that your Committee might be able to check conditions in some of the areas where urban freeways have been completed and have been in service for some time, to see if there is any validity to charges that our highways did harm communities, or that we gave inadequate consideration to important social or economic considerations.

We read such charges quite often and it would be interesting to see how they might stand up.

In closing, we emphasize that no other group has the record of urban highway development that the State highway departments have, and we are proud of it.

We thank you for the great privilege of presenting this statement.

THE CREDIBILITY GAP: A NEW CHAPTER—PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON THE THREE SISTERS BRIDGE

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, for many months now several of my colleagues and I have pointed out numerous instances of the credibility gap which grows wider and wider as it separates this administration from the people.

This week, a new chapter in this story has been written before the Subcommittee on Roads of the House Works Committee.

Yesterday, Alan S. Boyd, Secretary of Transportation, testified before the subcommittee.

He assured my colleagues and me that:

> The Department is consulting and intends to continue consulting with the States and local governmental officials to resolve these issues so that highway transportation development in the region can proceed at a rapid pace.

Unfortunately, the remainder of Mr. Boyd's testimony did not offer any assurance that these noble ideals of consultation with local officials were, in fact, being carried out. As he continued, he outlined several proposals he was offering, and several conclusions he had come to.

He then added, after presenting his conclusions, that:

> It is my intention to place these questions before the three highway commissioners.

Apparently his discussions with the State and local governmental officials will come only after his own conclusions are a fait accompli.

As if to bear out this contention, today we heard from Douglas B. Fugate, State highway commissioner of Virginia. And, in discussing problems connected with the proposed Three Sisters Bridge, here is what he had to say about Mr. Boyd's "consulting":

> In my opinion, Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act requires that the Secretary of Transportation shall cooperate and consult with the states in developing transportation plans and programs, and we have never been consulted in connection with the studies which the Department of Transportation has apparently made.

Mr. Fugate also told our subcommittee that the Secretary's decision, which he had heard of only through a newspaper article, "comes as a distinct surprise" to him and others engaged in transportation planning on the State and local area.

If this is the consultation that Secretary Boyd so nobly talked of before our subcommittee, then something is radically wrong. But I am afraid this is just another chapter in the sad story of the

credibility gap which is widening between the administration and the people on the State and local level.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM—THE NEED FOR ACTION

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been drawn to a recent editorial in the November 18, 1967, Little Rock, Ark., Democrat, entitled, "Congress and Reform."

The editorial calls attention to the inability of Congress to deal effectively with the vast and complicated Federal budget. I quote two paragraphs from the edtiorial for emphasis:

Congress needs a staff of experts who could devote close study of the budget and help lawmakers pinpoint quickly and surely where money is being wasted, where funds can be saved, where programs can be shut off, and others expanded to be more effective.

A bill to give Congress better control of the budget has been passed by the Senate but not by the House. The Congressional Reorganization Bill, among other things, would provide experts and computers to help lawmakers keep abreast of how money is being spent and how effective the programs are.

Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps those of us who have been fighting for congressional reform have neglected to point out the salutary provisions of the bill from time to time and have spent too much time defending the bill from attacks against those who would resist all *change*.

The Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress sought to deal with precisely the problem pointed up in the Little Rock, Ark., Democrat editorial and title II of S. 355, entitled "Fiscal Controls," was the best our committee could do to provide the Congress with the tools and the procedures to do a better job of understanding and dealing with vast and varied Federal expenditures.

We have all heard of the relatively recent movement in the executive branch of Government for cost effectiveness studies of the program planning budgeting system.

Title II of S. 355 was aimed at equipping the Congress, through its committees and especially through the General Accounting Office, to cope with the new budgeting systems in the executive branch of the Government.

It should be interesting to my colleagues, therefore, to know that the General Accounting Office, not waiting for final action on S. 355, which seems presently to be frozen in the Rules Committee of the House, has inaugurated studies of the kind contemplated in title II of our reorganization bill, S. 355, by creating a Systems Analysis Section in the Office of Policy and Special Studies of the General Accounting Office. This development was announced in the GAO Newsletter of November 10, 1967, volume 1, No. 10.

Mr. Speaker, I wish my colleagues, and particularly the majority leadership, would look at the reorganization bill, which was the product of 2 years' hard work by a bipartisan, 12-man committee, not for the purpose of finding out things they do not like in the bill, but for those provisions which would enable the Congress to do a better job of understanding national problems and adopting intelligent national policies, as well as reviewing the execution of the laws and the expenditure of funds more effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the Little Rock, Ark., Democrat editorial at this point in my remarks:

CONGRESS AND REFORM

The great conflict in Congress centering around budget spending emphasizes the need for the lawmakers to have more accurate information on government income and on the operation of the spending programs.

Congressional committees, when studying the budget, are compelled in most cases to accept the figures presented by bureaucrats who have vested interests in getting and spending money, in building up their bureaus and the scope of their influence. This can hardly be considered as beneficial to the national interest.

Congress needs a staff of experts who could devote close study of the budget and help lawmakers pinpoint quickly and surely where money is being wasted, where funds can be saved, where programs can be shut off, and others expanded to be more effective.

A bill to give Congress better control of the budget has been passed by the Senate but not by the House. The Congressional Reorganization Bill, among other things, would provide experts and computers to help lawmakers keep abreast of how money is being spent and how effective the programs are.

Under the present system many Congressmen often vote for bills they have not had the time to study; as a result, they do not know what they are voting for. Huge appropriations are made without proper safeguards to see that the money is properly spent.

That's what the reorganization bill is all about.

Congress has an opportunity to improve its own image by setting up proper machinery to help it deal with money matters. When programs are wasteful and inefficient, the taxpayers suffer and Congress degrades itself by not making good on its responsibilities as the sole, single source of all federal spending.

A Congress that does not reform itself is grossly lacking in moral fiber.

WAR NEVER SOLVES ANYTHING? A PERCEPTIVE EDITORIAL ANSWERS THE QUESTION

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, history is replete with tales of war and great battles for great causes. It is equally replete with harsh denunciations of war. Sherman's "war is hell" and F. D. R.'s "I hate war" are expressions that come readily to mind.

But is it true that war never solves anything? I think not. In support of this thesis, I offer for the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a perceptive editorial written by an editor in my district, Richard Lewis, of Franklin, N.H. Mr. Lewis' editorial appeared in the September 28 edition of the Journal-Transcript.

While it is quite true that war does not solve everything, Mr. Lewis points out that the case for war as a solution to some problems is quite clear. The Revolutionary War solved the question of American independence. The Civil War certainly was the only way in 1861 to hold the Union together. As Mr. Lewis himself states:

The Second World War cut short the international depredations of Adolph Hitler and Nazi Germany. The Korean police action, if nothing else, stablized, even though the hard way, the line of demarcation between North and South Korea.

Because so many voices of protest are now being heard against war in general and against our fight to defend South Vietnam in particular, it may be helpful to remind ourselves that in spite of our inherent aspirations for meaningful peace, wars have solved some important problems in the past. In the opinion of many thoughtful and peace-loving people, war will also solve a problem now—that in Communist aggression and terrorism against South Vietnam.

The editorial referred to follows:

WAR NEVER SOLVES ANYTHING?

Our eye was caught by a photo appearing this week on the front page of the Christian Science Monitor. The picture was one of a pair of protest marchers at opposite ends of the scale—one carried a sign reading "War Never Solves Anything", and the other proclaimed "Support Men In Vietnam".

It was the comment "War Never Solves Anything" that particularly attracted our attention.

It's a fine ringing phrase that sounds quite plausible at first blush, and maybe there's a certain amount of truth to it, but painfully, there's a considerable amount of baloney, too.

Quite, obviously, war does solve certain problems. A war surely settled the question of whether or not the 13 American colonies would continue under British rule. The Civil War, we should say, answered definitely the question, shall the Confederate States be established as a nation independent of the United States of America? The First World War resolved certain conflicts among the major nations of Europe, and the Second World War cut short the international depredations of Adolph Hitler and Nazi Germany.

The Korean police action, if nothing else, stabilized even though the hard way, the line of demarcation between North Korea and South Korea.

Just as obviously, none of these wars solved everything involved. It took years of sweat and hard work to turn the 13 American colonies into an independent, functioning nation. The Civil War surely left pain, heartache and deep disagreement in its wake. The First World War created as many problems as it solved, and if World War II cut short the territorial ambitions of the Germans, it marked the resurgence of Russia as a major world power. The Korean conflict stopped a specific act of aggression, but obviously didn't wipe out aggression as anybody's national policy.

To say that "War Never Solves Anything" is nonsense, of course. But it's just as much nonsense to proclaim and believe that war is a solution to everything. None of the wars we've mentioned here solved all the problems that were involved in the events leading to each, and in some cases, created brand new

problems that might not have existed otherwise, or led to other wars that in turn solved some problems and created new.

War has never served as a final solution to all problems, but then neither have negotiation, good will, treaties, or any other means of problem solving.

The tool of war is in many ways a stupid way to solve disagreements, but then, many are the stupid ways that men attempt to solve their problems.

WHAT MAKES ROMNEY RUN?

Mr. HUNT. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the December 12, 1967, issue of Look magazine, which is on the newstands this week, contains an article by Mr. T. George Harris on the subject of the presidential candidacy of the Governor of Michigan, George Romney.

It has been several days since I read the article, and a striking feature keeps recurring to me which I believe is so significant that it should be given this attention in the RECORD.

The author, Mr. Harris, relates that he asked Governor Romney for a copy of his latest form 1040, the Federal individual income tax return. Mr. Harris reports the Governor's response in the following language:

He balked when I badgered him for a copy. . . . Release of the document, while it might serve a political purpose, would not prove very much, he argued. One year could be a fluke, perhaps done for show, and what mattered in personal finance was how a man conducted himself over the long haul.

Stumped by this argument, I was not prepared for the move that it eventually led him to make: He ordered up all of the Form 1040's that he and Mrs. Romney had filed over the past *twelve* years—including those profitable ones when he saved the American Motors Corporation from bankruptcy and became a millionaire on the company's stock options. While his wealth and income had fluctuated wildly with the auto industry, he and Mrs. Romney had kept right on living in modest comfort, tithing and contributing a substantial share to community needs. Over the long haul, I discovered, they had put an average 23 percent of their adjusted gross income each year into donations (straight charity, 4 percent: church, 19 percent).

Mr. Speaker, no comment of mine can lend eloquence to this simple and voluntary act of honesty and complete disclosure of personal interest by a candidate for President of the United States. None of us knows nearly a year in advance of the election who among the many candidates of both parties will be our next President. But I believe our form of government, our two-party system, and the value of our citizenship have all been enriched by this demonstration of personal integrity by Governor Romney as he begins his campaign for the Presidency.

Excerpts of the Look article with editorial comment from the Washington Star follow:

[From Look, Dec. 12, 1967]

WHAT MAKES ROMNEY RUN?

(By T. George Harris)

Presidential candidates do not hustle votes door-to-door in the suburbs or hug children at dozens of campaign offices right in the homes of ghetto families. But these and other odd doings will be seen early in 1968, on a hefty scale. Many a roller-haired housewife will soon answer the bell and face a ruggedly joyful man with a notched nose, crow-feet eyes and a hedge of white hair that his daughter clips on Sunday for a dollar. He will look familiar, bigger than five-feet-eleven, 170 lbs.

"My name is George Romney," he will announce in that gravel baritone. "I hope you will support me."

Reporters and haulers of TV gear will trail along, sore of foot and sullen in the belief that Romney, while obviously having a ball, is wasting their talent covering a lost cause. He has already been pronounced dead by more experts than any politician to the right of Che Guevara.

In 11 months this year, he managed to get himself more or less officially buried half a dozen times: on his Western tour last spring, then in his tax-reform battle at home, twice over Mormonism's anti-Negro policy, once over his Mexican birth and, for sure, during the Detroit riot.

People interviewed by pollsters stubbornly considered him their favorite future President, however, until his famous TV blooper this fall: "When I came back from Vietnam [in 1965], I just had the greatest brainwashing that anybody can get . . ." To admit he'd been wrong, over-sold on President Johnson's war strategy, was ungainly enough. Worse, that word "brainwash" had a curiously chemical effect on the minds of Washington columnists. They flipped. It took other politicians some weeks to pick up the word, gingerly, to find that it said something to people and might be useful. But Romney just jutted out that jaw among angry Negroes in 17 big cities. He also quietly pushed the button on the most unorthodox campaign that is likely to be seen for some years.

The more trouble he has winning primaries and delegates, the harder he will drive. A genial Mormon elder, not wanting to call George stubborn, puts the matter very carefully. "When a Romney drowns," he says, "you look *up*stream for the body."

His family shares the general joke. Mike Romney, a mining engineer in Salt Lake City, lets an almost ribald grin crease the horse-kick scar on his face, broad and leathery, when he talks about younger brother George. "I have always operated on the premise that Romneys were not descended like other humans," Mike drawls. "We descended from the mule."

Maybe not, but Governor Romney of Michigan has a pronounced tendency to act as he sees fit, even if it might lead to embarrassment. For 41 years, no matter how hot the sun, he has worn long cotton-knit underwear with Mormon symbols stitched on chest and stomach. He knew, when I asked about these "temple garments," that he might inspire a national giggle, but he told me the facts.

He balked when I badgered him for a copy of his latest Form 1040, the Federal Individual Income Tax Return. Release of the document, while it might serve a political purpose, would not prove very much, he argued. One year could be a fluke, perhaps done for show, and what mattered in personal finance was how a man conducted himself over the long haul.

Stumped by this argument, I was not prepared for the move that it eventually led him to make: He ordered up all the Form 1040's that he and Mrs. Romney had filed over the past *twelve* years—including those profitable ones when he saved the American Motors Corporation from bankruptcy and became a millionaire on the company's stock options. While his wealth and income had fluctuated wildly with the auto industry, he and Mrs. Romney had kept right on living in modest comfort, tithing and contributing a substantial share to community needs. Over the long haul, I discovered, they had put an average 23 percent of their adjusted gross income each year into donations (straight charity, 4 percent; church, 19 percent). You can work out these and other conclusions from the nine-column chart of their personal affairs from 1955 through 1966.

Year	Salary and bonus	Deferred compensation	Dividends, interest and taxable capital gains	Adjusted gross income	Church contributions	Other contributions	Total deductions	Net taxable income	Tax
1955	$125,000.04	----------	$3,541.21	$129,674.46	$23,887.96	$3,190.96	$36,118.98	$89,355.48	$45,651.47
1956	125,000.04	----------	7,031.70	133,763.31	33,154.43	2,261.50	43,370.05	86,193.26	43,172.19
1957	87,500.01	----------	3,607.18	92,573.06	22,341.01	2,740.45	32,948.45	56,024.61	23,959.20
1958	168,750.02	----------	4,280.00	173,858.77	39,758.25	5,765.63	56,760.06	113,498.71	63,469.19
1959	200,000.00	----------	60,451.82	260,801.82	64,027.08	5,591.25	86,761.14	170,440.68	109,150.24
1960	173,125.00	----------	487,202.68	661,427.68	156,038.31	16,697.10	181,905.47	476,522.21	237,000.48
1961	155,083.40	----------	116,493.66	272,977.06	41,243.68	26,875.30	81,036.03	188,941.03	124,955.96
1962	75,803.02	----------	117,117.36	194,920.44	13,404.22	37,149.89	66,062.17	125,858.27	73,173.37
1963	27,499.92	$31,705.00	507,566.55	566,771.47	42,821.62	2,054.23	60,675.59	503,095.88	249,998.56
1964	27,499.92	31,705.00	211,958.18	271,163.10	78,941.00	3,051.50	97,263.19	170,899.91	80,830.62
1965	30,000.00	31,705.00	74,803.56	136,508.56	31,033.97	1,362.50	47,231.83	86,276.73	35,213.50
1966	30,000.00	11,705.00	41,130.52	78,483.85	13,956.64	8,465.59	33,723.37	41,760.48	12,980.40
Total	1,225,261.37	106,820.00	1,635,184.42	2,972,923.58	560,608.17	115,205.90	823,856.33	2,108,867.25	1,099,555.18

Note: All pay from 1955 through 1962 came from American Motors, except $7,500 in delegate's per diem at the state constitutional convention. Romney has paid high taxes, accountants note, has not dodged into loopholes.

One year, in 1960, they carefully gave away all but $389.59 of his salary and bonus, $173,125.

The Romneys can be as open about their lives as they are about their money. Mrs. Romney—Michigan thinks of her as Lenore—is a full partner in politics, who tells it like it is. When a radio interviewer asked what she likes best about her husband, she told the folks: "The way he kissed me good-night." Her marriage rule: "Never go to bed angry." . . .

This earthy pair will keep politics aboiling for the next few months, no matter what may happen at the Republican National Convention. As the primary races get tight, some alert reporter will make headlines with an exposé of Romney's "hidden" machinery—his lease-time computer, his radio-TV communications hookup and such spooky things as the "telectraphonics" device that lets him "call" thousands of carefully selected homes with a pre-taped phone message (4¢ a call). Behind his old-fashioned style and door-to-dooring, the story will say, is an electronic data-processing (EDP) monster, a solid-state Big Brother George. It searches local census tracts and precinct voting records to pick the exact neighborhoods, from Ohio to Oregon, where the Governor will surprise housewives and blitz through shopping centers. It monitors his every move through before-and-after polls and pretests each campaign device on guinea-pig voters.

The whole EDP system is, as his research chief Dr. Walter De Vries says, "unorthodox and rational."

That's the way Romney wants it. Out-Kennedying the Kennedys, he and his Midwest political scientists have perfected their EDP weapon while wrecking, in three gubernatorial battles, the country's most powerful Democratic-labor combine. They have nailed down an increasingly precise definition of the men and women most likely to be impatient with the present way of doing the public's business at home and abroad. These millions, whatever their party, seem ready, given half a chance, to fight for a say-so in government and in the other institutions that crowd in upon their lives.

So Romney, as he reaches out into other states, is hunting with computer help for specific people. He has them defined; he has proved that they control elections; he believes these restless activists are the key to the Presidency.

Through his own life runs a rebellious, original streak that is often obscured by the Rotarian Gothic of his rhetoric. He stomps down the shibboleths of both liberals and conservatives. Modern liberalism's panacea—"Federal pills for all ills," Romney calls it—is to him dangerously superficial. Its tendency to concentrate power in the Federal Executive at home leads to crude use of that same power abroad. Yet no notion grabs his spleen quicker than the one generally served up at GOP functions: rugged individualism. "It's nothing," he grits, "but a political banner to cover up greed." . . .

Though a displaced person at birth, on July 8, 1907, in pin-neat Colonia Dublan, Mexico, George Wilcken Romney was hardly deprived, not at first. His father, Gaskell, now owned a dairy-wheat farm and a planing mill. His mother, Anna, was a Pratt, descended from a family of fiery theologians who wrote still-popular hymns (e.g., *As the Dew from Heaven*) and drew up the intellectual architecture for LDS government. Anna was also a good cook, the kind who would tear the hot crust from a loaf of home-baked bread, slather it with fresh-churned butter for the sons who came with watering mouths.

Life was tasty. In 21 years, the Saints had irrigated the local desert, built a college and cut their commune red tape to gain the variety and higher production of the profit discipline. George's grandfather, Miles Park, ever a dedicated square dancer and amateur actor, had even organized a theater so as to play his favorite Shakespeare lead, *Othello*.

The Saints made the mistake, however, of growing their neat stalks of plenty without regard for the hunger all around them. In 1912, when George was a five-year-old in a striped middy blouse, the Red Flagger guerrillas of the Mexican Revolution drove the colonists back north to their native country. Gaskell rode rear guard for the retreating column.

The lesson was planted in the family. Years later, on November 14, 1947, George Romney became the first business witness for the Marshall Plan. "One of the most serious problems we face as Americans," he once said, "is the envy of other people." Before and after that, as head of a corporation operating in 19 nations and three time as a U.S. representative to international labor-management conferences, he proposed public and private programs to help other countries develop their own resources and commerce. The business of foreign policy, he argued, "is to help people without dominating them"—a principle that led in time to his troubled conscience over the U.S. role in Vietnam.

Gaskell Romney was forced to start life again with a big family (six boys; later, one girl) and $25. At El Paso, he boarded a train to Los Angeles with his brother, a science teacher but also, of course, a carpenter and head of a large family. After repairing houses for a couple of years, the brothers moved their families to the potato country of Idaho and survived the first winter, both families on $72 a month. That meant potatoes for breakfast, dinner (high noon) and supper. "We had potatoes coming out of our eyes, ears, nose, and other places too," recalls Romney.

The kids were like a task force. They would talk a family of red-headed neighbor children into a game of Run-Sheepie-Run so as to hide by the chicken nests, pick up a few eggs to trade at the store for Golden Crumbles candy. (George Romney still worries about that.) They functioned the same way on farm chores and on the odd jobs, from carpentry to teaching, that they took to help their parents pay the bills. As a teen-ager, moved to Salt Lake City, George could grip a bundle of laths between his thighs, spit nails through his teeth and, teamed with two brothers, lath an entire new house in a day. Once, jumping off an unfinished house, he slipped, sprained an ankle and broke his cowcatcher nose. It was already beat up. Not being a natural athlete, he had made the high school football team because his legs kept pumping after his face dug dirt.

His football was casual in comparison with his dogged pursuit of Lenore LaFount, the 15-year-old brunette he met when he was 17. That girl had the dewy beauty of excited innocence, a schoolmate recalls, "so gentle and sweet that you could just choke her." . . .

It took seven years, and he dropped out of college (after two and a half years) to take a job that would support her, but she at last accepted the inevitable in a temple wedding at Salt Lake on July 2, 1931. A practical romantic, she was proud to learn later that he financed their honeymoon by selling aluminum paint—he brought along samples—between the bridal parties.

Marriage did not cure them. George was trapped at work in Washington when their second daughter, Jane, was born. By the time he raced to the bedside, a row of fever blisters had cut a line across his lips. "But they went away in a few days," explains Mrs. Romney, "because they were emotionally induced."

Romney demonstrated in youth his gift for starting a job by falling on his nose. As a new LDS missionary in Britain, he looked so bound up on the soapbox that a kindly Scot, a Gentile, up and offered him a set of golf clubs to relax with. Slowly, he became convinced of what he was doing and used the specifics of that conviction to work out a practical way of doing it. Result: a new style of missioneering, still in use. Named head of the Scotland group, he would muster all his young teams into one community, enough to scare up outrageous attacks that he could use to draw sympathetic, attentive crowds.

He came back to the States after his two-year stint, signed up for courses at George Washington University while taking a stenographer's job with a U.S. senator from Massachusetts. This time, it took him three days to flop—at taking dictation; he shifted to more demanding duty, doing case studies on the Hawley-Smoot Tariff bill, and provided pages of solid research for the Senate debates.

By luck, or an instinct for action, he regularly ended up at points of illuminating friction. Having preached Saint optimism to desperate Scottish coal miners during the first General Strike and near-revolution, as well as during the rise of the Labor Government, he found his place on the Senate staff in Washington right between GOP protectionists and Democratic free traders. Though he leaned toward the free traders, and later became one, he was a born Republican. He went to Utah in 1932 to campaign for Sen. Reed Smoot, king of the protectionists, for President Hoover and for his father, a Republican county commissioner. All three disappeared under Franklin Roosevelt's landslide. So Romney, by now the Aluminum Company of America's Washington lobbyist, spent the next six years in a high-pressure classroom: between the abrasive reformers of the New Deal and the bauxite executives of what was then the top monopoly.

In these heady years before Washington got sure it had all the answers, Romney sat in on fundamental debates between planners and business. In one study group, he read Keynesian economics under tutors like Federal Reserve Chairman Marriner Eccles. "Many of the New Deal reforms were needed for balance," he says, "but the Great Society is the New Deal carried to excess."

Romney, having been on hand for the formative years of big government, now got a close look at the labor movement's climb to power. In 1939, he took over the Detroit staff of the Automobile Manufacturers Association—about the time the United Auto Workers took over mass production's hometown. Management, mobilizing for war, was learning how to live with unions. Romney and Victor Reuther, brother of Walter, tore into each other but also joined forces on the Detroit Victory Council. They fought side by side to improve public services for war workers, get open housing for Negroes and plan postwar civic improvements.

Management's Romney once had to be talked out of resigning to become a labor organizer. He wanted to fight, from within, union leadership's tendency to escalate its power by industry-wide pressure rather than build strong, productive communities inside the plants. In 1948, he became an auto-production executive at Nash, dedicated to the same idea. He later negotiated a "progress sharing" contract that Walter Reuther, a sparring partner for at-home debates, called "the most significant and historic collective bargaining agreement ever signed in the United States."

For all his uncommon experience, Romney might have been just one more ambitious businessman who talked ideas on the side but walked lockstep up the standard ladders. The winter of 1955–56 changed that prospect. He had been left, by the sudden death of his boss, George Mason, running American Motors Corporation. It was piling $89 million debt onto 28 banks, who expected to liquidate at 50¢ on the dollar. Its cars, Nash and Hudson, were lemons on a market where Ford and Chevrolet were dumping juicy bargains in a price war for first place. AMC's labor costs were exorbitant. Like a driver at the wheel of a rattletrap skidding for a crash, Romney had to react with considered instinct. He did everything wrong while the experts keened disaster in his ear—and it worked.

In business folklore, Romney wound up a clever merchandising pitch against "the gas-guzzling dinosaurs." That's the surface of it, but the legend misses the full flavor

and body. The Big Three—General Motors, Ford and Chrysler—had learned to move car buyers up status steps . . . forever manipulated by big business and can be protected only by ever-bigger government.

"We faced at American Motors the kind of problems that Galbraith talked about," Romney admits. But he had a less-grandiose solution in mind. He dusted off a defunct car that had a wheelbase no bigger than the old Model T Ford, slashed its costs, invented a category and name for it, "compact," and organized a far-reaching consumer protest against the Big Three. He bet that affluent people, perhaps less passive than hungry ones, would share his rebel sentiment and actively demand the right of wider choice. He preached against pouring money into stylish cars rather than education.

The Detroit pros called him "the preacher." Wall Street, the business world's opinion poll, sold him short. The banks squeezed his credit. Financial columnist Sylvia Porter wrote with her firm authority that "his management may not last beyond this year." Company raider Louis Wolfson, then the suave terror of wounded companies, held a Halloween seance to warn Romney that he had bought 200,000 shares of AMC stock and had $8,000,000 in reserve, he indicated darkly, to buy control. The situation, in retrospect, was comic. Looking like a bouncy square in his double-breasted suit, Romney didn't seem to know he was supposed to panic. He treated Wolfson so fairly it confused the man—and won the fight a few months later while the smart people were still counting him out. Wolfson made money but, by underestimating a square, missed out on a fortune and lost his usefully ominous reputation.

By '58, Romney's compact was splashing through black ink to the tune of a new pop record, *Beep, Beep,* about that spunky "little Nash Rambler" on the road. The ex-carpenter had come quite a way. "My mother had always made beans taste pretty good," he says. Except for a few stocks Lenore inherited, plus the paid-off part of their home mortgages, the couple had been without capital. They had never fretted much about it, and now, with Rambler making money, they seemed downright casual. He always refused to let the AMC board raise his pay to the going scale for the blue-chip chiefs, and never above the $200,000 line. Any time his total salary and bonus ran to unseemly heights—or if, on the other hand, the company needed to hold down costs—he turned cash back to the till. A veteran accountant at AMC recently figured, when I asked, that Romney had turned back a total of $268,000 in pay due him.

He kept on with his parsimonious ways. When he took son Scott on a car trip West, he still refused to squander on luxuries like restaurant food and motel beds. They chewed sandwiches while roaring along at his usual breakneck pace; at night, they would find a cornfield where Scott could sack out on a camp cot while the president of American Motors used his car-bed.

But the AMC stock options he held, once worthless, were rising like warm dough. By 1960, when Romney sold a block of risen stock, his gross adjusted income hit $661,427.68. He needed the cash to pay off the loans with which he had financed the options. He also had to make payment on the bigger house he had promised Lenore long ago and, of course, to keep up their tithes and offerings on the new wealth. His income soon slipped, in part because he docked his own pay for the time he was spending (1961–62) as a delegate to Michigan's constitutional convention. As Governor, his salary slid to $27,500 (later $30,000), and his deferred compensation from AMC drifted down. He handed his portfolio over to a bank, which, to diversify, sold more chunks of AMC.

One question about wealth did worry Romney, from the day he saw that the compact would make him a tidy bundle: how to use the freedom it brought. He had always wanted a chance at "public service." Oddly enough, though he was dip-dyed Republican, he did not necessarily intend to run for office. He edged toward politics in 1959—when he led the drive, pointedly nonpartisan, to rewrite the Michigan constitution—but he was "keeping open a live option." With Walter Reuther, ex-enemy, he had quietly set up a national citizens organization rather like the Urban Coalition that eventually emerged after the 1967 riot. This route might avoid the hell that his Mormonism would, he knew, raise in politics. . . .

As his religion would cause him political pain, just as surely he would put his church in the squeeze. The inevitable assault on him would broaden into an attack on the whole of Mormonism. Should he warn the leaders? He brooded over the prospect late in 1961, when he was deciding whether to run for governor.

So he made an airplaine flight to Salt Lake City that he did not talk about. Around Christmas, he strode into Mormonism's headquarters, a heavy Romanesque bulk just up the street from the Hotel Utah. . . .

Closeted with President David O. McKay and a group of advisers, Romney as usual went abruptly to the point. "I want to know if there is any *religious* reason why I should not run for governor," he said. "I will make my own decision, but if there are any religious [he came down hard on that word again] objections, I ought to hear them now."

President McKay, then 88, understood instantly. Romney was serving notice on his church: Don't Dabble. . . .

The visitor wanted to be sure that nobody in the hierarchy would ever be confused about the separation of church and state, a line that has often been obscure in Mormonism. He would, if he became a candidate for governor of Michigan, resign from the stake presidency. He would manage his business; they would manage theirs. There was an implicit corollary. He would not criticize them—that would be dabbling—and they would try to be charitable about the turmoil his public life would stir up. He ran, and that's the way it went. . . .

The novice out of business was off to one of his classic starts. He was also trying to find a way to win rather than run the usual Republican race. Tradition beckoned him to rural GOP redoubts; urban centers belonged to the majority Democrats. He knew what was wrong with that arithmetic, but he did not care to upset party regulars any more than he had to. So he sent Lenore out to be Joshua's army. She took on the 64 outstate counties, running hard enough to sound like several candidates, while he slugged full-time at Democratic power in the 19 heavyweight counties down south.

That was only the first stage of heresy. Romney more or less ignored the voter who calls him Independent and who, liberal wisdom says, is the key to GOP victories. He went instead after the citizen who is most despised by loyal party workers: the Ticket-Splitter, that untouchable who favors one party at the top of the ballot (President, senator, governor) but shifts to the other party just below.

Most experts lumped Independents and Splitters into the same mangy category, but Romney's EDP research showed that, taken as groups, they were distinctly different breeds. The Independent tended to be apathetic, a dud. The Splitter might call himself a Democrat or a Republican, or be put out with both parties, but he tended by nature to be an activist. He read more serious news, went to hear more candidates talk and turned into a ferocious volunteer if drawn into a cause. The future belonged, Romney sensed, to the party that could find out why Splitters were on the rise, how to make them regulars and how to use their energy.

He made a stab at it in 1962. By '66, he had nearly half of Michigan voting the straight Republican ticket.

In campaigns and out, he has hunted recruits for "citizen involvement," as he lugubriously calls it—or, when talking to his Student Volunteer Corps, "those who want a piece of the action." He has tested a variety of state and party devices to reach them. Michigan became a constant, floating seminar of Governor's conferences on every problem from crime to the pains of age. Thousands came. The conferences hashed out legislative proposals, and he needed quite a few. Under the new Michigan constitution, after a decade of two-party stalemate, there was a lot of catching up to do in state services. Over four pay-as-you-go years, he boosted outlays 54.5 percent, mainly in education. If states would belly up to their job, he argued, they could grab the initiative back from the Federals and lab-test in failure areas like slum housing.

Romney has even pushed the rural-minded Michigan GOP into urban experiments. The party's first full-time slum organizer, a former civil-rights activist, uses Republican power to serve the Negro community. He puts the muscle on slumlords, utility companies and welfare agencies to get a fair shake for the helpless poor, about 30 a day, who call in anger or despair to see if he is for real. Habits change. During the Detroit riot, 300 GOP workers and staffers piled up truckloads of food and clothing, ran the goods through sniper fire to burned-out Negro families.

The notion that a political party can serve voters directly, instead of orating, has not been seriously tried since city Democrats built their machines on scuttles of free coal for immigrant families. Only in recent years have a few groups of Republicans—notably in Illinois, California and Indiana—begun to hunt for a new service role. Their early efforts brought on many of the 1966 election upsets.

With his state party leading this movement inside the national GOP, Romney argues that people who are concerned and deeply involved in public problems at home can find new answers, perhaps non-Federal. With the Negro militants and Conservatives alike, he doubts that the city can be rebuilt from the top down. The ghettos will blow up again and again, he says, "until we learn to bring power back to the level where the people themselves—and I mean all the people, not just the rich and influential—can can shape their own destinies."

George Romney has spent his life rousing workers, consumers, Negroes, Republicans and ordinary citizens to break out of the passive-masses trap. He is a Populist faith. Urban America, like rural America before it, will not be habitable, he believes, until there is again a boiling in people of the will to run, not be run by, the bureaucracies around them. Hustling votes door-to-door, this stubborn Mormon Romney will pester a generation of his countrymen to reach for active control over the shape of their destiny.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 30, 1967]

ROMNEY'S RETURNS

Governor Romney's disclosure of his income tax returns for the last 12 years is a bold act of candor that ought to set a precedent for all White House hopefuls.

The figures on his income shed new light on his character. Romney appears to have been well rewarded for pulling American Motors out of the doldrums a few years ago. His company stock options plus salary and other income brought him nearly $3 million during the period. But Romney also has re-

vealed that he is an unusually generous man who goes far beyond the norm for church tithing. He donated more than $560,000 to his church, plus another $115,205 to other causes.

In past years presidential candidates have made public their assets. But the picture as shown in income tax returns is far more revealing. The Michigan governor's willingness to open the books in this fashion sets a high example for other presidential aspirants.

NATIONAL MONUMENT TO FAILURE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the public school system of the District of Columbia has been the target of criticism from many sources in recent years. One of the finest articles which I have seen on this subject appeared in the November 18, 1967, issue of Saturday Review. I commend it to the reading of all Members of Congress.

The contents of this article follows:

BIG CITY SCHOOLS IV—WASHINGTON: NATIONAL MONUMENT TO FAILURE

(By Susan L. Jacoby)

"My boy, he pass to fifth grade this year and he can't hardly read at all. That just not right. Why they pass him when he don't know how to read? That school, it just not doing the job it ought."—(A Negro mother in Washington, D.C.)

Hardly anyone in the nation's capital wastes time quibbling over whether the Washington public schools are really as bad as critics say they are. The school system has been declared a failure by white families who have fled to the suburbs in more massive numbers than in any other American city; by middle- and upper-income Negro families, who are enrolling their children in private schools at a rapidly increasing rate; and by poor Negroes, who are becoming increasingly vocal in their outrage at the deteriorating public schools they do not have the money to escape. Washington has the closest thing to an all-ghetto school system of any city in the nation: Nearly 91 per cent of its students are Negro. More important, a majority of public school students come from a poverty subculture which stymies traditional educators. School officials estimate that at least 50 per cent of the students come from homes where the annual family income is below federal poverty guidelines ($3,000 for a family of four).

"It should be obvious to everyone that the issue is not whether Washington will have an all-Negro school system," says former Board of Education President Euphemia L. Haynes. "The real issue is whether we will have a system composed entirely of poor children."

Every sophisticated indictment of the school system, which serves nearly 150,000 children, boils down to the fact that an overwhelming majority of its students are not learning the basic skills they need to survive in a technological society. Two statistics tell the dismal story of public education in Washington: The citywide dropout rate hovers between 45 and 50 per cent; and, of the students who do finish high school, at least one-third are retarded in reading to the point where they would find it difficult to pass an employment examination administered by the Civil Service Commission or a local bus company. Reading retardation—always disastrous for high school graduates seeking jobs—is even more of a hindrance than usual in Washington's "paper economy."

Most jobs open to high school graduates in Washington are found in the lower grades of the federal civil service, where a reasonable degree of reading proficiency is essential. When former Superintendent Carl F. Hansen released a school-by-school breakdown of scores on standardized reading tests for the first time last year, the Washington *Post* editorialized flatly: "The collapse of public education in Washington is now evident." John A. Sessions, a Board of Education member who has pressed vigorously for major reforms in the school system, said at the time, "I think 'collapse' is a pretty strong word to use. But it does seem to me that the first requirement for change is to admit what a mess we're in."

Unprecedented pressures for reforms in the public school system have been brought during the past year by a variety of likely and not-so-likely sources. A controversial federal court decision found that the schools had discriminated against Negro students, especially in slum areas, by failing to provide facilities and academic programs comparable to those in more affluent areas of the city. In a lengthy, indignant opinion, Judge J. Skelly Wright concluded that "the Washington school system is a monument to the cynicism of the power structure which governs the voteless capital of the greatest country on earth." A year-long study of the school system by Teachers College at Columbia University produced the unsurprising conclusion that the schools are in "deep and probably worsening trouble." The study, headed by Dr. A. Harry Passow, recommends major reforms, ranging from decentralization of the school system to regular classes for three-year-olds.

The Board of Education, appointed by Washington's U.S. District Court judges, openly admits that much of the community has lost confidence in the schools and is moving on several fronts to give parents a stronger voice in school-policy decisions. Most observers feel that the existence of a liberal majority on the current board may have strongly influenced the decision of conservative Southern Congressmen to endorse a bill which will allow Washington residents to elect their school board. "I think they decided an elected board couldn't possibly be worse than the liberal group of board members the federal judges have come up with in recent appointments," says one Congressional aide.

The chances for change in Washington's school system do not depend exclusively—or even primarily—on the Board of Education or the residents of the District of Columbia. The nation's capital is in the peculiar situation of being the only city in the United States where citizens have virtually no control over their local government. City finances, including the school budget, are controlled entirely by Congress. Most city officials are appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate. Unable to push a home-rule bill through a balky Congress, President Johnson resorted this year to a reorganization plan that has streamlined the city government but given it no new powers. (The President insists that his appointed city commissioner, Walter E. Washington, be given the title of "mayor." Webster's Dictionary, however, defines a "mayor" as an elected city official.)

If the school board election is held as expected this spring, it will be Washington's first local election since 1874. But the elected board will have no more financial or administrative power than the present board. Conservatives who control key posts on the House and Senate appropriations subcommittees dealing with District finances are fond of cutting budget requests for school programs they do not like or, in many cases, do not understand. And the school budget is sure to receive even closer scrutiny than usual this year from Congressmen who were angered when the board forced Superintendent Hansen's resignation last summer by refusing to appeal Judge Wright's ruling on discrimination in the schools.

The relationship between Carl Hansen, Congress, and racial politics in Washington is essential to any understanding of what has happened to the public school system during the past twenty-five years. Judge Wright's decision—which ordered the board to make major changes in its methods of grouping students, to integrate faculties, and to bus students from crowded Negro schools to white schools with empty seats—forced an inevitable confrontation between Hansen and the board.

Unwilling to place itself in the distasteful posture of a Southern school board fighting federal court orders, the board voted 7 to 2 against appealing the decision. Hansen, personally affronted by Wright's implication that his policies had encouraged resegregation of the schools during the 1950s, insisted he would appeal the decision himself and submitted his resignation.

When Hansen came to Washington as an executive assistant to the superintendent of schools in 1947, the nation's capital was essentially a segregated Southern town. The city operated a dual school system, and separate but unequal was the rule in many neighborhoods where white children attended schools with empty seats and Negroes were crammed into classrooms on double sessions. White enrollment in the schools began dropping sharply after World War II—a phenomenon which suggests that middle-class whites were seriously concerned about the deteriorating quality of public education in the city schools long before desegregation. Only 55 per cent of the students in the Washington public schools were white when the Supreme Court declared legal segregation unconstitutional in 1954—a fact that school officials conveniently ignored for years when they said whites were fleeing Negroes rather than poor schools.

Hansen, then an associate superintendent of schools, developed a desegregation plan based on the "neighborhood school" concept which went into effect in September, 1954. Local and national civil rights leaders hailed the plan as a "model for the nation." Hansen staunchly resisted attacks by Southern Congressmen who conducted "investigations" aimed at proving that desegregation had turned the schools into cauldrons of vice, violence, and sexual promiscuity. Hansen's stand was regarded as a brave one by most Negroes and white liberals in Washington, and he was appointed superintendent of schools in 1958. In the 1960s, Hansen was understandably puzzled and disturbed when—like former Superintendent Benjamin S. Willis in Chicago—he became a symbol of frustration to groups demanding a better break for the city's poor Negroes. Ironically, the Southerners on Capitol Hill who had attacked Hansen during the early 1950s gradually became his staunchest defenders a decade later.

What happened was really no mystery. Policies that seemed liberal during the 1950s in what had basically been a Southern town seemed very conservative ten years later amid the rising tensions of a Northern ghetto. Hansen had not changed, but the city had. The creed running through Hansen's entire career—a creed shared by most professional school administrators—insists that education is the responsibility of professional educators alone. In the 1960s, Hansen resisted attempts by angry ghetto parents to play a role in school policy decisions as rigidly as he had resisted the attempted encroachments of segregationist Congressmen. The more people wanted things to change in the

schools, the more they stayed the same. Shortly before his resignation, Hansen made an auspicious-sounding proposal for "parent-advisory councils to return the schools to the people of each community." There was only one hitch, and it was a beauty—the method of selecting the councils was to be determined not by the people in each community, but by the school principals.

Hansen's track system, which became a focal point for criticism of the schools, was the prime example of a well meant idea that the former superintendent was not flexible enough to adapt to changing educational needs. Critics tended to blame all the ills of the school system on tracking; in reality, the track system was merely one obvious example of the lack of imagination, rigidity, and just plain bungling that characterized (and, despite the upheavals of the past year, still characterize) many administrative and teaching practices in the schools.

Hansen developed the track system after desegregation, when citywide testing revealed great disparities in achievement between white children and Negroes who had attended inferior schools under segregation. (No one bothered with standardized tests in the Negro schools when they were separate from the white schools.) There were three tracks—a basic track for students classified as retarded, a general track for average students, and an honors track for highly superior students. In high school, college-bound students were separated from students who were not going to continue their education in the general track.

The lower tracks, as might have been expected, consisted mainly of Negro students from deprived homes. The college preparatory and honors tracks were composed primarily of affluent white students and Negroes from professional or other upper-income homes. (The District schools have only a minimal number of poor white students, because low-income whites are able to find housing readily in the less affluent suburban communities.) Bright students in slum schools usually had to do without honors tracks because there were not enough children who met eligibility requirements on standardized tests to make up a class. In predominantly white schools, there was usually no basic track.

Wilhelmina B. Thomas, principal of Walker-Jones Elementary School in one of the city's most blighted areas, tested her students and found thirteen in one grade who belonged in the honors track. The school system's department of pupil personnel services, unable to believe that so many able students could come from a "slum school," suggested that Mrs. Thomas retest the youngsters. "They told me I couldn't possibly have that many children who belonged in the honors track," says Mrs. Thomas, "but I tested them again and indeed I did. We tried to arrange for transportation to the nearest school with honors classes, but most of the parents couldn't do it. The schools won't provide children with transportation in these cases, you know."

Hansen met protests against the track system with stubborn resistance, especially when they came from militant Negro leaders. He accused anyone who criticized the track system of wanting to abolish "ability grouping"—ignoring the fact that the track system is only one form of ability grouping. In Washington, each track had a different curriculum. Mobility between tracks was minimal in such a system because a child who graduated from a basic-track sixth-grade class was only able to do the work of a fifth-grade general-track class. The federal court decision which led to Hansen's resignation came in a suit filed by militant Negro leader Julius W. Hobson, who removed his daughter from public school after she was placed in the basic track. In ordering the board to abolish the track system, Judge Wright based his opinion not on objections to ability grouping but on his belief that tracking classified children on the basis of standardized tests that measured not the ability but the cultural background of ghetto students.

The abolition of the track system placed the schools in something of a quandary this fall. Between half and two-thirds of the former basic-track students are clinically retarded to some degree, and the schools have simply placed them in regular classes. One tearful mother told a reporter: "My daughter was doing well in her basic class last year. Now she comes home from school crying every day because she can't keep up with the other children. I just don't know what to do." While the Passow research team discovered that many children classified as retarded by the schools simply need glasses or hearing aids, the report also suggests that several thousand retarded children have not been identified. Acting Superintendent Benjamin J. Henley says testing procedures in the system were so poor that hundreds of basic-track children were incorrectly classified as retarded and should have been in regular classes. The gap between the theory and practice in the administration of the track system would have astonished Carl Hansen, who always emphasized that the success of tracking depended on accuracy of testing and other forms of evaluation.

As an administrator, Hansen's major success was in gaining the confidence of the Southern gentlemen who control school appropriations on Capitol Hill. When Hansen was appointed superintendent, Washington's per-pupil expenditure was far below that of most other large cities, not to mention the suburbs. The city's per-pupil expenditure of $644 last year was still far below the Maryland and Virginia suburbs, but was "about average" for a large city, the Passow report showed. The Congressmen approved of Hansen's track system and his resistance to demands for more community control of the schools, and it paid off at budget time. "You've simply got to remember," said one community leader, "that Carl Hansen got money out of Congress for the schools. And don't forget he got that money for a Negro school system. Remember the racial facts of life."

In Washington, the "racial facts of life" are an imponderable in the battle for change in the schools. Several Board of Education members regard the overwhelming racial imbalance in the schools as a blessing in disguise. "At least we don't have to waste our energies fighting racial battles any more," says one board member. "We aren't going to be like Boston, so tied up in bickering over integration that no one does anything while the schools go to hell." Most board members, like Dr. Haynes, are deeply concerned over the school system's continuing loss of middle-class Negroes. In many instances, schools in middle-class Negro neighborhoods are as isolated from the ghetto as predominantly white schools.

Many Negro professionals go to great lengths to keep their children out of schools that enroll large numbers of low-income Negro children. The board's controversial tri-school plan, which went into effect last February, is a case in point. Modeled on the Princeton Plan, the tri-school experiment assigned students by grades to three schools in Southwest Washington. Southwest is a "showcase" urban-renewal area, with expensive high-rise apartments and townhouses and public housing. Median income in the high-rises is nearly the highest in Washington; in public housing, it is about the lowest. Amidon Elementary School (which gave the name to a plan of "fundamental" education developed by Carl Hansen) enrolled nearly all of the children from the high-rise apartments.

The tri-school plan was originally developed by a coalition of high and low-income Southwest residents, but most Amidon parents were outraged at having to disperse their children to two other elementary schools in the public-housing area. Some of the plan's bitterest opponents were Negroes who live in the high-rises. This fall, an overwhelming majority of the affluent whites and Negro families whose children formerly attended Amidon have enrolled the children in private schools. Interestingly, about 60 per cent of the students who used to attend Amidon were from public housing. The middle-class parents would tolerate a 60 per cent enrollment from low-income homes but not a higher percentage as effected by the tri-school plan. Also, the track system had kept most of the poorer students in separate classes from the more affluent ones. "They just don't want their precious darlings to sit in the same classroom with dirty little slum kids," says Hobson.

Enrollment of Negroes in private schools tripled during the past decade while the number of Negro students in the public schools only doubled. At the same time, housing in the suburbs is beginning to open up to Negroes. One of the Maryland suburbs has already passed an open-occupancy ordinance and another is expected to follow soon. Unless the quality of the Washington public schools is upgraded, the white flight to the suburbs is likely to be followed by a flight of Negroes who never had the opportunity before. And the task of upgrading the school system will be made far more difficult if the schools are to be filled entirely with children from the most impoverished segment of American society.

In the final analysis, the chances of improving Washington's school system rest not on the racial or economic balance of the student body but on the staff. The statement might seem obvious to those outside the educational profession who do not realize that one of the gravest problems of Washington's school system—indeed, of all school systems with large concentrations of disadvantaged students—is a deeply ingrained belief on the part of many teachers and administrators that slum children have less ability to learn than other children. "Don't expect too much from these kids," an assistant principal of a junior high school cautioned a shocked young teacher on her first day of school last year. "Just keep them moving along as best you can, and don't break your heart over how stupid they are."

School board member Sessions made an unannounced visit to an elementary school last year after he received complaints that classrooms were being painted during school hours and that teachers and students were growing faint. Walking past a fourth-grade classroom, he heard a teacher screaming at the children. When she saw Sessions, she stopped yelling and stepped to the door to greet him. "Doesn't it smell terrible in here?" Sessions remarked, referring to the odious paint fumes. "Oh yes," the teacher replied in a loud voice. "It's the children. They always smell that way—just like little animals."

Carl Hansen once remarked that "the greatest problem the schools face is that large numbers of children are entering school uneducable." In fairness to Hansen, it must be noted that he did not intend to absolve teachers of the responsibility for poor teaching. But the attitude that large numbers of children are "uneducable" gives teachers an easy out if they work where most of their students score in the bottom fifth of the nation on standardized reading tests.

The poor attitudes of many teachers toward slum children are fostered by traditional teacher training, which does not give them the tools and methods they need to reach ghetto children. "The teachers find themselves in a situation that their training has taught them to believe is atypical," says John D. Howard, principal of a ghetto

elementary school where the Passow researchers were astonished to find that children were doing far better in reading than many schools in middle-class areas. "They stand in front of a class where most of the students are far below where they should be, and they don't know what to do."

The Washington schools have a provincial teaching staff. More than half of the new teachers hired each year come from D.C. Teachers College, which is operated by the public school system. Another hefty chunk of the new teachers comes from southern Negro teachers colleges—most of them the starving stepchildren of de facto segregated state systems of higher education. The teaching staff is nearly 80 per cent Negro. Although it might be expected that a predominantly Negro teaching staff would reduce some antagonisms between the schools and ghetto communities, in fact some Negro teachers who are one generation away from the ghetto are extremely contemptuous of slum children. "I got out myself," says one teacher. "I don't see why these kids deserve any more help than I got."

Passow concluded that the need to upgrade the competence of the teaching staff is the most urgent problem the school system must face. He recommended that teachers be released 20 to 30 per cent of their time each week for in-service training. "I'm not talking about in-service training in some college classroom," Passow says, "but training in the schools that deals with the immediate problems teachers are facing in the classroom. The school system should make every effort to persuade colleges across the country to establish student-teaching programs in the nation's capital. These might be coordinated with in-service programs for experienced teachers."

The school system itself is already operating an admirable model for such a program—the Cardozo Project in Urban Teaching. Under the Cardozo project—which served as a model for the national Teacher Corps—students working toward a Master of Arts and Teaching degree at Howard University spend an internship developing new curricula and instructional materials for their classes under the supervision of a master teacher. The Cardozo project opened its internships to experienced teachers in the system this year but received a less-than-enthusiastic response. "I guess most of the teachers think they know everything there is to know about teaching," says former project director Larry Cuban. "They weren't exactly beating down our doors."

The teachers themselves may attempt to stymie the kind of in-service training Passow has in mind. Washington Teachers Union President William H. Simons issued a warning blast when he said, "The union takes strong exception to the implication [in the Passow report] that the District schools have a large number of unsatisfactory teachers." The union, a local of the American Federation of Teachers, won collective bargaining rights in an election last spring and is just beginning to flex its muscles.

Just how much clout the Teachers Union will wield in Washington remains to be seen because of the peculiar financial relationship with Congress, which determines teachers' salaries. The present starting salary of $5,840 compares reasonably well with the Washington suburbs, but is far below settlements achieved after teachers' strikes this year in New York and Detroit. Salaries are even poorer for experienced teachers, who may make several thousand dollars less than their counterparts in the suburbs. Contract negotiations between the board and the union, which went smoothly this year, may have been a deceptive prelude to next year.

"You think we can't strike the Congress next fall?" says one union representative. "Do you suppose LBJ and all of the Congress would like to have schools closed in the nation's capital just before an election?" Says one school official: "Just between you and me, I don't think the school board and the administration would be violently angry to see the teachers strike the Congress. For once, it would place the responsibility squarely where it belongs."

Whether the union will fight reforms such as decentralization—as the United Federation of Teachers is doing in New York—remains to be seen. Washington is already operating an advanced experiment in school decentralization in an area about two miles north of the White House known as Adams-Morgan. The Board of Education approved the experiment so quickly last spring that no one had time to prepare a murmur of protest. The Morgan Elementary School was contracted out to Antioch College to be operated in consultation with a community school board. Antioch's three-year contract calls for the college to take over another elementary school next year and to begin operating programs in a junior high school.

The experiment was originally proposed by the Adams-Morgan community council, an alliance of low-income Negroes who are longtime residents of the area and young white families who began moving into the neighborhood about five years ago. The school board gave Antioch a free hand in its contract. Adams-Morgan is completely free of supervision from the regular departments of the school system in its selection of personnel and curriculum development.

Principal Kenneth Haskins, a forty-four-year-old Negro from New York, was selected to head the school by a joint committee of representatives from Antioch and the community. His appointment was routinely confirmed by the Board of Education. Several candidates for the principal's job expressed varying degrees of amazement when they arrived at the school and found they were to be interviewed by parents as well as professional educators. Nearly 75 per cent of the teachers at Morgan requested transfers after the experiment was announced by the board—a phenomenon comparable to what happened in New York City when teachers began mulling over the implications of community control in widely publicized decentralization experiments at Intermediate School 201 in Harlem and in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville section of Brooklyn. The unwillingness of teachers to participate in experimental projects involving greater community control of the schools raises the disturbing question of whether they will be willing to participate in any programs aimed at changing traditional attitudes and methods. In Washington, strong administrative leadership and the cooperation of the teachers union—by no means a foregone conclusion—will be needed to introduce innovations such as the Adams-Morgan plan on any broader scale.

The opening of the Morgan School this fall brought another potential conflict into the open—a clash between innovative educators who are trying to reach ghetto students in new ways and ghetto parents who are primarily concerned that their children learn the three Rs. Parents at Morgan were annoyed when an Antioch staff member told children they had to attend school only as long as they were interested. When some fifth and sixth-graders went home for the day, parents were—as one teacher put it—"pretty unhappy." Haskins is sensitive to the problem, noting that "many Negro parents in the slums practice a very traditional kind of discipline in their homes and do not understand or approve of an educational philosophy that allows as much freedom for children as the one Antoch tries to install in its teachers. Their main dissatisfaction with the schools in the past has been that their children haven't learned to read and write. They want the ineffectiveness of the school corrected, but there are going to be a lot of disputes over methods. We have an untested relationship here."

For the Washington school system, the only hope lies in "untested relationships." The tested relationships have failed, as they have in ghetto areas of other cities. But the failure of public education is particularly shameful in a city filled with marble monuments proclaiming that this is, indeed, "the greatest country on earth." The Passow report sums up the situation succinctly:

"Washington is not just another troubled large city; it is the nation's capital and its international center. The District schools cannot be treated as just another school system, different only in that its patrons are without vote and that it is subjected to greater 'federal control.' America's cities are in crisis and turmoil and Washington is one of those cities, but it is much more to the nation. Schools alone cannot resolve the problem of the cities but, without adequate education, there is little hope of alleviating the difficulties metropolitan areas face. What better place is there for the nation to tackle its urban problems than in the city which houses its national and international leaders?"

NEW SUPERINTENDENT FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOLS

William R. Manning, forty-four, a white school superintendent from Lansing, Michigan, was selected as Washington's next superintendent in an angry, chaotic meeting at the end of October.

The meeting was disrupted by demonstrators ranging from Negro militants to members of the Greater Washington Chapter of the Americans for Democratic Action. They charged that the community had been systematically excluded from the process of selecting a new superintendent. Manning's appointment was supported by only five of the nine board members, some of whom had wanted to appoint Acting Superintendent Benjamin J. Henley, a Negro, on a permanent basis. The fact that a Negro was passed over in the process of selecting Manning will not help his relations with the more militant elements of the Negro community. But Julius W. Hobson, leader of the demonstrators at the meeting, emphasized that his quarrel was not with Manning's qualifications or his race, but with the way the board picked him. If the Senate approves a bill that will give Washington an elected school board, as it is expected to, Hobson pledged that candidates will run on a "get rid of Manning" platform. Two court suits have already been filed by civil rights leaders to declare the appointment null.

Manning's appointment was also opposed by the Washington Teachers Union, and some of his immediate problems may arise from a staff that resented Henley's being passed over. But Manning was expected to formally accept the appointment after notifying his board of education in Lansing, "I feel a sense of dedication," he said, "to help solve some of the problems facing our great urban centers."

THE PASSING OF FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding figure of the 20th century and one of my leading constituents has passed on.

Francis Cardinal Spellman, whose career encompassed an era in New York

City, achieved so great a place in lay and religious history much beyond our power to add or detract.

I will merely acknowledge the deep sadness at the loss and bring to my colleagues' attention the survey in the New York Times of December 3, 1967, which details the tremendous record of a leader. The article follows:

FRANCIS J. SPELLMAN: NEW YORK ARCHBISHOP AND DEAN OF AMERICAN CARDINALS

(By Alden Whitman)

From 1939, when he was appointed Archbishop of New York, Francis Joseph Spellman was a pre-eminent leader of the nation's 45 million Roman Catholics.

He was the best-known, most widely traveled and most publicized member of the American hierarchy of about 250 prelates; and of the six American cardinals he was the dean as well as the first among equals. He dominated his church in the United States as no other person had, so much so that he was often thought of as a kind of American pope.

The brilliant career of a small-town grocer's son whose forebears came from Ireland had two undeniable peaks amid a score or more of high points. The first, coinciding with the pontificate of Pius XII from 1939 to 1958, raised him to membership in the College of Cardinals, brought him extraordinary influence in the Vatican and made him a personage in the United States.

The second peak occurred in 1965, when he was host to Pope Paul VI on the Pontiff's epochal peace mission to the United Nations and visit to New York. The Pope's many personal accolades, bestowed throughout the visit, were visible signs of his approval of Cardinal Spellman's imposing accomplishments.

Many of these accomplishments were tangible—the new churches, schools and hospitals built for a congregation that since 1939 has doubled to almost two million. The Cardinal's brick and mortar, valued at more than a half-billion dollars, was spread over an archdiocese of 4,717 square miles. This included Staten Island, Manhattan and the Bronx in New York City plus Westchester, Putnam, Dutchess, Orange, Rockland, Sullivan and Ulster Counties. (The Brooklyn Diocese, over which Cardinal Spellman had no canonical authority, covers Queens and Brooklyn, with a total Catholic population of more than 1.5 million. Because many people did not realize that there were two dioceses in New York City, it was often believed that the Cardinal's jurisdiction was more extensive than it actually was.)

The Cardinal's prominence and preeminence in Catholic and American life arose from a combination of related circumstances. These included his pervasive power in the Vatican, especially in the reign of his close friend, Pius XII; the untold wealth of his see and its location at the communications center of the United States; the millions he collected yearly for the papal treasury; the number of American bishops and cardinals elevated from among his proteges and on his recommendation; his personal associations and his network of friendships at the uppermost levels of American Government, society, business, industry and banking; his extraordinary skill as a behind-the-scenes diplomat; his key position as Military Vicar to the Armed Forces; the tireless care with which he attended his churchly duties; and, of course, his personality.

ENHANCED IMPORTANCE

In addition, the emergence of Catholics to a new and more accepted position in American society and the vastly increased role of United States Catholics in their global church tended to enhance the Cardinal's importance and the respect he was accorded.

On the whole the Cardinal exercised his influence unobtrusively, making his views and desires known through others. He, of course, spoke out from time to time—on Federal aid to parochial schools, on motion pictures and on Communism. On some of these occasions he generated controversy; his acerbic dispute with Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt over state-church relations; his calls to boycott certain films as salacious or sacriligious; his endorsement of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy's anti-Communism; his breaking of a gravediggers' strike and his support of United States involvement in Vietnam.

Much of the acute public controversy over the Cardinal occurred in his early archiepiscopal years. He acquired the reputation then of being a social and political conservative, and this tended to obscure his liberal statements on racial discrimination and anti-Semitism.

The Cardinal traveled hundreds of thousands of miles, many of them as head of the Military Ordinariate. This was, in effect, a second archdiocese that extended all over the world, wherever American troops were stationed. Beginning with World War II, the Cardinal visited training camps, fleets at sea, air forces at their bases, fighting fronts. It was his custom to pass the Christmas season with troops overseas. These personal visits, the Cardinal's battlefield masses and his supervision of nearly 2,000 Catholic chaplains brought the church to a great number of American youths, including many reared to be suspicious of Catholicism.

The Cardinal's activity, in an indirect way, helped generate an increasing toleration for his church. At the same time he widened his friendships among high-ranking military men, a great many of whom on their visits to New York regularly "checked in" at 452 Madison Avenue, the Cardinal's residence, for luncheon or conversation.

A genuinely warm and friendly man, Cardinal Spellman possessed a gentle smile and sly Irish wit. These attributes endeared him to important people in ecclesiastical and temporal life—among them President Franklin D. Roosevelt. He was Mr. Roosevelt's "favorite bishop" who helped to bring about a rapprochement between the Vatican and the United States in 1939.

He was also on amicable terms with President Harry S. Truman, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, President John F. Kennedy and President Johnson.

The Cardinal was a gregarious man, at home with a great variety of persons. This characteristic puzzled some of his friends, who could not understand how he could enjoy, seemingly equally, the company of a serious intellectual and that of a fun-loving, yacht-owning lawyer.

DELIGHTED IN INFORMALITY

The fact was that the Cardinal delighted in the rare moments of informality that his position afforded. These were the times he could sit and chat with old school and family friends, to whom he was either Frank or Spelly. Such occasions were an echo from his youth or his less burdened Roman days.

He enjoyed listening to songs, Irish ballads in particular. A favorite was "Danny Boy," and a monsignor on his staff, possessed of a good tenor, was often called upon to sing it and other sentimental lilts

The Cardinal was rarely without guests for breakfast, luncheon or supper at the large oval table in his dining room. In the course of a week he talked to diplomats, travelers, men of affairs, potential contributors to charitable causes and others whose knowledge or expertise might somehow be useful.

These gatherings were scarcely ever solemn, for the Cardinal had a spontaneous humor. He could turn a phrase or make a sally. His accent, even after years in Italy and New York, betrayed its Massachusetts origin. "New Yorkers still think I speak English with a foreign accent," he said after 25 years as head of the archdiocese.

The Cardinal was a tireless worker. His day began at 7 A.M. or earlier with mass in his private, oak-paneled chapel on the third floor of the residence; it often ended at midnight or later. (Like all priests, he devoted an hour a day to saying his office.) Although he delegated many responsibilities to members of his staff and officials of the Chancery, he was personally involved in most diocesan activities. For example, he appeared for years at every Catholic college commencement in the archdiocese, handed out the diplomas that he had signed and shook hands with each graduate and his parents. For good measure he sometimes took in a couple of high school graduations.

The public saw the Cardinal most frequently as a ceremonial figure—presiding at the 10 A.M. Sunday mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral, reviewing parades from the cathedral steps facing Fifth Avenue, appearing at school commencements, cornerstone-layings, parish events, formal luncheons, dinners and charity affairs. At these times he seemed almost swallowed up in the Renaissance magnificence of his clerical robes, an impression that his stature of just over 5 feet accentuated.

But what was memorable amid the opulence of the Cardinal's garb was his face. It was round, benign, shining, almost cherubic. The forehead was high, the ears large, the nose a mite pointed, and the dark blue eyes, peering through old-fashioned rimless spectacles, were steady. The face conveyed a sense of cheerfulness that even long hours of ceremony rarely seemed to dull.

CASSOCK AND KHAKI

The Cardinal's unaustere demeanor was best complemented when he dressed in unadorned black, which he did as often as he could. In a house cassock he was indistinguishable from a rotund parish priest. For his walks, which he took almost nightly in his younger years, he also dressed in black. As a stroller, the Cardinal was known to hundreds of policemen and taxicab drivers, who singled him out from other priests because of his face.

On his trips to troop concentrations he dressed in his khaki uniform as a military vicar, but he often wore his shirt collar open and sported an overseas cap. He liked to mingle and banter with service men and women.

Once, in the early days of World War II, a G.I. said to him, "How come, Archbishop, that you're not a cardinal?"

"Our T.O. calls for 70," the prelate replied, "but promotions have been frozen during the war."

Informal occasions suited the Cardinal. After a dedication or other ceremony at a church or school, when he put aside his robes, he could be the jolliest and most exuberant person present. His natural affability also shone at luncheons at the residence. Over the years these brought leading Protestants and Jews into touch with Catholic clergy and laity and thus played a significant part in the Cardinal's personal ecumenism. At these repasts he was relaxed and humorous, a delightful host, according to those who sat at his table.

Another aspect of the Cardinal's humanness was his fortnightly session with members of the laity beset by troubles. On a typical such day a dozen persons visited him at 15-minute intervals in the long drawing room on the first floor of the residence. There could be a mother whose son was in difficulty, a father seeking help for an ailing daughter, an elderly person wanting admittance to a Catholic home.

The Cardinal was a sympathetic listener, quick to dispel his visitor's awe. At the end of the talk he was likely to help the guest

with his coat, walk him to the door and part with a handshake.

In matters of charity Cardinal Spellman was generous to a fault. Visiting another bishop's diocese, he almost always left a check for a worthy cause. Passing through Genoa once, he pressed a check for $1,000 on its astonished Ordinary. Other clergymen, recipients of his bounty, looked upon him as something of a Santa Claus. On his 75th birthday he made a gift of $75,000 to Pope Paul VI for a papal charity. And there was $10,000 here and $10,000 there for other public or nonchurch funds.

Criticism of Cardinal Spellman, in the church and outside it, amounted to a small industry. Although he was generously praised for his piety, his charity, his building program and for helping to bring Catholics more into the mainstream of American life, his critics called him narrow in his outlook and halting in his leadership. He inspired, they said, a theological airlessness in the American church.

Conservative was the word most frequently employed by the Cardinal's critics. His voice, it was said, was unmistakably clear in condemning movies and plays that he disliked, but less vehement on such social issues as political corruption and slum housing.

Of the few occasions on which he appeared in the cathedral pulpit, three were attacks on Communism, one was a call to boycott so-called indecent movies, one marked his accession as archbishop and another welcomed an apostolic delegate to the United States. This record, critics said, did not reflect the currents of concern in the world.

Rather than displaying largeness of mind in confronting the touchstone public and church issues of his time, Cardinal Spellman concentrated, according to his critics, on buttressing rigid attitudes on morals, divorce, birth control, mixed marriages and Americanism.

Complex political, economic and moral issues, critics asserted, were turned into easy choices between good and evil, patriotism and treachery. "The only grave sins the Cardinal recognizes are Hollywood sex and Communism," one critic remarked.

The Cardinal's critics conceded, however, that he did indeed issue statements or make speeches about racial equality, social justice and interfaith goodwill. But what was lacking, they instisted, was vigorous, crusading leadership. He was too prudent, too bland, too soft, it was charged, and not basically interested in such matters as the social encyclicals of Pope John XXIII.

Critics also made much of the Cardinal's publicly inactive role in Vatican Council II. He was out of general sympathy with its aims, it was said, even though he contributed to financing it. The Cardinal had slight influence, some observers said, spoke seldom and supported liberal proposals only sparingly. Theological points propounded by progressive prelates did not capture his interest, it was said.

In the Council sessions Cardinal Spellman was on the record as opposing a plan for a ministry of deacons, possibly including married men. He was against the doctrine of collegiality, the idea that the college of bishops share church government with the Pope. He also opposed a softening of the Catholic stand on mixed marriages; and he expressed strong reservations about an approving reference to conscientious objection in the decree on the Church in the Modern World.

On the other hand, the Cardinal was on the Central Preparator Commission for the Council, a member of its Coordinating Committee and of the Council of the Presidency, the highest Council body. He was credited with helping to bring the religious liberty statement to a vote when it was being ambushed by ultraconservatives in 1965. He also worked for a strong declaration exculpating Jews collectively from the age-old charge of deicide.

In the view of some observers, the Cardinal shifted from conservatism to a mild liberalism in the Council session. In 1963, it was noted, the Cardinal took to Rome as his personal theological adviser the Rev. John Courtney Murray, a Jesuit once excluded from Council matters for his liberal views on state-church relations. In this sense the Cardinal was an unpredictable conservative.

Cardinal Spellman's defenders, for their part, said that his lack of flamboyance did not imply ineffectiveness in keeping the church in step with the times or passivity in promoting interfaith goodwill and social goals.

"The Boss," said one priest, using the nickname by which the Cardinal was universally known in his archdiocese, "did not believe in change just to change, nor did he believe in thrashing out church problems in public. He preferred to work quietly in the background, encouraging change when and where it would do the most good."

This priest suggested that the Cardinal was also a traditionalist. "The imprint on him from the church and its liturgy as he experienced them in his formative years was very strong. You would not expect him in his late years to become a flaming liberal," he said.

CONTEXT OF HISTORY

Another priest, sympathetic to the Cardinal, said that he should be viewed in the context of the history of the Catholic Church in this country.

"The American church was shaped by a strong Irish component, fresh from persecution in Ireland," the priest said. "It was fiercely self-protective, preoccupied with maintaining doctrinal purity and attaining a measure of social respectability.

"The Cardinal, with his Irish background, was molded by this history so that his Catholicism was more akin to strait-laced Irish Catholicism than it was to the more easy-going Catholicism of the church in France or Italy."

Another priest who observed the Cardinal's theology and politics for many years summed him up by saying: "He was basically more Puritan than Catholic."

In his own archdioceses and through selection of his protégés for church office, the Cardinal was said to have singled out men of Irish background for preferment. In the archdiocese, priests said, there was only one bishop of Italian descent although the bulk of the diocesan population had Italian forebears.

Of the approximately 30 members of the American hierarchy who are said to owe their promotions to Cardinal Spellman, the most conspicuously controversial is James Francis Cardinal McIntyre of Los Angeles. Once chancellor and vicar general of the New York Archdiocese, Cardinal McIntyre has been a pronounced conservative in racial and social matters on the West Coast.

On the other hand, the Cardinal's friends cited his interest in meeting the religious and educational needs of Puerto Ricans in New York. Newly ordained priests were sent to Georgetown University for Spanish studies and to the Catholic University in Puerto Rico for language and cultural instruction. In addition, teaching nuns and brothers received background training in Puerto Rico.

In temporal affairs in the city, state and nation, the Cardinal wielded a degree of political power that was difficult to define precisely. His residence and the Chancery across Madison Avenue were generally referred to in political circles as "the powerhouse." It was said that Mayors, Governors and sometimes Presidents harkened to "word" from "the powerhouse"; but documented instances of this were rare indeed.

A priest close to the Cardinal for many years said that he exercised less political influence than he was given credit for.

"The Cardinal's views, or rather the church's attitude, seep down," this priest said. "But the days when 'the powerhouse' ran the city went out with the demise of Tammany Hall."

Within the church in New York it was conceded that the Cardinal ran a tight ecclesiastical ship. Restive priests who ventured out of line on social and political issues could find obstacles in their careers. One such was the Rev. George Ford, former Catholic chaplain at Columbia and pastor of Corpus Christi Church. Father Ford, an outspoken political liberal and ecumenist, was at one time forbidden to speak outside his parish. The Cardinal's ban, once strict, ceased to be enforced after a while, and when Father Ford retired as pastor he and the Cardinal were on good terms.

DIFFICULT TO GAUGE

Another priest in disfavor with the Cardinal was the Most Rev. Fulton J. Sheen, once Auxiliary Bishop of New York and now Bishop of Rochester. For some years Bishop Sheen was high in the Cardinal's esteem, but, according to reliable sources, he slipped in a difference of opinion over money raised for Catholic missionary work. Their poor relations were an open secret.

Priests who dealt directly with the Cardinal found him difficult to gauge.

"The Boss can be brusque and impassive in bawling out a subordinate," one priest recalled, "yet when the interview is over he is on his feet helping the errant man into his overcoat and making pleasantries. You never know what to make of him. If a priest who has displeased The Boss then does something he likes, he does not hold the past against him."

Although the Cardinal was known to be displeased from time to time with The Commonweal, a liberal Catholic magazine, and with The Catholic Worker, a monthly paper, he did not interfere with them. He could be irked by what they printed, and subside after a while in seeming benevolence.

One example involved "The Foundling," a novel the Cardinal published in 1951. The signed review that appeared in The Commonweal was quite unflattering to the Cardinal's literary craftsmanship, and he passed the word that the reviewer had forever incurred great displeasure. Fourteen years later the reviewer received an award for Catholic journalism. Not only did the Cardinal present the citation publicly, but also he avowed privately that the journalist was a splendid chap.

As an author of inspirational religious and patriotic poetry, including "What America Means to Me and Other Poems and Prayers," the Cardinal stirred less criticism. The half-million dollars in royalties from all his books—they were brisk sellers in New York—was given to various charities.

Although the Cardinal took pride in his writing, which he undertook in his limited spare time in the evenings, his best-known hobby was philately, which he began as a seminarian in Rome. His collection at first specialized in the United States stamps issued since 1847, and then branched out to include stamps of any country depicting persons or scenes related to religion or literature.

His albums and their thousands of stamps were given, during the Cardinal's life, to Regis College in Weston, Mass., in memory of his aunt, Sister Mary Philomena of the Sisters of St. Joseph.

When Cardinal Spellman was named Archbishop of New York he announced: "I shall pray as if everything depended on God. I shall work as if everything depended on me."

This formula, with its emphasis on strenuous practical activity, reflected Francis Joseph Spellman's life and rise in the church.

He was born May 4, 1889, in Whitman,

Mass., a small shoe-manufacturing town southeast of Boston. He was the first of five children of William and Ellen Conway Spellman. His mother named him for two saints—Francis of Assisi and the husband of the Virgin Mary.

William's father, Patrick, was a bootmaker who had immigrated from Ireland. Mrs. Spellman's father was a farmhand, also an immigrant from Ireland. Both families lived in an area with a sparse Catholic population, and they assimilated very quickly the dominant Yankee ways of thrift and frugality. Although Catholics in other parts of the country were then subject to persecution, the Spellmans, the Conways and their co-religionists escaped searing manifestations of bigotry.

SUCCESSFUL ENTERPRISE

William Spellman was the proprietor of a "cash grocery" when his eldest son was born. It became such a successful enterprise that he was able to buy a fine house set off in five acres of lawn and trees and also to expand his store. Frank worked there in his spare time from the age of 8, selling provisions or delivering them in a horse-drawn wagon.

His father had a dry wit. "Son," he used to tell the boy, "always associate with people smarter than yourself, and you will have no difficulty finding them."

The father was also a cautious man with a penny. When his son came home one evening from college to announce that he had won a scholastic medal, William Spellman's comment was, "Did you put out the light downstairs?"

Frank's mother, on the other hand, was indulgent, gentle and easy-going. A picture of her hung prominently in the Cardinal's study, and he established an endowment fund in her memory at Whitman High School.

As a student in Whitman, Frank was not outstanding, although he won two prizes for essays, one on the Battle of Gettysburg and the other a suitably patriotic collection of impressions of a visit to Washington. His out-of-school interests were photography, boxing, ice hockey, horseshoe-pitching and baseball.

On graduating from high school in 1907 Frank was sent, largely at his mother's urging, to Fordham, a Jesuit college in the Bronx. His four years there were passed inconspicuously, although he showed competence in English composition, Latin and scientific studies. Disappointed in not making the baseball team (he was a good infielder but a light hitter), he learned to play tennis. He also tried his hand at poetry and oratory.

There is no chronology of the young man's decision to study for the priesthood, nor did the Cardinal ever make his reasons public. The clearest account is in "The Cardinal Spellman Story," an authorized biography by the Rev. Robert I. Cannon, a former Fordham president.

"As a student at Fordham, Frank Spellman continued to be an active, intelligent young Catholic with a layman's interest in his church," Father Cannon wrote. "He was regular in his reception of the sacraments and active in the 'Parthenian' — the oldest and most distinguished of the student sodalities. As a sophomore, he read an essay on 'Devotion to Mary in Modern Times' as part of a literary academy for the Feast of the Purification, and in his junior year we find him listed as 'sacristan.' . . . As far as a vocation was concerned, he was content to keep an open mind and stay in the state of grace until the senior retreat came around. This opportunity, he quietly determined, was not to be wasted.

DECISION ON PRIESTHOOD

"Following the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius, he weighed every word of the Foundation with its inexorable logic, and like any generous youth of blameless life, he came prepared to the 'Meditation on the Kingdom.' There he saw Our Blessed Lord as the perfect Captain of men's souls, calling for a new crusade to win back the world to His Eternal Father, and bowing down with his head in his hands, he whispered, 'Lord, I shall follow You wherever You go!' He talked things over with his favorite scholastic, Mr. Edward P. Tivnan, S.J., who told him that he had the required aptitude and if he made application, would, no doubt, receive the call from his Bishop."

The day of his graduation Frank Spellman told his parents that he wanted to be a priest. His mother was overjoyed; his father asked only if he were certain. On his assertion that he was, the family agreed to back him in his desire to attend the North American College in Rome.

"In those days you did not have to be bright to go to the North American College," the Cardinal said in later life. "The only qualification was financial."

That was not quite the case, for he had to obtain the consent of his clerical superiors, including the Most Rev. William O'Connell, Archbishop of Boston and later a cardinal.

Arriving in Rome in the fall of 1911 with camera in hand, Frank Spellman donned his seminarian's uniform—a black cassock with blue piping and buttons and a maroon sash—and went for his interviews with the college officials. He did not make a favorable impression, with the result that for five years he was never an officer of his house, a sacristan or a beadle; moreover, he was not permitted to go for a walk alone.

If his superiors were frosty, the seminarian's fellow students were not, and he made lifelong friendships. He also struck his stride as a student, showed a capacity for organizational leadership and developed prodigious memory.

At the same time he made a fortunate friendship with one of his teachers, Francesco Borgongini-Duca, later to be an influential cardinal and Vatican official. Frank Spellman also sharpened his instinctive ability for pleasing people of high rank. Visiting a new cardinal with a group of seminarians, Frank persuaded the dignitary to pose for his camera. Departing, he asked if he could call again to deliver the finished photographs. The cardinal agreed, and before long Frank had acquired a powerful patron.

The seminarian received his doctorate in sacred theology after a thesis in sacramental theology and was ordained a priest May 14, 1916. He said his first mass the following morning at the Tomb of St. Peter.

Returning to the United States and to the Archdiocese of Boston, Father Spellman received a cool welcome from Cardinal O'Connell, a crusty, blunt and powerful prelate.

DUTIES IN BOSTON

In the nine years that Father Spellman spent in the Boston chancery he appeared never to have been in the Cardinal's favor. Some students of the situation have said that there was a clash of personalities between a strong-minded superior and a young man who seemed to be in a hurry. Others have said that the young priest lacked humility after his exalted experiences in Rome.

In any event, Father Spellman's first appointment was as chaplain for a home for aged women. This was followed by a routine assignment as second curate at the Church of All Saints in Roxbury, where, in addition to sick calls, parlor duty and preaching every Sunday, he was in charge of the Holy Name Society, the First Communion class, the Confirmation class, the Sunday school and the baseball team.

With United States entry into World War I, Father Spellman delivered fervent patriotic speeches and received Cardinal O'Connell's permission to volunteer as a Navy chaplain. Turned down by the Navy, he was accepted by the Army and was on the point of departure to camp when Cardinal O'Connell abruptly ordered him to promote subscriptions to The Pilot, the diocesan newspaper.

For the next four and a half years Father Spellman visited a different church each Sunday, preaching at all the masses and drumming up sales of The Pilot. It was humdrum work, and somewhat to relieve the monotony and for intellectual exercise Father Spellman studied Spanish and translated into English two devotional books written in Italian by his old professor, Monsignor Borgongini-Duca. This endeared him to the monsignor, who, at an opportune time, was able to get Father Spellman out of Boston.

Meantime, he had become a general handyman on The Pilot, reading proofs and writing headlines and an occasional editorial. In 1922 he was made an assistant in the chancery, where he studied accounting and canon law and gained experience in the procedures of diocesan administration. He apparently did not please his cardinal, however, for he was demoted to archivist and given an office in the basement of the chancery office. However, he was able to joke about his dull estate.

The turning point in Father Spellman's career came in 1925—a Jubilee Year in Rome. Cardinal O'Connell and his chancellor, Msgr. Richard J. Haberlin, led a pilgrimage of Boston Catholics to the Eternal City early in the year. While the chancellor was away his brother died, and Father Spellman comforted the family.

The chancellor, on his return, thanked the young priest and asked what he could do to repay his kindness. Father Spellman replied that he would like to go to Rome on his second pilgrimage. Monsignor Haberlin was able to arrange this, and Father Spellman sailed for Italy as secretary to the bishop leading the pilgrims—over the bishop's protests.

GREETED BY FORMER TEACHER

When the party arrived in Rome there was an immediate and dramatic change in Father Spellman's status, for on hand to greet him at the railroad station was Monsignor Borgongini-Duca of the Vatican Secretariat of State, his former teacher whose works he had translated. The monsignor made it plain to the Boston bishop and to the pilgrims that Father Spellman was his friend.

In the course of the pilgrimage Father Spellman was introduced to Pope Pius XI and pleased him by translating several of his addresses to pilgrim groups. Also during the visit, Monsignor Borgongini-Duca arranged for Father Spellman to take charge of a playground project in Rome that had been initiated by the Knights of Columbus. The appointment was confirmed by the Pope himself, and Father Spellman was effectively detached from the Boston Archdiocese for the next seven years.

Technically, Father Spellman was made an attaché in the first section of the Vatican Secretariat of State—the first American to hold such a job. There he enlarged his circle of friendships to include Pietro Cardinal Gasparri, the Secretary of State, as well as other members of the Roman Curia, or governing body of the church.

Father Spellman's playground duties were not so onerous that he could not spend a part of each day in the Secretariat of State. When prominent Americans came to pay their respects to the Pope, it was Father Spellman who made the arrangements and who came into contact with the American Embassy in Rome.

Among the Americans in Rome with whom the black-haired, good-looking priest became intimate were the Nicholas F. Bradys who owned a villa, Casa del Sole, on Janiculum Hill. Nicholas and Genevieve Brady were immensely wealthy and immensely interested

in partaking of the Vatican's social life. To their villa came all the important cardinals, and through one of them, John Cardinal Bonzano, Father Spellman.

Very shortly Father Spellman was the Bradys' private chaplain and good friend. "After mass in the morning, I play tennis with Mr. Brady and then take a shower and get to work at 10:30 or 11," Father Spellman wrote his family at the time. "It does him good and I am certain it does me worlds of good."

Another letter to Whitman, Mass., reported:

"Yesterday Cardinal Gasparri, Monsignor Borgongini, Monsignor Pizzardo and Mr. Brady and I had a 150-mile ride in the country . . . We all had a great time.

"I suggested to Mr. Brady to give Cardinal Gasparri a new Chrysler Limousine 82 and he said 'Sure.' Both Mr. Brady and the Cardinal are delighted."

Somewhat later Father Spellman obtained three Graham-Paige motor cars for the Pope through a former classmate at Fordham.

Three years after his arrival at the Vatican, Father Spellman became a monsignor and then, later, a domestic prelate. Meanwhile, he had made the acquaintance of John J. Raskob, the American industrialist, and had persuaded him to give $45,000 for a papal project. For this he was personally commended by the Pope.

In 1929 Monsignor Spellman met Msgr. Eugenio Pacelli, then the Papal Nuncio in Berlin and later to be a cardinal and Pope Pius XII. "He is a wonderful man," Monsignor Spellman wrote of their first meeting.

The friendship that developed was profound. After Monsignor Pacelli returned to Rome as Vatican Secretary of State, he and Monsignor Spellman spent their vacations together in Switzerland, and, of course, the two men saw much of each other through their duties in the church.

Over the years the friendship flourished. It was Eugenio Pacelli who consecrated Monsignor Spellman a bishop, who appointed him Archbishop of New York and who named him a cardinal, bestowing upon him his own red hat. As Pope Pius XII he recognized his friend as the chief American cardinal. When Cardinal Spellman had Vatican business to transact, he went directly to the Pope rather than through normal bureaucratic channels; he was able to get the Pope directly on the telephone from New York; and he was able to lunch with the Pope, a privilege permitted no other cardinal. In turn, the Cardinal performed delicate diplomatic tasks for the Pope, raised money for papal projects and advised him on his relations with the United States.

In 1931 a bishopric vacancy opened in the Boston Archdiocese, and the following summer Monsignor Spellman was named to fill it. He was not Cardinal O'Connell's candidate, as the monsignor's letter to his family made clear.

"On Monday evening July 25th Cardinal Pacelli sent for me," he wrote. "I went into his big room and he at once came towards me and before saying a word he embraced me. Then he said, 'I have something to communicate to you, something joyful and something sad, sad because it means you will leave me, joyful because it will be for the welfare of the Church and because it is clearly God's will—the Holy Father has named you Auxiliary Bishop of Boston'."

Monsignor Spellman was consecrated in St. Peter's Basilica in September, 1932. He was named Titular Bishop of Sila and Auxiliary Bishop of Boston. He was the first American to receive episcopal consecration at the Basilica's high altar.

His ring, a gift of Archbishop Borgongini-Duca, was a sapphire surrounded by diamonds with a fragment of the True Cross set in gold. His vestments were those that Cardinal Pacelli, his consecrator, had worn when he himself was consecrated a bishop.

Afterward, the new Bishop was received privately by Pope Pius XI, who suggested to him his episcopal motto, Sequere Deum, or Follow God. Following a short holiday with Cardinal Pacelli in France and Switzerland, Bishop Spellman departed for Boston. He was 43 years old and on the verge of a new career.

In seven years he had served a diplomatic apprenticeship open to few priests. He had copied orders, translated encyclicals, arranged broadcasts, drafted documents, carried out diplomatic missions, obtained a global perspective on Vatican affairs, met every American bishop to visit Rome. He had, moreover, achieved every mark of the Vatican's approbation.

Bishop Spellman's return to Boston was less cordial than he might have hoped. His official greeting was a radiogram, delivered to him on shipboard. It read:

"Welcome to Boston. Confirmations begin on Monday. You are expected to be ready. Cardinal O'Connell."

The Cardinal was as frosty as his message, for he did not receive his new auxiliary for more than five months. He then appointed him parish priest of the debt-burdened Sacred Heart Church in Newton Centre, Mass. He remained there until his appointment to New York in 1939.

As a parish priest, Bishop Spellman won the affection and respect of his congregation, increased its size, erased its debt by skillful fund-raising, including a horse show, and built up an excellent parish school.

HOST TO VISITING OFFICIALS

At the same time, he traveled about the United States, seeing and talking with other members of the American hierarchy, playing host to visiting Vatican dignitaries and maintaining a flow of correspondence with Vatican officials. Some of this correspondence had to do with American affairs, beginning in 1933 when United States recognition of the Soviet Union was under way.

An entry in Bishop Spellman's diary for Nov. 7, 1933, read:

"Had a letter from Mr. [Enrico] Galeazzi [a Vatican intimate] saying that the Pope wished him to tell James Roosevelt to ask his father to request some guarantee for freedom of religion in Russia before recognition. Sent letter to Apostolic Delegate."

Bishop Spellman edged further into Vatican-United States diplomacy in 1936. In that election year, when the Rev. Charles E. Coughlin, a Michigan priest, was berating President Roosevelt as "anti-God" and as "a scab President," Cardinal Pacelli, the Vatican Secretary of State, accepted an invitation to spend his vacation as a guest of Mrs. Nicholas Brady, by then a papal duchess, at Inisfada, her Long Island estate.

This raised the possibility of delicate complications: To what political leaders, if any, should the Cardinal pay his respects? What should he say if he was asked to comment on Father Coughlin? What should he say if he was asked about an American-Vatican diplomatic tie?

Bishop Spellman stepped into the situation with characteristic energy, and became the Cardinal's guide and mentor on his visit, which, it was stressed, was purely personal and ecclesiastical. The Cardinal gave no interviews on his 8,000-mile tour of the country.

The fact that a publicly obscure Boston prelate was Cardinal Pacelli's host-in-fact was not lost on observers, especially when Bishop Spellman escorted the Cardinal to a post-election meeting with President Roosevelt at Hyde Park, N.Y. The interview had been arranged by Joseph P. Kennedy, a Catholic layman and a friend of the Bishop's.

The Cardinal's obvious confidence in the Bishop led President Roosevelt to consult increasingly with him on national and international affairs. He became, indeed, the principal avenue of communication between the White House and the Vatican, and the President termed him "my favorite bishop."

To the end of the President's life in 1945, the prelate and Mr. Roosevelt were on good terms. He was a frequent White House guest, and his advice was solicited on great and small matters. He was consulted, for example, when Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black was disclosed to have been a member of the Ku Klux Klan; when Mr. Roosevelt considered paying a call on George Cardinal Mundelein of Chicago; when the President was dickering for a diplomatic tie with the Vatican.

ROLE IN VATICAN ACCORD

In 1939, shortly after his appointment to New York, Archbishop Spellman arranged the final steps whereby by Mr. Roosevelt sent Myron C. Taylor as his personal representative to the Vatican. It was a momentous diplomatic accord, the first United States recognition of the Holy See since 1866. Arguments for even limited relations with the Vatican had, in the nineteen-thirties, excited many in the Protestant community who felt that the Vatican was not properly a state, and it took all Mr. Roosevelt's skill to assuage fears that recognition implied an alliance with a religious organization.

Archbishop Spellman's role was discreet and behind-the-scenes in bringing the Vatican and the President together in such a manner that recognition in fact was accomplished comparatively innocuously.

During World War II, when the Archbishop was also Military Vicar and traveling the world to war theaters, he and the President were in communication on policy matters regarding Europe. Coolness in the Archbishop's support began to develop, however, with the Allied bombing of Rome and Vatican property in 1943 and 1944.

On several occasions he intervened with the President to protest American and British tactics in battling the Germans in and near Rome. And when Rome finally fell to the Allies on June 4, 1944, the President yielded to the Archbishop's importunings and agreed to a virtual demilitarization of the city. Subsequently, the Archbishop was instrumental in obtaining economic relief for Italy.

In other areas, the Archbishop's enthusiasm for the President also waned. For one thing, he came to disagree with the policy of unconditional surrender for Germany; and, for another, he was disenchanted by the Yalta agreements with the Soviet Union on the ground that Mr. Roosevelt had conceded too much, especially in Catholic Eastern Europe, to the Russians. There was no public break, of course, and when Mr. Roosevelt died the Cardinal said a votive mass in St. Patrick's.

The way had been opened for Auxiliary Bishop Spellman's further rise in the hierarchy by the death of Patrick Cardinal Hayes in New York in September, 1938.

Although Bishop Spellman received some initial consideration for the vacancy, archdiocesan officials in New York favored the Most Rev. Stephen J. Donahue, Auxiliary Bishop of New York, and Pope Pius XI was said to have decided on the Most Rev. John T. McNicholas, Archbishop of Cincinnati. But before the designation papers could be signed the Pope died in February, 1939. He was succeeded by Cardinal Pacelli as Pius XII, and one of his first acts was to send a personal cablegram to Bishop Spellman. This was followed, in April, by his designation of his old friend to the New York post.

"The news broke at 7 o'clock [April 24]," the Bishop wrote at the time. "I said mass in the convent at 6:30 and told the nuns after mass . . . I wrote a letter to the Holy Father, to President Roosevelt and I went to see Cardinal O'Connell. It was quite an interview. He was very nice. Of course he knew the past and also the immediate past, and I knew the past and also the immediate past."

A BUSY SCHEDULE

Cardinal O'Connell's public statement was a model of praise but his private comments

were caustic. "Francis epitomizes what happens to a bookkeeper when you teach him to write," he reportedly remarked to a Catholic journalist. He also cautioned a group of New York priests, "Don't you believe a word he says."

Coming to New York Archbishop Spellman impressed himself on the public as a busy and civic-minded prelate. He appeared at public receptions, dinners and dedications, considerably in contrast to his more retiring predecessor. He also took steps to overhaul the administrative machinery of the archdiocese, which he found $28-million in debt. Curtailing the fiscal autonomy of parishes, he centralized and refinanced the debt, consolidated insurance coverage, centralized purchasing, created an archdiocesan bank and established firm controls over spending and building.

In carrying out these policies, with a talent that amounted to genius, he came to work closely with bankers, industrialists and corporation executives. "There's nothing abstract about the Cardinal," a financial man who collaborated with him once remarked. "He tells you exactly what he wants and then lets you do it."

One striking result of the reorganization was a remarkable building program in which the archdiocese became second only to the city as an institutional generator of construction. Since 1939 the value of construction has been put at $500-million, with an annual outlay at present of $50-million.

The money has gone (and goes) for schools, churches, hospitals, convents, seminaries and homes for the aged. Among the structures put up since 1939 are the $5-million Archbishop Stepinac High School in White Plains, the $6-million Cardinal Spellman High School in the Bronx and the $11-million Foundling Hospital in New York. In 25 years the number of parishes increased by 25 to more than 400 and the number of schools from 130 to more than 425.

The Cardinal was personally concerned with all the Catholic charitable enterprises, but he lavished special attention on the Foundling Hospital and on St. Vincent's Hospital. For the latter he raised money at annual Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinners; and for the former he raised millions by soliciting friends. The Cardinal's guests, on tours of the city, were almost certain to be shown the Foundling Hospital, and he himself evidently enjoyed going there to watch the care of its children.

Archbishop Spellman was nominated by the Pope for the College of Cardinals in December, 1945, and was raised to it in Rome Feb. 18, 1946. The red hat that he received from the Pope was the one Pius XII had himself received when he became a cardinal. The Pope also gave the new Cardinal his own pectoral cross and assigned him his own Titular Church of SS. John and Paul in Rome.

Returning to New York in March, the Cardinal was given a triumphal reception that included a public accolade at the Metropolitan Opera House. Gov. Thomas E. Dewey represented the state, Mayor William O'Dwyer the city and Postmaster General Robert E. Hannegan brought greetings from President Truman.

In his New York years Cardinal Spellman was involved in several public disputes. The four most notable concerned films, a gravediggers' strike, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and McCarthyism.

In 1941 he condemned "Two-Faced Woman," a slight comedy starring Greta Garbo, as dangerous to the morals of Catholics. Ten years later he attacked Roberto Rossellini's "The Miracle," a story of an idiot girl seduced by a stranger she believed to be St. Joseph. When a child was born, the girl considered a miracle had occurred.

Calling for a nationwide Catholic boycott of the movie, the Cardinal termed it sacrilegious and "a despicable affront to every Christian." Catholic pickets were mobilized to march at the New York theater where it was showing and the film was quickly banned by New York State. The ban was thrown out, however, by the United States Supreme Court in 1952 in a landmark ruling that condemned capricious censorship.

MORAL AND PATRIOTIC DUTY

The Cardinal's crusade against "The Miracle" troubled many people, especially as the film was freely exhibited in Italy without provoking protests.

Despite rebuffs the Cardinal kept his eye peeled for films he considered obnoxious. In 1956 he urged his co-religionists to shun "Baby Doll" under "pain of sin." Pronouncing against the film from the pulpit in St. Patrick's, he said:

"It is the moral and patriotic duty of every loyal citizen to defend America not only from dangers which threaten our beloved country from beyond our boundaries, but also from the dangers which confront us at home."

The Cardinal's personal involvement in a labor dispute came in early 1949 when 240 members of the United Cemetery Workers Union, a C.I.O. affiliate, struck for a five-day week and a basic wage of $77.23. The gravediggers, virtually all of whom were Catholics and who began their meetings with a Hail Mary and a prayer, declined to dig graves at Calvary Cemetery in Queens. They picketed the burial ground and the Chancery.

The Cardinal broke the strike by enlisting as gravediggers priesthood students at St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, Yonkers, and by leading them through union picket lines.

"I admit to the accusations of being a strikebreaker," he said, "and I am proud of it. If stopping a strike like this isn't a thing of honor, then I don't know what honor is."

Eventually the strikers joined an A.F.L. union and the Cardinal approved a contract with it for an 8.3 per cent raise over the prestrike weekly wage of $59.40.

Looking back on the strike, the Cardinal remarked that it had confronted him with "one of the most difficult, grievous, heartbreaking issues that has ever come within my time as Archbishop of New York, and it will be my daily prayer that if ever again the workingmen of this Archdiocese must make their choice between following their faith or faithless leadership, they will of their own free and immediate choice, choose—God!"

In mid-1949 the Cardinal fell out with Mrs. Roosevelt over whether parochial schools were entitled to Federal aid. Mrs. Roosevelt regarded such help as a threat to the constitutional separation of church and state. The Cardinal wanted funds and nonreligious textbooks, bus transportation and health aids.

The controversy began with a single reference to the Cardinal in one of Mrs. Roosevelt's "My Day" columns. It said:

"The controversy brought about by the request of Francis Cardinal Spellman that Catholic schools should share in Federal aid funds forces upon the citizens of the country the kind of decision that is going to be very difficult to make."

The Cardinal's response was a long, emotion-charged letter in which he accused Mrs. Roosevelt of waging a "personal attack" and of mounting an "anti-Catholic campaign." The letter concluded by calling Mrs. Roosevelt "unworthy" as "an American mother."

The letter shocked many Americans and public criticism was immediate. Acting through Edward J. Flynn, a Catholic layman and a Democratic leader, the Cardinal thereupon got in touch with Mrs. Roosevelt and the rough edges of the episode were eventually smoothed over.

In later years the Cardinal shunned discussion of the incident. "I don't like to have any hard feelings," he said in explanation. "I want to be charitable with everybody."

Cardinal Spellman was chary of openly expressing his political preferences. This neutralism, however, did not extend to Senator McCarthy and his investigations of alleged subversive activities. The Cardinal came to Mr. McCarthy's defense in 1953 by asserting:

"No American uncontaminated by Communism has lost his good name because of Congressional hearings on un-American activities."

The following April the Cardinal appeared at the annual Communion Breakfast of the Police Department's Holy Name Society and, to the cheers of some 5,000 policemen, shook hands with Mr. McCarthy.

Cardinal Spellman never retreated from his defense of the Senator even after Mr. McCarthy was censured by the Senate. Indeed, the Cardinal maintained a friendship with one of the Senator's coworkers and most contentious investigators, Roy M. Cohn. The Cardinal was a guest from time to time on Mr. Cohn's yacht and appeared often at dinners arranged by the lawyer.

On the subject of Communism the Cardinal was outspoken, and he saw its perils and threats in many areas of American and international life. According to Father Gannon, his biographer, the Cardinal's all-inclusive hatred of Communism led him to deplore "the indifference of the United Nations to Divine Guidance, their exclusion of Ireland and Spain and every civilized country that might prove embarrassing to the Kremlin, and above all, their cynical attitude toward the liquidation of Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and the Atlantic Charter."

But the United Nations finally proved better than nothing, Father Gannon wrote, "and when New York City formally turned over several tracts of land on the East River to the United Nations, His Eminence pronounced the invocation."

The Cardinal was often a target of Moscow invective—he was once called "the archangel of atomic war"—because he likened Communism to, among other things, "a wild beast of the forest." When Nikita S. Khrushchev, then Soviet Premier, toured the United States in the summer of 1959, the Cardinal summoned the entire archdiocese to Holy Hour services in every church on the eve of the Premier's arrival.

In the late nineteen-forties the Cardinal took a hand in the United Nations discussion over Palestine partition and was helpful in rounding up support from the Catholic countries of South America for the admission of Israel to the United Nations. One aspect of the plan called for international control of the holy places in Jerusalem. When this fell through, the Cardinal was critical of Israeli officials.

CARDINAL'S GUESTS

On a personal level, however, the Cardinal was friendly with scores of Jewish leaders. The late President Chaim Weizmann of Israel was a dinner guest of the Cardinal, as was Abba Eban, the Israeli diplomat. Locally, Charles S. Silver, a former Board of Education official and an officer of the American Woolen Company, was a close friend and frequent table companion.

Cardinal Spellman was on his way home from a pilgrimage to Lourdes when Pope Pius XII died in 1958. He flew to Rome, took part in the funeral rites for his old friend and attended the conclave that elected Angelo Cardinal Roncalli as Pope John XXIII. The two were on friendly terms.

Similarly, he was on friendly terms with Pope Paul VI, whom he had met when both were in the Vatican Secretariat of State. The Pontiff honored him when he celebrated his 75th birthday and 25th anniversary as Archbishop of New York at a dinner here in May, 1964. On that occasion the Pope, through a

representative, gave the Cardinal a jeweled clasp that had been worn by Pope Pius XII. It was inscribed in Latin in words meaning "to our beloved son."

Later that year the Pontiff, through the Cardinal, gave his jewel-studded crown to this country "to express gratitude for the goodness of all people of America." After being exhibited at St. Patrick's Cathedral the triple tiara was placed on permanent display at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington.

A climactic honor came to the Cardinal Oct. 4, 1965, when he was host to Pope Paul on the Pontiff's visit to New York to address the United Nations in an appeal for world peace. From the moment of the Pope's arrival at Kennedy Airport until his departure late that night, the Cardinal was at his side. The honor paid the Cardinal was enhanced by the fact that it was the first visit of any Pope to the United States.

Nonetheless, the Cardinal's influence in the Vatican and his power in the United States had diminished considerably by 1965. Having so often "jumped channels" when Pius XII was Pope, the Cardinal had annoyed many in the Curia, and the political pendulum now swung against him. At the same time, the Vatican paid less heed to the Cardinal's advice on American affairs.

In May, 1966, the Cardinal marked his 50th anniversary as a priest. There was an elaborate ceremony at St. Patrick's Cathedral attended by four other cardinals and the Apostolic Delegate to the United States.

In the glow of the celebration the Cardinal seemed to have mellowed and to have withdrawn from the arena of public dispute. This estimate was accentuated by his offer, in September, to resign as Archbishop of New York and as Military Vicar because he was over 75. A month later he announced the offer (and its rejection by the Pope) in one of his rare appearances in the pulpit at St. Patrick's.

"I accept this decision of His Holiness as God's will for me," he said.

But any thought that the Cardinal might have eschewed controversy was dispelled, when he traveled to South Vietnam at Christmastime. Addressing American troops, he asserted, "This war in Vietnam is, I believe, a war for civilization." He went on to say that "less than victory is inconceivable."

These words, uttered as the Pope was earnestly striving for a Vietnam peace, evoked denunciation of the Cardinal from without and within the church. He was even chided by the Vatican newspaper, which remarked that all Catholics had a duty to give loyalty to the Pope's peace efforts. The Cardinal later sought to modify his stand by insisting that he wanted peace in Southeast Asia.

This fall the Cardinal was again in controversy when, in a rare political statement, he endorsed the proposed New York State constitution as "a document worthy of support by the people." The proposal, which was defeated, repealed a specific restriction on public aid to parochial schools.

Out of the spotlight, the Cardinal spoke longingly of his joy in pastoral work. "That has always been my ideal," he said recently, "to be close to the people. That is what the church has always done and always should do."

BABCOCK & WILCOX CO.—100 YEARS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the State of Ohio and Summit County in particular have been most fortunate in having industrial firms who have not only added greatly to the wealth of the people but who have a genuine concern not only for their own employees but for all of the people of the community in which their plants are located.

The Babcock & Wilcox Co. is this year celebrating its 100th year and ranks among the industrial giants of the world. We congratulate them.

We, in Summit County, Ohio, take a deep pride in the tremendous growth of the boiler division of that company. While this great division does not date back to the origination of the Babcock & Wilcox Co., its antecedents do go back to 1880.

Today some 6,000 persons are employed by this company at its boiler division headquarters in the fine city of Barberton, Ohio. Another 4,000 are employed by B. & W.'s other departments in neighboring counties. Its Ohio payroll is in excess of $81 million annually.

Under its great industrialist, vice president, J. P. Craven, the boiler division of the Babcock & Wilcox Co. has shown great dedication to the total welfare of the community.

Just recently the Barberton Area Chamber of Commerce gave their annual certificate of merit to this division of the Babcock & Wilcox Co. In doing so, the Barberton Area Chamber of Commerce president, William Haury, stated:

> We give this award to the Babcock & Wilcox Co. in recognition of its contribution to the industrial life of the Nation; for the dynamic leadership of its management that has contributed to the constant growth and expansion of the firm's Boiler Division; thereby providing increasing benefits to the economy and well-being of the Barberton Area community; and for the continuing participation and support in community activities.

J. Paul Craven, who accepted the award on behalf of his company, has the respect and the affection of the citizens of Ohio. He has been a member of the Babcock & Wilcox Co. for over 39 years and is considered one of the world's great authorities in his field. The Babcock & Wilcox Co. boiler division's entire staff of executives and employees have gained an international reputation for the excellence of their work.

I cannot close this tribute without paying homage to the parent organization. The Babcock & Wilcox Co. has over 30,000 employees in its 35 facilities here and abroad. Its sales for 1966 were over $561 million. Its history is one of ever-increasing growth. One can well understand this when one considers that it spends over $15 million annually in research and development.

When the industrial history of man's conquest of his environment is finally written the name of Babcock and Wilcox will occupy some of its most important chapters.

We do feel that under its chairman of the board and president, Morris Nielsen, the Babcock & Wilcox Co. will achieve even greater goals in the next hundred years of its existence.

We thank them for the faith that they have shown in the State of Ohio.

MINNIE HARRELL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, December 4, I made a speech which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 25, page 34771, concerning the fact that neighborhood legal service attorneys, paid by OEO antipoverty funds in three States and the District of Columbia, have gone into Federal district courts seeking to strike down both State and Federal residency requirements as unconstitutional.

The original draft of my speech contained a reference to one Minnie Harrell, whom I had been told was in the district only 5 days when the suit was filed in her behalf against the District of Columbia Commissioners. Prior to making the speech I learned that she had been here 9 months, and that the case was filed on June 20, 1967, the same day a Federal court ruled in the case of Thompson against Shapiro that Connecticut's residency requirements were unconstitutional. I therefore deleted the following paragraph from my speech:

> The case of Minnie Harrell v. the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia was filed 5 days after Minnie Harrell entered the District. Anyone acquainted with the law and the effort and research connected with filing of a suit, knows that she must be a plant, the UPO attorneys co-conspirators and the victims none other than the American people who will foot the bill.

Unfortunately, a few copies of the original draft reached the press although my office attempted to retrieve all copies containing the error. I therefore would like to take this opportunity to correct this unintentional error and to express my regrets if any embarrassment has been caused thereby.

LET US SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, on October 23, 1967, in a discussion of House Resolution 948, and on October 24, 1967, in reference to the same matter, my colleague from the Second District of Maryland charged the Honorable Spiro T. Agnew, Governor of the State of Maryland, with a conflict of interest and impropriety in the alleged ownership of land next to the proposed parallel Chesapeake Bay Bridge.

Specifically, the gentleman charged that Governor Agnew—

First, owns land on the approach to and very near the proposed parallel span;

Second, that his ownership of the land was discovered last year;

Third, that, when the ownership was discovered, the Governor promised to sell the land and give the proceeds to charity; and

Fourth, that the land had not been sold but "repeated public prodding has only just now succeeded in getting a definite action to sell this property."

The charges appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 22, pages 29605 and 29610. The charges are a distortion of the facts and unfairly impugn the integrity of Governor and Mrs. Agnew. The record should reflect the following facts:

First. A one-ninth interest in the land in question was purchased by the Agnews on June 31, 1965, some 15 months before Mr. Agnew was elected Governor.

Second. On July 6, 1966, before the gubernatorial primary election in Maryland, Mr. Agnew voluntarily disclosed his ownership interest in the land in question. He subsequently volunteered to divest himself of his ownership therein so there could be no conflict of interest in the event he should be elected. On September 16, 1966, prior to the Maryland gubernatorial election, the Agnews entered into an irrevocable trust agreement with the Maryland National Bank under the terms of which the bank was directed to sell the Agnews' one-ninth interest in the property at a private sale within 1 year of that date and, if no suitable sale could be consummated within that time, the trust agreement directed that the Agnews' one-ninth interest be sold at public auction. Any profit from the sale was to be paid over to charity. No suitable purchaser having been found for the property, the trustees, on October 13, 1967, advertised the Agnews' one-ninth interest for sale at public auction.

My colleague was aware on October 23, 1967, when he made his charges, that the Agnews' interest in the property had been advertised for sale and would be sold on October 31, 1967, at public auction. The Agnews' interest was sold on October 31, 1967, at public auction for $13,200. The only bid at the auction was by a representative of the other owners of the property to whom the property was sold. The sale will result in a small loss to the Agnews.

In fairness to Governor and Mrs. Agnew, it should be emphasized—

First, that their purchase of the land was some 15 months prior to Mr. Agnew's election as Governor;

Second, an irrevocable trust disposing of the Agnews' interest in the property and divesting the Agnews of any further ownership in the property was executed and recorded 2 months before his election as Governor;

Third, the Agnews' interest in the land was sold at public auction under the terms of the trust agreement and at a loss to them; and

Fourth, the Agnews' interest in the property was not "discovered." Governor Agnew voluntarily disclosed his interest in the property well in advance of the Maryland gubernatorial primary election.

VIETNAM LETTER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, all of us receive voluminous mail about Vietnam. The mail comes from constituents at home and from our servicemen on the firing line. The letters plead, cajole, bully, and give a great deal of advice. But on a rare occasion, the one letter comes in which is such a simple and clear statement of feeling and fact that it makes us sit back and honestly reappraise our sometimes cluttered and confused thinking.

Mr. Speaker, I have received just such a letter from Michael W. Massey, a Navy Seabee stationed in Da Nang, which I would like to share with my colleagues. His letter follows:

DANANG, REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM.

HON. CONGRESSMAN MORTON,
First Congressional District Representative of the State of Maryland.

SIR: I have been meaning to write this letter for weeks. My name is Michael W. Massey, and my home address is 716 Edgar Drive, Salisbury, Maryland. I have been a Maryland resident for the past twenty-one years. At the present time I am an enlisted Navy serviceman stationed at DaNang, Republic of Vietnam with U.S. Naval Mobile Construction Battalion 1. I have been in Vietnam a little over six months.

I am writing to encourage you to support the continuation of the bombing of North Vietnam. I am sure that you realize that the bombing of North Vietnam is buying an item so valuable that not even all our tax money can buy. That item is human lives. With each bomb dropped in the north we help to earn a few more men the right to live so that they might be able to come home. As long as the supply lines from the north are paralyzed the Seabees here in DaNang, Phu Bai, Chu Lai areas can have only limited contact with the V.C., thus making it a little easier to do the job we are expected to do. I realize world opinion is against us in a great many of the countries we have considered our allies; plus a lot of people, particularly college students, do not favor or endure the war. I myself don't pretend to tell you I think war is the solution to any of the world's ideological disputes. It seems to me that we the people who are striving to reach unlimited goals in space and human development should concentrate more on getting along here on earth. But as one human to another, small cries of peace and understanding in a darkened, hateful world can not stand up against the misguided teachings of a few world communist leaders. I hope you will seek every means of helping to end this war, and encourage your fellow Congressmen to also do so. You must evaluate the facts and vote for the right measures.

We here in Vietnam listen and read of the differences of opinions circulating in Congress at the present time. The lives of thousands of servicemen are in your hands. We here in Vietnam don't want to be used as a political ball to be thrown back and forth from one political party accusation to another. We were sent here to do a job which Congress gave the President permission to do. I say, let's get it done and done right.

I know you are doing your best and I know you will continue the good job you have done. In closing let me say I don't know the answer over here. I have learned one lesson over here. That lesson is peace and democracy are worth any battle no matter if it is fought in Congress, the debating tables in the United Nations or in the rice paddies of Vietnam.

Respectfully,

MICHAEL W. MASSEY,
U.S. Navy USN MCB 1, "H" CO.
FPO, New York, N.Y.

CONGRESSMAN BURKE CITES ADDITIONAL SOVIET BUILDUP IN MIDDLE EAST

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on November 20 I called to the attention of my colleagues reports of a tremendous military buildup taking place in the Middle East and the Mediterranean area, in which the Soviet Union is instrumental. Today I want to relate to you another step which the Soviet Union is taking to command military control of the vital Mideastern and Mediterranean Sea routes, and destroy the southern flank of NATO defenses.

The new step is the basing in Egypt of a squadron of Tupolev 16 jet bombers by the Soviet Union this past weekend. This squadron of Russia's best bombers have been placed there, complete with Russian pilots and crews. It is especially significant because it marks the first time that the Soviet Union has equipped foreign nations outside the Soviet bloc with their best bomber plane. Furthermore, it is also the first time that Russian pilots and crewmen have been supplied to such nations.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of acting now to review this situation and reassess our position and policies with Russia in the light of these recent events. The Tupolev 16 planes have long been considered the pride of the Soviet bombing fleet, and are capable of carrying missiles and nuclear weapons for a great distance, even as far as the eastern shores of the United States.

In my opinion, these latest developments by the Soviet Union mean only one thing: The Russians are moving into the Middle East, far more swiftly than our administration realizes, to capture control of the vital sea routes, to bottle up our 6th Fleet, and to further undercut our Western defenses, principally NATO.

How long must we wait before we get some assurances from the Johnson administration that steps will be taken to curb this Soviet takeover of the Middle East and Mediterranean?

In my November 20 statement, I reported to you some information which I received through reliable sources to the effect that the Soviet Union is already moving missiles to develop a rocket complex at the Port of Oran in Algeria. This complex of rockets will be aimed direct-

ly at the Straits of Gibraltar. I also reported that the Russians have totally rearmed the Arab nations with weapons more modern than those destroyed in the June war. In addition, this time they are supplying six to eight Russian generals to oversee the operation. Furthermore I understand that the Russians have based over 25,000 Soviet military personnel and technicians in Syria, Egypt, and Algeria to train Arab troops in the manipulation of the modern war equipment they have supplied. These Russians will also be used as backup reserves for the Arab forces.

I feel compelled to say again, Mr. Speaker, that the danger of world war III appears to lurk more in the passionate deserts of the Middle East and Mediterranean today than in the Southeast Asia war.

The Russians are playing for high stakes throughout the Mediterranean. They are definitely aiming at the weak foundation of NATO, hoping to undermine the entire defense structure of the Western Community.

I think the present administration is underreacting in the Middle East and Mediterranean because of a misguided belief that the Russians are less hostile and less dangerous than the North Vietnamese and the Red Chinese. But do not believe for a minute that the Soviet Union has in any way changed its long recognized desire for world conquest.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that we must reassess our position and our policies with respect to the Soviet Union. Russian objectives in the Middle East are far from peaceful. Again, I urge my colleagues to join me in urging the Johnson administration to take immediate steps to counteract this situation before it is too late.

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. HUNT. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the Indian Claims Commission is an agency of vital importance to many of my constituents. The saga of negligence and unfair treatment of the American Indian by the Federal Government is a sorry chapter in the history of our Nation.

The Indian Claims Commission was created to correct some of the wrongs done to the original Americans, the Indians. This Commission was created to redress grievances and function to restore honorable relations between Washington and the Indian. The Commission should be regarded as sacred to our national honor as is the U.S. Supreme Court. Its members should be chosen with the same care on a basis of individual merit.

I am deeply troubled, Mr. Speaker, to read in the Washington Evening Star and Washington Post that Richard W. Yarborough, son of Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, a Texas Democrat, was appointed to a $26,000 position on the Indian Claims Commission reportedly because the Senator rendered a political favor for a close personal friend of President Johnson.

Today I have received information to indicate that young Mr. Yarborough, whose legal experience appears mainly confined to work in his father's office, is certainly not the most qualified individual available for service on the Commission. Indeed, he appears to have no special background in the complicated laws that pertain to Indian claims or to the unique problems of the American Indian.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if the administration regards the Indian Claims Commission so lightly that appointments to that body are used to pay off political debts. I would like to know why Mr. Yarborough was chosen when more experienced and qualified men were obviously available. I would like to know if the administration is indicating a lack of concern for the claims of great importance to our Indian citizens now pending before the Commission.

The answers to these questions must be forthcoming if we are to restore public confidence in the Commission and reassure our Indian citizens that their claims are regarded in Washington as a very serious matter.

MENTAL RETARDATION FACILITIES AND COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1963

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN] may extend hs remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I watched with considerable personal pride as the President signed into law a bill to amend and improve the mental retardation features of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act of 1963.

It had been my privilege during the 88th Congress to serve not only on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which brought the act to the floor, but also the Public Health and Welfare Subcommittee, which drafted the act.

But my pleasure at playing a part in this milestone occasion was inhibited somewhat by knowledge that a few days ago Colorado suffered a great loss in the human resources side of its ongoing program to assist the victims of mental retardation and mental illness.

A young leader in this field in my district has died. His name was Merlin Zier. Among the newspaper articles which marked his passing was a particularly moving eulogy by Leonard Larsen, a staff writer for the Denver Post. Mr. Larsen makes the statement in the article that Merlin Zier, despite having made a tremendous contribution to institutionalized children in Colorado, left this world relatively unknown by his fellow men.

I doubt that the fact of nonfame would have bothered Merlin Zier. He did not, by nature, seek the limelight.

But Mr. Zier deserves to be remembered in the hearts of all men—and not just the fortunate few whose lives have been directly touched by his selfless service to humanity.

Leonard Larsen's eulogy has served to memorialize Merlin Zier in the hearts of thousands of Coloradans. It now seems fitting to expand the readership of this fine article, Mr. Speaker, and this can be accomplished by reprinting it in the RECORD. The text of Mr. Larsen's article follows:

A MAN WHO CARED ABOUT LITTLE THINGS

(By Leonard Larsen)

Merlin Zier was one of those men who is in public life but not in a public spotlight, not like a governor or a congressman or even a penitentiary warden.

He died of leukemia last Sunday and he was not a famous man. Chances are the only people who knew he was a state official were those in his own circle of friends, other state officials and employes and the parents of children whose lives have been brushed by the tragedy of mental retardation.

Zier had served since 1962 as superintendent of the State Home and Training School at Wheat Ridge, a quiet, compassionate man who represented a new breed of administrators in state institutions.

Zier and the others like him don't look on their jobs as keepers or wardens of places which operate mainly to keep the inmates in. That was to be done, but for men like Zier the real objective is to help open doors.

A place like the Ridge home can be shocking and depressing. Children, some of them helpless, misshapen, without a flicker of response, are cared for there, along with others who may appear bright and animated but are still severely retarded.

Only a few years ago in Colorado all of them were filed away as hopeless.

But administators like Zier have come on the scene—with, it must be acknowledged, the backing of legislators and governors—to work at human salvage as well as human custody.

For the mentally ill, new approaches have produced impressive results. It is harder in the area of mental retardation. If a smile of recognition begins to form behind a child's fixed mask, if a word or a sentence is blurted out, if a finger is pointed in recognition at a tree, that's progress.

About a year ago, Zier was meeting with the legislature's Joint Budget Committee to outline his proposed budget for the forthcoming year and I, for one, got a better look at this little-known state official—his humility, his concern for the children he cared for and his view of progress.

He would like some extra money for special activities at Ridge, Zier told the legislators, money to pay for parties and other projects for the children in his care. It wasn't much money, really lost in a total request of about $4.7 million to operate Ridge, but it was important, he said.

He explained how some of these activities had been carried out on a limited basis and gave an example which showed not only the plight of the children, but Zier's compassion for them.

There had been a night-time party arranged at the home and the children were taken from their cottages to walk across the grounds to the party location, he said.

On the way—in that dark night—some of

the children cried out. His first thought, Zier said, was that the children were frightened. But they weren't afraid, Zier told the legislators. The children were crying out in wonder and delight at the stars above them.

These children had become so institutionalized—their lives arranged in a schedule of meals and play and training and sleep—that they didn't know there were stars in the sky when the world got dark, Zier said.

He confessed he had lost sight—until that moment on the darkened Ridge campus—of how deep were the needs of the children in his care and how important it was to reach them in very small ways.

Merlin Zier will be missed in Colorado state government. I hope he can be replaced by another star-gazer.

NATIONAL JEWISH HOSPITAL SAVE YOUR BREATH MONTH

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has a growing problem of chronic respiratory diseases. Despite tremendous strides forward in both research and the care of respiratory disease victims, some 160,000 Americans die annually of such afflictions as tuberculosis, asthma, and emphysema.

It is estimated that 10 million of our fellow-citizens suffer from a respiratory disease.

One of the Nation's foremost research and care organizations in this field is located in Colorado. National Jewish Hospital, a nonsectarian institution founded in 1890, has played a vital role in the continuing fight to understand and cure respiratory diseases.

This institution has provided more than 5 million patient-days of free care to victims of chest disease in its 67 years of operations.

In recognition of the need for our Nation to support the ongoing research and care programs of National Jewish Hospital and other outstanding organizations in the Nation which are involved in the ongoing fight against respiratory diseases, yesterday I introduced a joint resolution which would authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating March 1968 as "National Jewish Hospital Save Your Breath Month," and emphasizing the major public health problem presented by chronic respiratory disease.

H.J. RES. ——

Joint resolution to proclaim National Jewish Hospital Save Your Breath Month

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in response to the growing national concern occasioned by the increase of chronic respiratory disease and in recognition of the accomplishments of medical science in the detection and control of such disease, the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation (1) designating March 1968 as National Jewish Hospital Save Your Breath Month, and (2) emphasizing the major public health problem presented by chronic respiratory disease, and calling upon the people of the United States to observe appropriate medical safeguards for their own respiratory health and that of their families.

U.S. SUPREME COURT UNREALISTIC

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the one-man one-vote concept and the rights of State legislatures to redistrict received a lethal blow this week when the U.S. Supreme Court, with three words, wiped out months of hard work by both the Legislature of the State of Ohio as well as the U.S. district court in Cleveland.

A 20-page opinion upholding Ohio's 1964 redistricting was summarily eliminated with only the words "reversed and remanded."

Perhaps the Supreme Court majority could not find a reason supported by logic; however, Justices Harlan and Stewart expressed deep concern in the dissenting opinion.

The Court, apparently, and nobody really knows because of the absence of opinion, felt only the 1960 census could be used in drawing new districts. This, of course, is wholly unrealistic and does grave injustice to the one-man one-vote concept they profess to support.

An editorial in the December 5 Washington Post tells the story graphically:

PROCRUSTEAN TENOR?

The Supreme Court's decision in the Ohio redistricting case highlights the hazards in the struggle for equal representation. The statute creating new congressional districts for Ohio in 1964 was admittedly defective, according to the criteria laid down by the Supreme Court, because one district had 13 per cent more population than the average and another had 18 per cent less, on the basis of the 1960 census. But state officials had defended the legislature's decision by saying that it had taken into account population shifts after 1960. The unofficial statistics thus relied upon were admitted to be unsatisfactory, but the lower court concluded that the disparities would not be greater than those which would result from a 1967 districting based wholly on the 1960 census. It was this conclusion that the Supreme Court overturned.

Justices Harlan and Stewart, dissenting, accused their brethren of closing their eyes to substantial population shifts and of thus giving the Court's decision in the *Wesberry* case "a Procrustean tenor." Unofficial population statistics are, of course, an unreliable guide in determining the legislative representation of any area. But so are obsolete population figures. In some parts of the country population movements in the last seven years have been widespread. Since there is no acceptable way of measuring these shifts until the 1970 census, all redistricting efforts in the next two years will leave much to be desired.

It is well to remember too that the courts will not now have the expedient of at-large elections to fall back upon. Congress has outlawed such elections, with a highly dubious one-year exception for Hawaii and New Mexico. Courts can no longer hold the threat of an at-large election of Congressmen over the heads of legislators if they fail to enact a constitutional districting plan. When no equitable districting plan has been enacted, the courts themselves will have to undertake the task—unless some other suitable mechanism created by the state is at hand.

However the job is done, it would be logical to recognize known population shifts, even though they cannot be measured with precision, so as to minimize the changes that will be necessary after 1970. Insofar as it discourages this policy, the one-sentence decision in the Ohio case is unfortunate. It is open to the interpretation that the Court is more concerned with form than with substance.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON INTRODUCES BILL TO LIBERALIZE PENSION BENEFITS FOR SURVIVORS OF CERTAIN RETIRED CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. HUNT. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which will provide more liberal pension benefits to certain survivors of former Government employees who must presently give up their pension benefits if they remarry.

The 1966 amendments to the Civil Service Retirement Act provide that surviving spouses of civil service employees who retire after the effective date of the legislation, July 18, 1966, are entitled to continue receiving pension benefits if they remarry, provided that they remarry after the age of 60.

Thus, under present law, of two surviving spouses who are in identical circumstances except that one of their spouses retired before July 1966 and the other after that time, one will be eligible to continue receiving pension benefits and the other will not if they elect to remarry.

My bill eliminates this inequity by providing that all surviving spouses of retired Government employees are eligible to continue receiving pension benefits even though they remarry. As under present law, the survivor would have to remarry after the age of 60 to be eligible for these continued benefits.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure which would make the civil service pension schedule more equitable and benefit surviving spouses of many former loyal public servants.

OUR COLLEAGUE FLORENCE DWYER RECEIVES THE ELEANOR ROOSEVELT HUMANITIES AWARD

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House will be as pleased and delighted, as I was, to learn that our good friend and colleague from New Jersey, Representative FLORENCE P. DWYER, has just received the Eleanor Roosevelt Humanities Award at a dinner held December 3, 1967, at Temple Sholom, in Newark, N.J. This distinguished award was established to perpetuate the spirit and ideals of a noble woman who graced the American scene as a humitarian fighter for freedom, defender of underdeveloped nations, stanch friend and supporter of the State of Israel. And those of us who know and have worked with "FLO" DWYER easily recognize that the Plainfield Area Committee, State of Israel Bonds, selected someone who emulates all of the great humanitarian virtues of the renowned former First Lady.

To the people of the 12th Congressional District of New Jersey, FLO DWYER is Union County's First Lady. Their respect for her ability, dedication, and hard work as a creative and forceful legislator has been clearly demonstrated, as they have returned her to the Congress five times since her initial election, and each time by an even greater majority. And with good cause. She has been a pioneer in the fields of education, consumer protection, civil rights, mass transportation, and urban problems. Her sponsorship and service on the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is a monument to her personal conviction that government can be used in a positive and progressive way but only so long as State and local governments are strengthened to meet the needs of the people and cooperation among all levels of government is increased to eliminate needless waste and duplication and to improve program effectiveness. Her efforts in this regard were previously rewarded when she received the "Watchdog of the Treasury" award.

I have had the distinct pleasure of serving with FLO DWYER on the Banking and Currency Committee and the Special Subcommittee on Housing. Over the years I have grown to respect her nonsense approach to proposed legislation which must pass her two critical tests: "Is it necessary?" and "Will it work?" This same spirit and dedication has also earned her the respect of her colleagues on the Government Operations Committee on which she is the ranking minority member.

In the presentation of the award, it was noted that FLO DWYER has always responded to the needs of the Jewish community in her district. But, what also pleased the Jewish people of Plainfield is the fact that she has always responded with equal vigor to all groups in the community. And in times of stress, when a humanitarian cause is to be championed, Congresswoman DWYER can be counted on to be a leader. Her remarks to the Plainfield Area Committee following the receipt of the Eleanor Roosevelt Humanities Award attest to this fact.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us have profited by having FLORENCE DWYER as a Member of Congress. I know others join me in extending our heartfelt congratulations. And I know, too, that all will enjoy reading her remarks to the Plainfield Area Committee which I now include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

TEXT OF REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE FLORENCE P. DWYER FOLLOWING RECEIPT OF THE ELEANOR ROOSEVELT HUMANITIES AWARD "FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO HUMANITY AND FRIENDSHIP FOR ISRAEL IN THE SPIRIT OF ELEANOR ROOSEVELT," PRESENTED BY THE PLAINFIELD AREA COMMITTEE, BONDS FOR ISRAEL, AT TEMPLE SHOLOM, PLAINFIELD, N.J., SUNDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1967

Mr. Chairman, General Horev, distinguished guests, and friends. This is a very proud moment for me, as I know you can understand. I can conceive of no other award—past or future—which means or could mean more to me than this one. I shall not bore you with protestations of humility; I shall only say how deeply grateful I am. I shall never forget this evening.

There are two things, especially, which make this award so meaningful to me: first, it is a part of one of the most noble and selfless causes I know—the effort to strengthen a tiny country and its people who have taught the world great lessons in courage and humanity: and, second, it symbolizes the spirit of a great and gallant woman—the first woman of the world during her lifetime—who exemplifies the very same qualities of humanity and courage, qualities which seem so often to be in such short supply.

Israel and Eleanor Roosevelt have always seemed to go together. The one and only occasion on which I was privileged to meet Mrs. Roosevelt personally was here in Plainfield at the very first Bonds for Israel dinner to which I was invited just eleven years ago following my election to the Congress. The occasion was a memorable one for me, and the memory of Mrs. Roosevelt and of the fundamental purpose of Bonds for Israel have continued to be inspiring as my interest in and concern for the welfare of that tiny bastian of democracy in the Near East has grown and deepened.

There is neither time nor excuse to speak at length this evening, but a few brief observations might be in order and might be of interest.

Eleven years ago, Israel faced a situation remarkably like the continuing crisis which confronts her today. Then, as now, Arab efforts to intimidate their small neighbor, Arab aggression against Israel's borders, Arab insistence that Israel must be eliminated as an independent state, and Arab confidence in the moral support and military weapons of the Soviet Union had been rebuffed decisively by Israel's armed services. And in the aftermath of Israeli victory, a long and tortuous search for settlement was under way.

Then, as now, Israel held firm. Then, as now, Israel demonstrated its readiness to respect the territoral integrity of its neighbors, but insisted on effective guarantees that its own rights and territory must be respected.

History has now come full cycle in little more than ten years. And because there is no hope or promise in forgetting the lessons of history, neither Israel nor Israel's friends can afford to forget that the failure of the 1957 guarantees was partially responsible for what happened last June.

In a very fundamental way, I believe, the Arab-Israeli wars of 1956 and 1957 have revealed the full measure of the challenge aimed at Israel. Both wars occurred as a direct result of Arab hostility and aggression. In turn, Arab hostility was motivated by an unyielding and passionate hatred of all things Israeli, a hatred based on tortured interpretations of history, deliberate distortions of Israeli intentions, and the peculiar concept that the very existence of the State of Israel constituted an act of aggression. And the aggression of the Arab states on both occasions was powered by Soviet incitement and supported by Soviet arms.

For me, there were many notable aspects of the June war which have permanent significance so far as Israel and the Jewish people are concerned. But two such aspects seem to stand out:

First, the immediate and total commitment of the entire Jewish people to the defense of Israel. From the overwhelming response of American Jews in Israel's time of need—probably the greatest single act of mass philanthropy in American history—to the Israeli people's own response to the Arab challenge—which saw more reserves volunteering than had been ordered to mobilize in a nation under total mobilization—the world-wide Jewish communty responded as one people to the attack on the life of the Jewish State. And you were not alone, for much of the non-Jewish world rallied to your side—in spirit, in admiration, and in active support.

Second, in the face of fanatic Arab hostility, of venomous propaganda, and of a long and deliberate campaign of hatred, in the face of threat and provocation, Israel's response in victory has been reasoned and restrained. In the occupied territory, she has substituted justice for injustice; she has met terrorist attacks with carefully limited retaliations; she has held out the promise of peace at a time when military victory might have seemed like an excuse for vengeance.

Nevertheless, the threat to Israel's security not only remains but is intensified. Less than six short months from all but total military defeat, the Arabs—with a cosmic disregard of history—have returned to the offensive. Backed by Soviet weapons in great number and higher quality than before, and stimulated by old hatreds and by the new frustrations of military failure, Egypt's Nasser and other Arab leaders are reviving the old slogans and frankly preparing for another round of aggression.

In a situation like this, I see little point or reason in calling on Israel alone to exercise restraint, to hold back, to avoid moves which might result in renewed warfare. For it is not Israel which desires war. To react to crisis in this way alone would be to place the burden of responsibility and restraint upon the victims of attack. This would seem a stranger way to secure peace.

Peace can best be secured by restraining those whose purpose is war. To the extent that there is any remaining possibility of achieving military balance in the Near East, therefore, further arms shipments to the Arabs should be effectively halted. This should be the aim of those who seek peace. Peace cannot be a product of one-sided Arab superiority. Peace cannot be purchased at the price of retreat from reason and principle. Peace cannot be secured by backing down in the face of threats and impossible demands. If, however, the balance of power could be restored and the Great Powers could be persuaded to withdraw from the area, if the Arab States could be persuaded to negotiate directly with Israel, then there might be a chance for a workable settlement, a lasting peace and, ultimately, the cooperative development of the great potential of the Eastern Mediterranean—the only objective that makes sense in human terms.

While there is still time, therefore, I would urge our own government to mobilize free-world pressure in the interest of preventing aggression.

I can think of no better or more appropriate way to close these brief remarks than by repeating a story with which a distinguished Jewish writer closed his own report of the birth of the State of Israel.

It is the story of how the Lord got thor-

oughly fed up with mankind and decided to arrange for a second flood. But this time it was to be a thorough job, with 30 fathoms of water everywhere, and there would be no Ark and no Dove.

The Lord dispatched the Archangel Gabriel to make this decision known to all concerned. When Gabriel had delivered his message to the leader of the Moslems, all Moslems turned toward Mecca and began praying for a comfortable corner in Paradise, with plenty of wine and women.

Gabriel next went on to the leader of the Christians and the Christians all over the earth fell to their knees and prayed to be forgiven their sins at the Last Judgment.

Finally, the Archangel broke the news to the leader of the Jewish community, who began to scratch his beard and gave a great sigh.

"Lord," he said, "what a difficult life it will be under 30 fathoms of water."

What more can be said of a great people's staunchness in the face of adversity, their refusal to retreat from impending disaster, their relentless struggle for survival, and their steadfast faith in ultimate victory?

This is what Eleanor Roosevelt always stood for. This is what Bonds for Israel really means. And this is why I thank you for the great honor you have given me.

FORD MOTOR CO. PRESIDENT ENDORSES THE NEGATIVE INCOME TAX

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a steady growth in the level of discussion of the concept referred to as the negative income tax.

I am happy to note that one of the leading industrialists in the United States, Mr. Arjay Miller, president of the Ford Motor Co., has added his thoughts to this question.

He did so on Thursday, November 30, 1967, before a meeting of the National Industrial Conference Board in New York City.

In his excellent speech, Mr. Miller endorsed the negative income tax concept and advocated its thorough study and testing by the Federal Government. He expressed the concern that I am sure every Member of the Congress shares—"that of all the social problems demanding attention today, the most basic is the elimination of poverty in this country."

As a pragmatic manager of one of the major companies in this country, Mr. Miller concluded that the possibilities offered by the negative income tax represent a way to achieve "a 'total approach' that would reach all of the poor and not just certain segments."

The concept of the negative income tax has been greatly misunderstood, unfortunately, and I believe it took great courage for Mr. MILLER to state his position. He did not have to do so and, thus, expose himself to the criticism that doubtless will ensue. The fact that he did represents a very deep concern for our poor people and the recognition that their economic betterment is in the best interests of this country.

As a proponent of the negative income tax, I welcome Mr. Miller's contribution to the continuing dialog on this issue. I commend him for his forthrightness in approaching the plight of the poor.

Mr. Speaker, I herewith insert in the RECORD the major portion of Mr. Miller's speech:

HUMAN VALUES IN THE COMPUTER AGE

(Following is an excerpt from remarks by Arjay Miller, president, Ford Motor Company, at a meeting of the National Industrial Conference Board, Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York, New York, Thursday, November 30, 1967.)

I am convinced that of all the social problems demanding attention today, the most basic is the elimination of poverty in this country. It is from poverty that many other social ills spring, and any successful effort to eliminate or greatly reduce this malignant growth could bring about dramatic improvement in the general health of our society.

The poverty problem is gigantic, by any measure, and it will not yield without enormous effort on our part. Although about 7½ million people are now covered by some form of welfare assistance, the government estimates that 30 million people do not have incomes sufficient to provide an adequate living standard. That's nearly one-sixth of our total population.

From all reports, the present welfare and manpower programs are making unsatisfactory progress—they are failing to reach many of those who need help most, and they have not sufficiently improved the welfare of others. Some of the poor now receive help from two or more programs, while others in desperate need receive nothing at all. It is increasingly evident that many of our welfare programs are inefficient and wasteful, offering no hope of breaking the poverty cycle.

I believe strongly that it is now time for us to take a "total approach" that would reach all of the poor and not just certain segments. What I have in mind would include both direct income assistance to those in need and measures to increase employment of the disadvantaged.

A satisfactory plan of income assistance should have these three essential provisions:

First, it would preserve incentives to those able to work to get jobs and to increase their earnings as rapidly as possible;

Second, I would be efficient in the sense of getting money only to those in need, without favoring some and ignoring others, and

Third, it would be relatively simple to administer.

In my opinion, the proposal that meets these requirements best is one called the "negative income tax." Under this plan, a family with zero income would receive a basic allowance related to the size and composition of the family unit. When a member of a family began to earn income, the basic allowance would automatically be reduced by an offsetting tax, but not by a corresponding amount.

Thus a family with a member at work would always be better off than a family without anyone at work, in contrast to present situations where every dollar increase in earned income is entirely offset by withdrawal of a dollar in welfare payments. Because the family's total income would always go up, there would always be an incentive to work and to increase earnings. As the family moved up the income scale, of course, it would switch from receiving negative income tax payments to *paying* income taxes in the normal manner.

The negative income tax is worthy of thorough study and testing by the Federal government to ascertain, for example, what combinations of basic allowances and offsetting taxes on earned income might be most workable and most acceptable to society at large.

Since this system would embrace all persons in need of help, it could replace a number of existing public assistance programs. Thus the net cost would be less than the gross cost of the assistance payments under this program. States and localities, however, would be free to continue portions of existing programs in order to compensate for unusually high living costs in certain areas or to meet other special needs.

Let me repeat that adoption of a negative income tax plan should be only one part of a total program to reduce dependency. The basic long-run approach to helping disadvantaged people who are able to work must, of course, be to improve their capability for work and to increase job opportunities. This requires, first, education and training to overcome lack of qualifications; second, incentives for trainees to improve their qualifications for employment and advancement and, third, reduction of other barriers to employment and advancement.

As we all know, lack of qualifications is not the only barrier to the disadvantaged who seek employment. Fortunately, the social and psychological barriers of prejudice and unfamiliarity are being overcome. But more rapid progress is needed. Employment tests, for example, should be re-examined to make sure they measure genuine employment potential and not merely cultural background. Tight limitations on entry into certain occupations should be eliminated.

If we are to plan effectively, we need to know a great deal more about the circumstances and disabilities of the poor and about the kinds of incentives and opportunities we must make available to them if they are to join the ranks of the self-sufficient. A systems analysis approach could give us a much better picture of these and other major factors, such as basic job requirements and the ability of these groups to respond to various methods of training. Until we see the problem in its totality and understand its many ramifications and its many sub-problems, we cannot expect more than piecemeal efforts and piecemeal results.

I have talked about the problem of poverty at some length because I believe strongly that if we can eliminate poverty from our society, we will have relieved many other problems growing from it. And we can approach with more skill and more confidence the other social ills that stand in the way of our aspirations for a better life.

For the first time in all recorded history, we have a sound and practical basis for optimism about man's future. This might seem paradoxical at a time when the world appears to be in terrible shape, what with war, riots, increasing crime and the rise of a host of new problems added to the old.

But the fact is that we increasingly recognize the need for a change in our attitudes and in our old ways of doing things. The riots in Watts, in Newark and in Detroit have shocked us into the realization that we cannot afford to daily on the road to social progress. We know that we must dare to experiment, to innovate socially and to take big steps.

We now have the power, if we can but learn to use it, to break the mold of social apathy, of resignation to age-old human ills, of continued tolerance of the wide cleavage between our aspirations and reality. We have skills and resources, human and mechanical, to achieve more than we can imagine. We must not fail to use them effectively.

We are only at the beginning of what could represent a quantum jump not only in man's relationship to his environment but in man's relationship to man. We have nothing to fear from technology. The real

problem lies in our own uncertain grasp of the tremendous God-given powers within us.

If we can summon the will and the intelligence to use boldly and humanely the promising new tools in our possession, ours will be remembered not as the Computer Age or the Space Age or the Cybernetics Age—but as the Age of Man.

ROADS VERSUS CONDORS ON THE SIERRA MADRE RIDGE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I brought to my colleagues' attention two important statements on the San Rafael Wilderness issue: an editorial from the New York Times of December 1 and a position paper published by the Citizens Committee for the San Rafael Wilderness of Santa Barbara, Calif. Taken together, these statements summarize the feelings of wilderness conservationists on the San Rafael Wilderness bill—S. 889. Conservationists hope to see this bill, scheduled for conference consideration tomorrow, go to the President for signature this year. However, they have asked the Congress to make improvements in the draft bill provided the Congress by the Forest Service, and I shall urge my fellow conferees to agree to an amendment of this bill which provides for these improvements.

I would like to document in fuller detail today the role which private citizens have played in protecting the sensitive values of the San Rafael area from developments planned by the Forest Service. My purpose in doing is not to criticize the U.S. Forest Service, which is one of the most efficient and dedicated arms of the executive branch of this Government. My purpose is to demonstrate that, in this instance, the special, fragile values of the Sierra Madre Ridge area were not fully considered by Forest Service planners until expressions of concern from responsible local citizen conservation leaders caused them to reconsider these plans. The planners' standard package of national forest development projects—high-standard access roads, major campgrounds, ski resort developments, extensive artificial fuel breaks, and so forth—was to be pumped into the Sierra Madre Ridge country to the detriment of the endangered California condor and other biological and archeological values.

The Service has been slowed in this ill-conceived ridgetop development plan by conscientious local citizens, backed by national conservation groups, who foresaw the threat this standard development package would pose to the condors, the ancient Indian village sites with their pictographs and other artifacts, and the unique plant and animal associations of the ridgetop potreros.

Members will note that I said "slowed" the Forest Service, not "stopped" it from proceeding with developments outlined in its long-range "Multiple-Use Management Plan."

I said "slowed" because today I received word from conservationists in Santa Barbara that the Forest Service appears to be about to relocate and upgrade a stretch of Sierra Madre Ridge road which it has promised committees of Congress it would not open to the public. Such a closure was promised in order to protect the California condor and reduce the wildfire threat in this area.

Aerial photographs airmailed to me this past weekend—taken within the last week—clearly show the eroding cuts and fills of a new ridgetop road running from Miranda Pine Mountain to McPherson Peak on the very edge of the proposed San Rafael Wilderness. Observers on the ground report that the ridge road from the McPherson Peak lookout tower eastward toward Montgomery Potrero appears to be slated for the same kind of relocation and upgrading as is in evidence now west of McPherson Peak. Survey stakes for this road construction project are in place along the Sierra Madre ridge now.

Members whose districts include lands administered by the U.S. Forest Service know how difficult it becomes for this agency to keep closed to public vehicular use new, upgraded roads built in the national forests. Built or improved originally to expedite timber harvest or firefighting with bulldozers and pumper trucks, these two-lane gravel roads soon become recognized locally as ideal also for sportsman access by car, for Sunday afternoon scenic drives, and even for shortcuts for commercial traffic. The result can be the capitulation of the Forest Service to local pressure to open its "administrative truck trails" to the motoring public. When the Forest Service completes its Sierra Madre road construction, will we see this chain of events take place, which experts predict could have a disastrous effect on the California condor?

While designation by Congress of a 145,000-acre San Rafael Wilderness as proposed by conservationists will not, in and of itself, guarantee the survival of the condor or even rule out the completion of a high-standard Sierra Madre Ridge road if the Forest Service insists upon completing this project, it will protect from development the maximum possible acreage of natural condor habitat within the wilderness unit, with the area's boundaries being circumscribed on almost all sides by roads.

I am hopeful that the members of the House-Senate Conference which meets tomorrow on S. 889 will agree to the inclusion within the San Rafael Wilderness Area of all of the natural wildlands which now qualify for inclusion and, in addition, will insist, in their report on the bill, that the Forest Service refrain from converting the entire Sierra Madre Ridge road from "an adequate fire protection route" into a scenic drive suitable for use by private automobiles.

Conservationists in the region are looking to the Congress to insist that the rights of a minority—the last 50 California condors—are thus protected, and they wish that something could be done to stop planned Forest Service construction on a neighboring ridge, as well, between Mt. Pinos and Mt. Able, where the demand for roads, parking lots, and commercial developments associated with a ski resort have taken precedence over the protection of the natural ecological values of the site including, again, the condor flyway.

Here is the recent testimony of the Chief of the Forest Service—on April 11, 1967, before the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—on the subject of the development and use of the Sierra Madre Ridge road:

> Now, the road will be further improved but we have it closed to public use for the protection of the condor. If the study shows that the road needs to be closed for the protection of the condor it will remain closed. We are just as much interested in the protection of the condor as anyone else.

And here is the record of the efforts of citizen conservationists, over the past few years, which to date have kept the ridge free of public vehicular traffic and which have led to the generation of widespread support for the designation of a San Rafael Wilderness Area of the largest possible size:

Our story begins with quotations from the Forest Service's 15-year plan for the area, the "Multiple Use Management Plan for the Cuyama District, Los Padres National Forest." This plan was approved by the forest supervisor on April 27, 1962. It describes the agency's plans for the San Rafael Primitive Area and the Sierra Madre Ridge in this way:

> The eastern half of the District (including the Sierra Madre Ridge) does not have the magnitude of fire potential that exists elsewhere on the Forest, and lack of public access routes in the western portion has contributed to a low fire occurence. This has resulted in a reduction of protection facilities during the past 10 years. The 1960 fire replanning study indicates the need for . . . some new facilities to meet the Forest protection responsibilities under the *expanded multiple use program.*
>
> Protection of the (Saulsbury) unit (an area extending from the Sierra Madre Road down the north slope facing Cuyama Valley) from fire is paramount in maintaining management objectives. Recent fire occurrence is light but history indicates a number of major fires, the result of an upward spread from the lower zone. *Maintaining the unit* on essentially a trail system *with a minimum of roads* to meet public needs *will moderate risk* to some extent. A skeleton preattack system has been completed, but additional fire lanes and helispots are necessary to make the system adequate to meet future needs. In addition, *a fuel break program at the base and crest* (in effect to the *north* of the Sierra Madre Road) *will materially aid in confining any starts.*
>
> Direct overnight use of the Saulsbury unit by concentrating campground development to the more aesthetic sites on the crest of the Sierra Madre...
>
> *Public access to the Sierra Madre Road* along the north boundary of the unit will significantly increase recreational use. . . . Managing the interior portion of the unit for public use on a trail system basis will minimize fire risk...
>
> Subsequent to the fire closure, fire history (on the Sierra Madre Ridge) has been light.
>
> *With planned vehicular public access on the Sierra Madre* a significant increase in recreational use can be anticipated in the Sisquoc (Canyon Bottom) Unit.
>
> *The opening of the Sierra Madre road to*

public travel should significantly increase the use of the (San Rafael Primitive Area) which currently fluctuates between 500 and 1800 man days. The 1960 NFRS (National Forest Recreation Survey) . . . indicates *a potential winter sports area on Big Pine Mountain. . . .* The Big Pine Road (9N11) crosses Big Pine Mountain within the wild area and a boundary adjustment is currently under study.

The (San Rafael) unit has a large fire potential. . . . Initial attack is dependent on the *"Forest Air Arm"* and the 1960 fire replanning proposes a helitack crew adjacent to the unit.

The Condor Sanctuary Zone is composed of the Fall Canyon Condor Sanctuary which is closed to entry under the Authority of Regulation T–91 to preserve the vanishing species. It is within the San Rafael Wild Area, and is bordered by the Sisquoc River Unit at the base and extends up the north slope of the San Rafael Mountains within the San Rafael Unit. Terrain is extremely steep, with a number of cliffs forming the walls of Fall Canyon. Vegetation is dense chaparral with some riparian vegetation along the Fall Canyon creek bed. A few Condors remain in the area and are periodically seen by travelers and lookouts. *It is essential that Condors are not disturbed in order to survive.*

I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention at this point the fact that several condors were seen resting in the conservationists' proposed additions within Area F as recently as October of this year. These observations pointed up the fact that the Sierra Madre Ridge remains today an important condor flyway.

These "multiple use plans" of the Forest Service were made public on February 24, 1963, when the Los Padres National Forest's new supervisor, William H. Hansen, released the story of the Services Sierra Madre Ridge roadbuilding plans to the Santa Barbara News-Press. Citizen reaction to this announcement was not long in coming, as this March 3, 1964, report in the New York Times indicates:

FATE OF CONDORS DEBATED ON COAST—ROAD WOULD OPEN UP HAVEN OF NEARLY EXTINCT VULTURE

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF., March 2.—One of the last known refuges of the nearly extinct California condor, one of the world's largest birds, was the focus of controversy at a Federal hearing here last week.

Conservationists and sportsmen expressed opposing views as the United States Forest Service detailed plans for development of the San Rafael Primitive Area, in the Los Padres National Forest, just north of here.

The forest service is proposing to improve a 50-mile fire road bordering the primitive area, developing it into a thoroughfare for passenger cars.

The plan is supported by spokesmen for sportsmen's organizations, who say that the area is now accessible only to a privileged few.

The proposal is opposed by spokesmen for conservation groups, including the Sierra Clubs and the Audubon Society.

A major point of contention is what the added traffic through the preserve might do to the unofficially designated "Condor Sanctuary."

The California condor—Gymnogyps californianus—is a member of the vulture family with a wing spread of about 10 feet. This is about the same as that of its relative, the Andean condor, and is much broader than that of the golden eagle, the next largest North American bird.

There are only a few dozen California condors known to exist. The females are thought to lay an egg only once every two years, and attrition is severe.

Slight disturbances frighten the birds away from incubating eggs, thus leaving the unborn young to die.

The condors eat only dead animals. The growth of cities has eliminated much wildlife, and once-plentiful dead sheep have been diminished by the trend to cattle raising.

The remaining condors have established a transient "sanctuary" in the San Rafael Mountains, 25 miles north of Santa Barbara, supposedly because the updrafts common there help their aerial reconnaissance for food.

ONE HUNDRED ATTEND HEARING

They have a nesting area 50 miles eastward in the Sespi area of Ventura County. Their only other known haunt is another "sanctuary" in Tulare County, 200 miles north.

An overflow crowd of more than 100 attended the hearing Thursday in a small chamber at the Santa Barbara Municipal Recreation Center.

William Hansen, supervisor of the 2 million-acre Los Padres National Forest, which encompasses the primitive area, said development of the fire road would both improve fire protection and open up the area to public use.

Fred Eissler, a local high school teacher, who is conservation chairman of the Sierra Clubs, cited the danger of disturbing the condors with a road only a few miles from their sanctuary. He urged a Federal study of the area's "optimum recreational capacity."

Kenneth Millar, a mystery writer who is an officer of the local Audubon Society, said the condors' nesting area in Ventura County was also threatened by dam building.

The Santa Barbara Audubon Society's opposition to the Sierra Madre public road was expressed by society President T. Nelson Metcalf to Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman in this letter of March 9, 1964:

SANTA BARBARA AUDUBON SOCIETY,
Santa Barbara, Calif., March 9, 1964

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I trust you are aware of the plans of the Forest Service for the construction of a through road along the Sierra Madre Ridge, Los Padres National Forest, Santa Barbara County, California.

Although the Sierra Club, the Santa Barbara Audubon Society and the Santa Barbara Trails Advisory Committee have been in constant contact with Messrs. Connaughton and Hansen of the Forest Service, it is our conviction that there is a matter of national interest involved which transcends any regional aspects of the situation.

The aspects which are of the widest concern relate particularly to the conservation of the California condor and the preservation of primitive wilderness area. You know that the condor's protected ranges and nesting areas are now limited to the Sespe and Sisquoc areas and that the preservation of this species is wholly dependent upon their situation in the midst of true wilderness. The extinction of this magnificent bird scarcely one hundred years after the intensive settlement of this area, would be an unnatural and tragic occurrence reflecting another irreparable loss to the nation's heritage. The road will enable the unrestricted introduction of great numbers of people into this primitive area and the condor will be pushed further into oblivion.

You also know that the true wilderness acreage in the nation has been consistently reduced, particularly in the last 25 years, due to increased pressure for types of recreation other than the enjoyment of primitive wilderness. The road will enable the further automobile access into areas hitherto open only to men with packs on their backs. As Dr. Keith Arnold has shown it is increasingly true that people cause more forest fires than natural causes. It has also been shown that fire is most completely prevented by keeping numbers of people out of the woods. The existing primitive fire road in the area has served well for many years. Surveys and reports by public and private authorities have demonstrated clearly that ready automobile access rapidly and permanently destroys the primitive character of wilderness. In fact, by definition, wilderness requires for its own protection, a buffer zone of depth of a one-day's hike.

The local and national organizations and the legion of private citizens who have supported a moratorium on the completion of this through road, urge you to act now to require that a thorough study be made by competent authorities before any action is initiated by the Forest Service.

Our frequent contacts with your Foresters have indicated that the traditional custom of a hearing under legal ground-rules is not their practice. A public meeting was held here on February 27, 1964, at which there was no opportunity for detailed discussion, only an opportunity to present our different views from the rostrum. We urge that you arrange a public hearing to make possible careful discussion of the issues and thorough development of the facts.

We believe that this matter requires your personal attention and submit that the public interest relating to conservation has not been served in the proceedings to date.

Very truly yours,

T. NELSON METCALF,
President.

On April 19, 1964, the Santa Barbara News-Press reprinted the article, "A Death Road for the Condor," from Sports Illustrated magazine, which dealt specifically with this Sierra Madre Road project:

A DEATH ROAD FOR THE CONDOR

(By Ross Macdonald)

We ate lunch on top of Big Pine. It was a brilliantly clear day and from this elevation, 6,800 feet, we could look down over the Coast Range, across the Santa Barbara Channel, and see all of the Channel Islands. In the other direction, inland, the Mount Wilson group stood under December snow. Farther north loomed the white peaks of Yosemite.

We took quick bites of our sandwiches and scanned the nearer horizons with our binoculars. This was condor country. At the foot of Big Pine lies the San Rafael Primitive Area, one of our few remaining wildernesses, and at its northern edge is the Sisquoc Condor Sanctuary. The Sierra Madre Ridge above the sanctuary is a major condor flyway, and has been since prehistoric times. But today there was not a condor in the sky.

The Forest Supervisor and his Assistant looked at us over their lunches with I-told-you-so expressions.

"There are practically no condors in the area anymore," said the Supervisor.

"Our observers see them all the time," I said.

The Supervisor's Assistant said firmly: "Our observers practically never see one."

The Supervisor and his Assistant didn't seem to want to see any condors, I thought. Their reluctance would have to do with the project they were pushing at the moment: the development of a through road along the Sierra Madre Ridge. They had brought us conservationists and bird watchers along on the present expedition in an effort to persuade us that the building of the Sierra Madre road and the consequent opening of the backcountry to cars and motorcycles would damage neither the wilderness nor the condors, if any.

The Supervisor rose athletically from his rock, a handsome man, extraordinarily tall, with clipped iron-gray hair and a quick, boyish smile. His assistant was shorter and broader, but very alert-looking. They reminded me of a brigadier general and his aide, shortly after the general has decided to run for public office.

"If you men have finished eating," the Supervisor said, "we can be on our way."

"But don't let us rush you," said the Assistant Supervisor.

They were important people who liked to be liked. The Supervisor managed two million acres of national forest, including nearly half of Santa Barbara county. If he wanted to build a road along the edge of his wilderness and open it up to Los Angeles Sunday traffic, he was going to be hard to stop. And he definitely wanted to build it. He and his rangers were openly advocating the road, in chambers of commerce and service clubs and rifle clubs.

The Forest Service, once noted for its single-minded idealism, has developed in recent years an interest in the art of politics and the manipulation of public opinion. The Supervisor's Assistant had confided to me on the way up to Big Pine that knowledge of human beings was his most valuable asset as a career forester. Soon, if he handled people properly, he would have a forest of his own.

Now, as we drove down from Big Pine, we argued about the road.

"We need it for fire fighting," he said.

"You've got a primitive fire road along the ridge, which has always been adequate. You haven't had a fire there in nearly 40 years."

"Are you an expert on fire fighting?"

"No, but I can read, and I know what your own experts are saying. Fire fighting is taking more and more to the air, using borate bombers and, eventually, missiles. Ask your missile research division. Or ask Keith Arnold, your forest protection research director, what happens to the fire risk when you let increasing numbers of people into a forest area."

He admitted that the risk rose. "But we have no right to keep the people out. The road will be built with public money, and that makes it public property."

"The condors and the wilderness are public property, too. They belong to the whole country."

"But this road," he said with esthetic fervor, "would make a beautiful scenic drive. We could have picnic grounds along it, too."

"You can't have a scenic drive and a wilderness area within five miles of each other. You'd be putting the Sisquoc Sanctuary, the heart of the wilderness, within two hours' hiking time of an automobile road, half an hour by motorcycle. You'll ruin your wilderness and drive away your condors."

"The condors hardly use the Sisquoc anymore."

"So you keep saying. Our people see them there constantly. It's a roosting area and a former nesting site that the birds can use again if anything happens to their alternate sites. The Falls of the Sisquoc is still their best watering place."

The Assistant Supervisor was not impressed. "So what? Who says the road will bother them?"

"All the experts say so. The condors are allergic to road building and automobiles and people in any great numbers."

"Five or six or seven miles away?"

"Yes. And remember they don't just sit on the Sisquoc. The Sierra Madre Ridge is their flyway. This whole back-country is their range."

I waved my arm rather emotionally out the car window. We were on the Buckhorn Road, headed north toward the Sierra Madre Ridge. The canyons and ridges of the wilderness lay around us like a violent dark green sea quick-frozen. It had been frozen in time. Except for the road we were on, a fire road normally closed to automobiles, nothing had changed here in 2,000 years.

The condor had been flying here longer than that, I thought. He had been catching the updrafts along these ridges since the Pleistocene Age. He was ancient. He was great, the greatest flying land bird in North America. His wingspan often exceeded nine feet. He could fly up to 50 miles an hour, scarcely moving his wings, with or against the wind, all day if necessary. Aeronautical engineers studied his design. Naturalists came from all over the world to catch a glimpse of him.

He was harmless and useful. He cleared the rangeland of dead animals. With only about 50 of him left, there are no lack of food. But he was running out of space to nest and roost. His range, which had once extended from ocean to ocean and from the Columbia River south to Mexico, had shrunk now to this small part of California.

We were only a few miles from his last retreats on the Sisquoc and the Sespe. We still hadn't seen him. I was getting anxious.

The Buckhorn Road is primitive and seldom used, even by Forest Service automobiles. From time to time our party had to stop and push fallen boulders out of the way of our cars. They rumbled down into the canyon.

Following the dust smoke of one such boulder, I caught sight of a little black thing half a mile or more down the precipitous slope. The little thing seemed to be crawling up over the secondary ridges, like a black beetle with extended wings. Then I saw that he was crawling above the ground, in midair, rising in air and growing steadily and incredibly larger.

I didn't speak. I didn't even raise my binoculars. Poised and outspread on the updraft, emblem and living totem of wilderness men and flyers, he rose up the slope toward me. Now I could see the clean white epaulets on his black shoulders and make out with my naked eye the deep orange color of his bald head. At his wingtips the great black primary feathers curved up individually in the wind. He balanced in the air a hundred yards away from where we stood, regarding us with his glistening black eye. Then he wheeled, the undersides of his wings glinting white in the sun, and slid away.

I think we all saw him, except the Supervisor and possibly the Supervisor's Assistant, who didn't say.

That was back in December. On February 27 the Forest Service held a public meeting in Santa Barbara. It was presided over by the Regional Forester, an elderly gentleman who looked like a major general but who described himself as a bureaucrat.

He watched with a calm, cold eye while the Forest Service's road project was severely criticized by conservationists, including me and my wife, and by a number of experts in the fields of botany, ornithology and land use.

One ardent proponent of the road suggested that condor lovers might keep a few stuffed condors around town that they could love. This one made even the Regional Forester look uncomfortable. But at the end of the meeting he stated that there were extremists on both sides and that his decision would fall between the two extremes. Which seemed to imply that he would decide to ruin the wilderness just a little, for the present, and permit the condor to survive for a few more years, perhaps.

The Supervisor's Assistant spoke to me on the way out of the meeting. "Another day," he said cheerfully.

On March 21 the Regional Forester announced that he would defer his decision on building the road until its effect on the survival of the condor had been studied further.

A photospread in the June 12, 1964, Santa Barbara News-Press, headlined "Disputed Wilderness Road" contained these captions:

Construction scars on mountainside show course of new Sierra Madre Ridge Road bordering wilderness region of Los Padres National Forest in Santa Barbara county. Public protests caused U.S. Forest Service to halt road-building pending study of wilderness, wildlife, and archeological sites in area. Road penetrates habitat of condor. Conservationist groups have protested road improvement, claiming existing road provides adequate fire protection route. Forest Service says greater fire-protection and public use is needed.

Dotted survey line of proposed new construction parallels unimproved section of disputed road between McPherson Peak and Bates Canyon. Survey work caused rumor that road was being built despite announced moratorium.

New portion of remote Sierra Madre Ridge road cost $12,000 a mile to build. U.S. Forest Service terms road single-lane, primarily for fire protection. Conservationists claim road is unnecessary and urge that funds be spent on heavily-used recreation areas at Figueroa Mountain, Davey Brown and upper Santa Ynez Valley.

Forest Service sign on locked gate at east end of Sierra Madre Ridge fire road proclaims that road is for official use only. But west end of road is open.

Absence of signs or gate at west end of disputed section of road permits vehicles to pass. County supervisors have asked that road be restored to original status, for fire protection only. Forest Service officials have said that fire roads were never built for public motorized use.

Threats to Los Padres National Forest are overcrowding of San Rafael wilderness area, wanton shooting of the rare California condor and vandalism of Indian pictographs such as the one shown, conservationists say.

On June 19, 1964, the distinguished critic-at-large of the New York Times, Brooks Atkinson, devoted his entire column to the Sierra Madre road threat to the condors:

THE VANISHING CALIFORNIA CONDOR IS TODAY MORE PREYED UPON THAN PREYING

(By Brooks Atkinson)

Ever since the Ice Age, the California condor has been patrolling America, but it may not patrol much longer. The condor population has shrunk to 40 or 50.

What can be said to dramatize the necessity of preserving them? Most people don't care. At a hearing in Santa Barbara in February to discuss a scenic highway that will impinge on the privacy of condors, one representative of modern America opted for progress: People enraptured with condors, he said, could shoot them, stuff them and take them home to look at as much as they wanted while the rest of the population enjoyed a scenic road.

If Americans do not regard the continuity of life as sacred but, on the contrary, regard a shrill, superficial, transient present as good enough for anyone, they will not be much concerned about the California condor, which is, in fact, a giant vulture with unlovely feeding habits. What can be said to disturb the self-satisfaction of such people? I sought the advice of Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

He replied that the genes of the California condor are unique and invaluable, because they have been passed on from generation to generation ever since the Pleistocene Age. At the time glaciers were carving out the land and forming moraines and kames, the California condor was planing the skies. In those days, men wore skins and hunted with stone-

tipped spears and were in the minority of living creatures. They were not able then to blast a scenic highway across the ridge of the Sierra Madre, which is the condor flyway.

The biologists of the Smithsonian Institution are trying, before it is too late, to safeguard natural areas with associated plant and wild life as what might be called living museums for scientific research. Although the Smithsonian is concerned with the whole spectrum of nature, the condor is a living museum. In 20th-century California, it retains the habits it had hundreds of thousands of years before recorded history. In view of the extent to which its habitat has been crowded, the wonder is that 40 or 50 birds survive.

The condor is an interesting bird apart from its scientific significance. With a wingspread of 9 feet and sometimes more (11 feet 4 inches is one museum specimen), it is the largest land bird in North America. If its body weight is added to its wingspread, some condor patrons argue, it is the largest bird that flies. Condors nest in caves. They lay one egg not oftener than once in two years. The young birds take two years to mature. Condors roost in secluded cliffs near pools where they bathe. They soar on motionless wings on thermal spirals and sail 40 or 50 miles to their feeding areas at heights ranging from a few thousand to 15,000 feet.

Man is their only danger. They make easy targets for gunners, although they have been protected by California law for more than half a century. One condor was shot last month. Most of the shooting may be by gunners who do not know what bird they are killing, but ignorance does not return to life the birds that are brought down out of the sky.

Particularly during the last several months, a lot of able people have been working to save the condor. Ian and Eben McMillan, ranchers of Shandon, Calif., who have watched condors all their lives, are completing the field work for a study that the Audubon Society will publish next autumn. Dick Smith and Robert Easton of Santa Barbara have completed the manuscript of an excellent book, "California Condor: Vanishing America," which will be published by McNally & Loftin Oct. 20. Some of the members of the Santa Barbara bird club, which is one of the keenest in America, propose to patrol the condor area, not only to spot gunners, but also to explain to other people the necessity for keeping away from the nesting, roosting and bathing sites. Ken Millar, who writes mystery stories under the name of Ross Macdonald, is one of several people who hope to get the condor accepted as a national monument.

The Forest Service argues that the proposed scenic highway will not pass close enough to the condor refuge to disturb the birds. But the normal spread of civilization has already disturbed them so much that the condor population is precariously small. Crowded on all sides, they may be living on borrowed time.

And the Santa Barbara News-Press thanked Mr. Atkinson and agreed with him in its editorial column of June 23, 1964:

PLEA TO SAVE "LIVING MUSEUM"

Brooks Atkinson, distinguished columnist of The New York Times, has made a strong plea for the preservation of a "living museum" in Santa Barbara's back country.

In a column printed in the News-Press last week, he pointed to the patrol of the great California condor in the Sisquoc area and the threats posed to their sanctuary and flyways. He reminded us that this huge survivor of the Ice Age, now numbering no more than 40 or 50, is faced with extinction as a result of public unconcern and a forest policy that places condor survival in something less than first priority. He noted the proposed Sierra Madre scenic highway, plans for which are in abeyance pending studies of its wildlife and archeological impact, as an instrument which could well deliver the condor its coup de grace.

Mr. Atkinson has taken the time to visit Santa Barbara's wilderness, to acquaint himself with the nature, the habitat and the plight of the condor, to assess the pleas of those who would conserve for future generations a priceless living museum. He is well aware of the running contest between the forest road-builders and the lovers of deep wilderness sanctuaries. The condor in these regions, as a local Audubon leader has stated, "incarnates the wilderness; if we lose one we shall lose the other, and if we lose both we shall be poorer than we realize."

A national spotlight on one of the major conservation challenges of the day is welcome. If Americans, said Atkinson, do not regard the continuity of life as sacred but, on the contrary, regard a shrill, superficial transient present as good enough for anyone, they will not be much concerned about the California condor. . . .

We believe that great numbers of Americans regard the continuity of life as sacred and are at least dimly aware of the inexhaustible riches to be realized from wilderness museums. They must become more alert, however, more adept at preserving these living museums. There are few enough of them left and, like the flyways of the giant condor, beset alike by the indifferent and the abettors of mass public intrusion.

Some historical notes on the use of the Sisquoc Valley by condors were distributed by the Santa Barbara Audubon Society on October 2, 1965, which documented the fact that the Sisquoc Condor Sanctuary was and can again be of great importance to those endangered birds:

NOTES ON THE SISQUOC

Conversation with Alfred Davis, (born about 1905) son of Alonzo Davis who homesteaded near the Manzana School.

"I was born at Sisquoc but we moved up the river and I went to school at the Zaca Canyon School when I was seven. During the school year, we boarded at John Lebieu's place at Zaca Lake. It was nine miles down to the school from there. The Manzana School was closed by then.

"We leased the Wilmann Place from 1920 to 1925. We grazed stock up there. I remember that John Lebieu came over to make wine out of the Wilmann grapes that were left. That's about the time the cattle went wild in the backcountry. We should have shot them and made jerky out of them then. Many of our regular stock for years would go wild when they met up with the old wild ones.

"The country had been burned off in '23 by a fire that burned the Sisquoc and part of the Manzana. I remember that the fish all died from the ashes that came down—made lye in the water.

"The hunters that came up after the burn got into John Lebieu's wine barrels up at the Wilmann place and left the stoppers out. It all went bad. That was after '23.

"About condors—we saw them all around the Manzana and up the Sisquoc. I counted 18 going up from the Sisquoc on the trail above Cottonwood in the '35s when I was working for the U.S. Forest Service. I was going up with horses and a mule and the birds soared all around. There weren't 18 at first but they kept growing in numbers until they were sitting on trees ahead of me and some in the air.

"In the '20s there were birds going in and out of the hole at the sides of the Sisquoc Falls. We went right up there from the river and there were at least 8 birds in and out of the cliff holes while we were there. I made several trips way up there and I can't remember a trip we didn't see condors. The season had a lot to do with that, though. It was spring mostly when we went up. That's nesting time and the falls was where they nested.

"I remember seeing other nesting places. Once when I was up in the Lost Valley Canyon, we saw a bird near the canyon end. This bird came out of a hole in a rock above a big oak tree and dived down on us until we finally got out of there. This bird really meant business. She kept going back up into that hole. We saw condors nesting in holes on Castle Rock all the time we lived there. The birds would be around in the spring pretty steady.

"On my last trip up into Sisquoc Falls about 1927, I saw young birds not yet white and with smaller wings. These young ones were coming out of the holes at Sisquoc."

The Smithsonian Institution expressed its concern over the welfare of the condors in this November 1, 1965, letter to Richard J. Smith from Dr. S. Dillon Ripley:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,
Washington, D.C., November 1, 1965.

Mr. RICHARD J. SMITH
Santa Barbara News-Press,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MR. SMITH: Your concern for the preservation of the California Condor is certainly appreciated here at the Smithsonian Institution. As I stated in a letter to President Johnson last February, I believe that one of the most compelling reasons for preserving species such as the Condor is not one of emotion or sentiment, but rather expediency. The Condor represents, among the warm-blooded vertebrates, birds and mammals, one of the very few remaining natural genetic reservoirs, unchanged since Pleistocene times a million years ago. It should be preserved as a biological resource. In the future scientists may well be put to it to reconstruct genetic combinations which exist today in such pure strains from the past. A whole biological story remains to be told here, waiting for the ever-increasing skills of scientists to be able to interpret. What a catastrophe if the story were to be destroyed before its meaning could be unravelled, the code uninterpreted before it is lost.

I have been assured by The President that every consideration will be given to the Condor and its continued preservation in the studies being conducted by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and the Bureau of Reclamation in cooperation with the California Department of Fish and Game and other conservation agencies and organizations.

I concur with the "Management and Research Plan for the California Condor" of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife (July 1965) which recommends a delay of 2 years for the accumulation of additional information prior to considering authorization of the Topatopa Dam.

From the purely scientific point of view, I feel that the preservation of the California Condor is of utmost importance, and I hope that neither the sentiment of bird lovers nor commercial interests will interfere with the application of appropriate, scientifically based management measures to enhance the continued existence of the species.

Sincerely yours,

S. DILLON RIPLEY,
Secretary.

On June 19, 1967, in testimony before the Public Lands Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Charles F. Luce, Under Secretary of the Interior, was able to make this announcement regarding the use by condors of the Sisquoc Condor Sanctuary:

My final comment relates to the California condor, a majestic bird threatened with extinction, which is found in this area. As brought out this morning the condor area is principally to the south of the San Rafael Wilderness Area. The proposed San Rafael Wilderness would add substantially to the protection of the condor environment now afforded by the relatively small Sisquoc Condor Sanctuary already established by the U.S. Forest Service. This sanctuary has historically been a bathing and watering area; however, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife biologists found only a few days ago that at least one nest in the area had been in active use during the past 2–3 years.

All of the foregoing reinforces my position in favor of the inclusion of the maximum possible acreage within the San Rafael Wilderness Area.

My colleague, the Honorable CHARLES M. TEAGUE, in whose district the San Rafael area is situated, summed up the feelings of all of us who favor a small addition to the Forest Service's San Rafael proposal when he said to the House Interior Committee on June 19:

You are going to hear a proposal, I believe, that (the proposed wilderness area) be increased by another 2,200 acres. As long as the area is being established, it seems to me it might as well be done properly and include all of the alleged advantages, advantages I think exist, to an adequate wilderness area.

Let us do the job properly, as Mr. TEAGUE suggests, and send to the President for signature a San Rafael Wilderness bill which provides wilderness system protection for the important Pine Corral Potrero and Logan Potrero areas recommended by local conservationists as well as the 143,000 acres recommended by the Forest Service.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

WILLIAM McCHESNEY MARTIN LAUNCHES POLITICAL ATTACK AGAINST THE PRESIDENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, William McChesney Martin has hit the campaign trail for the Republican Party.

The Federal Reserve Board Chairman in his traditional arrogant manner used a meeting of the American Bankers Association to describe President Johnson as "irresponsible."

Mr. Martin went on to tell the audience of bankers just how the country ought to be run.

Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly we can expect to see many of the Martin quotes—including his blunt description of the President as "irresponsible"—in Republican campaign literature in the coming months. The Federal Reserve Board Chairman made an open and blatant political speech designed to embarrass the Democratic administration and its President.

As a citizen, William McChesney Martin has every right to comment on the conduct of the country, even to the point of calling a President irresponsible. However, I suggest that this campaign oratory would be more appropriate if Mr. Martin were outside of the Government.

Indeed, this rule is generally followed by all officials in the Federal Government. If they desire to campaign against President Johnson, it is appropriate that they step aside and carry on their attacks as private citizens. I am sure that President Johnson would be happy to free William McChesney Martin for whatever role he wants to play in the 1968 campaign.

Mr. Martin is extremely free and loose with the use of the word "irresponsible." This is the second time in less than a month that he has lashed out against elected officials in this manner. On November 16, he spoke to the American Petroleum Institute in Chicago and described Members of Congress as "irresponsible" for opposing increases in taxes.

Mr. Speaker, with the failures—the massive failures—of the Federal Reserve Board's actions over the past 2 years, it would seem that William McChesney Martin would have more to do than run around the country describing elected officials as "irresponsible." Mr. Martin and his colleagues have gotten monetary affairs in one of the worst messes in the history of this country. It would seem that it was time for Mr. Martin to stay home and try to correct some of his own errors.

Much of the fiscal problem facing the country today stems directly from the misguided policies followed by the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. Speaker, as I have warned the Congress so many times, William McChesney Martin and the present Federal Reserve Board attempt to operate a separate Government and to dictate economic policy to the administration. This is a dangerous situation in which Mr. Martin uses monetary policy to sabotage programs he does not like and to destroy public officials with whom he disagrees.

Mr. Martin should not be called on to establish tax policy or general economic programs of this Nation. We have a President and a Congress elected by the people of the United States to do this job. Mr. Martin has once again overstepped his bounds and I hope that Members of Congress will think long and hard about this latest blatant and uncalled for attack on the President of the United States.

THE GREAT WHITE FLEET—NEW HOPES FOR THE FUTURE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on October 11, 1967, a group of dedicated Americans came to Washington to present a dramatic briefing to several Members of Congress on a subject with which I am sure many of my colleagues are familiar—the concept of the Great White Fleet.

The Great White Fleet proposal would establish a fleet of ships which would sail in continuous service to people around the world, concentrating on hospital care and education. The basic idea is embodied in the highly successful hospital ship *Hope*, which has won the hearts of people in Asia, Latin America, and Africa, in a series of mercy missions sponsored by the People-to-People Foundation.

This "floating Peace Corps" has been formally introduced to the 90th Congress in the form of two pieces of legislation. Representative SEYMOUR HALPERN introduced H.R. 12509, which would amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide for the establishment of a White Fleet. My House Concurrent Resolution 15 would likewise declare the sense of Congress on the concept. Both of these measures are pending before committees.

When Capt. Frank Manson, USN, initiated the Great White Fleet concept in 1959, I joined Representative WILLIAM H. BATES, of Massachusetts, and a number of others in cosponsoring legislation in the House calling upon the President to establish the Great White Fleet. Principal Senate cosponsors were the present Vice President, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, which has considered this legislation, Mr. BATES not only has done much to promote the idea of a White Fleet, but he also actively helped to bring about assignment of a Navy hospital ship, now known throughout the world as *Hope*, to the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc. Mr. BATES, now the senior Republican member of the Armed Services Committee, is at this moment with the Armed Services Subcommittee visiting Vietnam and American bases in other Far Eastern countries; so he cannot be directly recorded here today as we renew our faith in the Great White Fleet proposal.

I feel that this occasion should not pass, however, without recording the longstanding interest of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] in this concept. He recently reassured me of his continued interest and willingness to assist in efforts to attain the objective we here seek. While the SS *Hope* is operated by a private foundation largely dependent upon contributions from an appreciative public, I know that Mr. BATES believes that this hospital ship has proved the great value of medical aid on a free and friendly basis to countries needing it. Indeed, this Great White Fleet project would assure all types of emergency services for nations desiring them.

However, my purpose today is not to discuss these measures, but rather to review the work of the October conference, which was largely the work of the White

Fleet Foundation and its inspiring founder, Captain Manson. Many excellent points were made during this conference, and I sincerely hope that some Members of Congress will take note of what is being said here today. This project is one that is urgently needed today.

One extremely enlightening statement was made by Dr. Robert Hingson, of Cleveland, Ohio, who is president of the Project "Brother's Brother." Our colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], is one of the driving forces in this particular project, just as she has been a great help in White Fleet work.

The Great White Fleet is not a "disaster plan" although it would have utility in disaster. Its basic purpose, however, is to avert disasters by working in areas before such calamities strike.

Dr. Hingson told us that one-third of the world's population is sick unto death with diseases which could either be cured or entirely eradicated with proper medical treatment. Such treatment, to the limit of its capability, would be provided by the fleet.

The Hingson group spoke to people in various areas, and Dr. Hingson said:

> We talked to them about their problems. We went out under the banner of . . . "Brother's Keeper" (first).

This name was changed when an old African chief pointed out that such a name indicated what it said—and that he thought "Brother's Brother" would be more befitting the work they had done in that particular area. The name was changed and has remained "Brother's Brother" ever since.

The doctor then discussed the first major project—when they went to Liberia to vaccinate the people against smallpox. He noted that while en route, they discovered that they had only 10,000 doses of vaccine for some 1,000,000 people to vaccinate. They could not turn around—and so had to experiment. He discovered that the vaccine could be diluted and still obtain satisfactory vaccinations. With this knowledge and armed with jet gun vaccination devices—which the doctor demonstrated for us—the doctor arrived in Liberia for the vaccination program.

I think that I should use his words to fully describe what he found:

> One hundred and ninety-four men, women, and children suffered under 10,000 blisters of smallpox. Thirty had died since the last doctor had visited this place. Open caskets were stacked under the steps of the houses. They had no covers. Dying patients lay on army cots. Flies and mosquitoes swarmed over this blanket of smallpox blisters.

This scene, Mr. Speaker, existed in a highly industrialized and civilized country only a few years ago.

It took the team only 6 weeks to innoculate 300,000 Liberians against smallpox and other diseases which threatened that nation in epidemic proportion.

Hingson further commented:

> Think about immunizing all the children in the Gaza Strip against polio. We did that. Think about immunizing all the children in the Vatican City in Rome at a time when there was no poliomyelitis vaccine in Europe. We did that.

This story represents only one trip which Dr. Hingson has taken—and with the same results coming on later ventures. And, Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, Mrs. BOLTON, will affirm everything I have said about the work of this great man, Dr. Hingson.

Such work would be performed by the Great White Fleet—and at a greater scale. Dr. Hingson's team is only one unit—we would have many identical units operating out of the fleet. Wherever there was a water access to an area, we could go. And, with a helicopter crew, we could go far inland to treat people not on the water.

The postscript to this story makes the possibilities of the fleet seem more feasible—the doctor said:

> One year after our immunization program in Liberia I returned to the smallpox hospital where Dr. Dibble had prayed for guidance before we began our work. I found two were playing checkers and a third member of the smallpox team was working on a sewing machine. They put their arms around me and said, "Dr. Hingson, there's no smallpox in Liberia. We have had no cases in four months."

And this occurred in a place where, but for the work of this team, we might have been reading of an epidemic which threatened the entire population with extinction only 12 months before.

Another outstanding presentation was delivered by Dr. John H. Proctor, who is employed by Litton Systems, Inc., in Fort Walton Beach, Fla.

Dr. Proctor emphasized the feasibility of the "systems approach" in the fleet concept. He pointed out that approximately 70 percent of the world's population lives within 100 miles of navigable waters. This statistic graphically points out the range of a vessel when we worry about reaching the people.

The need is still further emphasized when we note the breakdown of national wealth, as computed by the Future of World Banks in 1965. This shows that of 135 nations then in existence: 38 were classified as very poor; 33 were classified as poor; 37 were classified as middle income; and 27 were classified rich.

These statistics show that over one-half of the nations of the world are poor or very poor—and they represent areas which would be served by the Great White Fleet.

Feasibility of creating this fleet came into the discussions, Mr. Speaker, and it is clear that this concept could be implemented with an absolute minimum of time and expenses. In fact, the facilities required are currently in existence—and in mothballs.

Naval Capt. James M. Hingson—and brother to the above-mentioned doctor—spoke and discussed the ships which would be needed. To sum it up, virtually any ship in existence could be utilized, with few exceptions. And, Mr. Speaker, he disclosed one of the most startling facts of the conference. We currently have ships in mothballs which could be used in the Great White Fleet—and it cost the United States more money to put them into mothballs than it would have to have maintained them. The captain said it is better for the ship itself to be kept operating than to be mothballed.

And, he said, there is currently a seaplane tender in Seattle which could be easily converted for fleet use, but will soon be put into mothballs—at a greater expense than it would cost to operate it.

While the fleet is still little more than a proposal on paper, I should carefully point out that its proponents have been working on it. In fact, they soon will sail a 42-foot cruiser which they have acquired up the York River in Virginia to assist two small tribes—the Mattapony and Pamonkey Indians. These tribes have been isolated from any neighbors by their waterlocked location, and the situation is worsened by the fact that they have no pier for boats to make stops. These fleet proponents are going to construct this pier in the near future, and will then assist the Indians in building a road from the pier to their reservation. Finally, fleet personnel will go into the area and train these people in vocational skills.

This effort seems small—and it is small in comparison to what the fleet potentially can accomplish. But, there are few funds with which to work, and the proponents felt that they should begin somewhere.

In addition, these two tribes represent a great link in American heritage—for they are direct descendants of Powhatan and Pocahontas. Without some assistance, these Indians will be extinct very shortly. The fleet is small—but even this first project is great in purpose.

I would also especially call attention to a statement made by Mr. Edwin Ott, president of Fairlea Metal Works in Fairlea, W. Va. He gave us an insight from an area which already is receiving funds for rehabilitation—through the Appalachia program. In a moving talk, he pointed out that:

> When we offer man an opportunity to improve we offer him a chance to enhance his own dignity and self-respect. Giving money away is not the answer. Offering man the opportunity to improve himself through his own education and hard work is the answer.

The possibilities for a White Fleet operation are almost endless. For example, Mr. Robert A. Peters, a hydrologist with the Layne Atlantic Co. in Norfolk, Va., appeared at our October 11 conference to tell us of the value of good water to underdeveloped nations—and of the abundance of supply which could be made available almost anywhere in the world. He said that good, inexpensive drilling equipment could easily be transported by White Fleet vessels and used to develop pure sources of ground water wherever it was found to be needed.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would not do justice to the concept of the Great White Fleet, without mentioning the name and efforts of its creator and foremost sponsor—Navy Capt. Frank Manson. And, I might add, Mr. Speaker, that his work has borne new fruit within the past 3 days when a private citizen donated a $2,600 30-foot boat to constitute the second vessel in the White Fleet.

This man's grasp of the fundamental principles has attracted an ever-increasing number of supporters throughout the country and even abroad. Single-

handedly, his logic, quiet persuasion, and conviction have won support in many quarters, including many congressional offices.

Captain Manson has spearheaded the drive to assist the Indian tribes that I mentioned above—the first of a series of planned projects which could be implemented in the near future if resources are secured.

I wish every Member of Congress could talk to this dynamic man. There would not be one dissenting vote on the measures which would create the White Fleet.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague upon the statement he is making.

Mr. Speaker, the concept we have heard outlined here today is a concept which, when it becomes a reality, could hold perhaps this Nation's greatest potential for helping others to help themselves in a meaningful, compassionate, understanding way.

I am especially proud that this concept originated with an Oklahoman, Capt. Frank Manson, of the U.S. Navy, and has had full-fledged Oklahoma support since Captain Manson first approached our distinguished colleague, Mr. EDMUNDSON, with the idea.

It may seem incongruous that the concept of sailing a fleet of helping ships to the underdeveloped nations of the world originated with Oklahomans, citizens of a landlocked State. But Oklahomans, Mr. Speaker, do not have landlocked hearts. And it is from the heart that an idea such as this one must come and grow.

I am proud to have been associated with this idea since its concept, and it will have my full support until the day that the fleet is launched.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the distinguished majority leader, who was a cosponsor of the original White Fleet resolution when it was first introduced in 1959.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for making it possible for us to bring this matter before the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take these few minutes to voice my most sincere support for the Great White Fleet.

I have been interested for many years in work similar to that which would be performed by the White Fleet. Dr. Robert Hingson, of whom our colleague from Oklahoma spoke, and I have worked on Project "Brother's Brother" for many years—and I hope to work on the Great White Fleet for many years more.

When a man gives another money, this is help—but only of a temporary nature. When man gives health, education, or opportunity to another, then he has given him help of a permanent nature—and, Mr. Speaker, this is help which he will never forget.

People in Liberia remember the work of Dr. Hingson's teams of inoculators, from the weeks they worked to eradicate smallpox. Similar reaction has been generated in other countries into which these teams have gone. Indeed such enthusiasm would come from any area into which the White Fleet could go. As Mr. EDMONDSON said in his remarks, this represents over 70 percent of the world's population.

The question is not whether we can afford to create this fleet—but whether we can afford not to create it. Surely there can be no doubt as to the answer.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks. I join wholeheartedly with her in her tribute to Dr. Robert Hingson, who is one of the truly great benefactors we have in our country today. I know and understand the gentlewoman's work on her project "Brother's Brother" and her work in Liberia.

Mrs. BOLTON. Dr. Hingson comes from my hometown.

Mr. EDMONDSON. We know the gentlewoman is proud of him, as we all are, and we are all proud of her association with this project.

Mr. Speaker, I yield at this time to my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I compliment the gentleman for bringing this subject before the House and before the Nation today. As the gentleman well knows, I am not always in full favor of additional giveaway programs, even of our so-called surplus commodities.

I do have copies of House Concurrent Resolution 15 before me, and also the other bill, by one of our colleagues, H.R. 12509, to which the gentleman referred.

But the real reason I rise at this time is not only to compliment the gentleman for portraying an idea and a concept which would be certainly magnanimous and which would share our largess with people in need around the world, but particularly through him to compliment Captain Manson, who was on the staff of the late Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Ricketts.

Captain Manson told me Admiral Ricketts was the first four-star admiral, so to speak, who ever grasped this concept, and that he was preparing an order for cooperation with the Department of State and the Department of Defense and the White House, and others, necessary for the completion of this quite free concept and especially for technical assistance and training and education in the estuarine areas of the world. I think this, perhaps, followed Admiral Ricketts' experience with Solant Amity, wherein for a long time the United States exchanged books, and so on with various sovereign nations and indeed some tribes around the coast of Africa. This was followed in South America by a Latin American project of the Navy called Unitas, which is now in its seventh year. The seventh project Unitas is currently engaged in and is underway in the ports of call in South America.

Admiral Ricketts unfortunately expired after this complete workup by Captain Manson and others was in the in-basket of the Chief of Naval Operations. We all recall when he passed away, making a speech for the Chief of Naval Operations.

If the gentleman will yield for just a minute further, I would like to read a quote from a speech made by Admiral Ricketts in 1964, at Oklahoma City, unless the gentleman has this available.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman. I join with the gentleman in his great regard for Admiral Ricketts, who, I think, was one of the truly great farsighted statesmen and military leaders of our Nation, and whose unfortunate death was a great loss to the Navy and to the Nation.

Mr. HALL. I think the gentleman is exactly correct.

For example, after a trip to Indonesia and Malaysia in the year prior to his death, the admiral very accurately forecast what would subsequently happen there with the liberation of Indonesia. He was a statesman as well as a great naval officer and a son of the sea. He said shortly before his death:

> Within the context of future ideas of technical assistance and our efforts to systematize the science of helping others, I predict that mobility of the base of operations will become of increasing importance. I predict that ships and waterborne craft will be utilized more and more. There are numerous reasons why this is so. Navigable oceans and inland waters reach a vast majority of the world's population, particularly the worst areas of impoverishment. Ships will bring mobility to the system, making it possible for the same system to be utilized in a dozens of places. Being the least expensive form of transport, ships offer the most economical means of transporting those tools and talents required to do the job. They provide maximum mobility at minimum cost. Beyond this, ships are highly organized and the responsibility is placed. The ship is an excellent instrument of management. Log books are kept, they are not easily distorted. The moment of truth in an unending truth. This is the tradition of the sea. Today we see an increasing interest in waterborne programs by those countries with large coastal regions and navigable lakes and rivers.
>
> The idea of using ships in emergency and technical assistance programs is conceptually sound, just as it is conceptually sound to place our armaments on the mobile base.

This, of course, refers to the concept of our Committee on Armed Services of prepositioning which was worked out and has done so well in South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. In closing I want to say I certainly strongly support the White Fleet concept as I have Project Hope, Project Concern and others, where the M.D.'s—and that stands in this case for "medical diplomats"—to whom the gentleman so kindly referred a while ago, have shared their knowledge around the world with others. This and all types of technical assistance and educational assistance to my way of thinking would be most appropriate.

I compliment the gentleman for what he has brought before the House.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Personally, I do not know of any instance in which any single profession has done as much for the image of America around the

world and particularly the underdeveloped areas of the world as has the medical profession participating with the nursing profession in Project Hope. I have had an opportunity to observe some of the films which have been made of the operation of this great ship, and I have talked with some of the participants and with some of the Latin American and Asiatic diplomats who have seen it in operation. I know it has succeeded beyond the fondest dreams of some of its sponsors, and I know that Captain Manson's concept of enlarging this operation and making it a fleet operation, in which we not only would have several hospital ships operating but also would have other vessels to perform other essential functions which help the people of underdeveloped areas, is a noble concept and a practical concept and one that fits so well into the vision of Admiral Ricketts.

I know that President Eisenhower was sold on this idea as an approach, and got behind Project Hope when it was first started.

I know that Vice President HUMPHREY, when he was a Member of the Senate, was one of those who saw the possibilities in it.

I believe it is something which every Member of Congress who has studied it has become convinced is worthwhile and desirable.

I am very pleased the gentleman from Missouri has expressed the views he has expressed on the floor today.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Speaker, I believe he has summarized better than most people could in his beautiful language what is involved. It is a part of the people-to-people program. If the time ever comes when the people of the world cannot sit down and help each other or discuss their problems across the table we will indeed be lost.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, mention has been made of the great work of Dr. Robert Hingson, president of Project Brother's Brother.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the report which he presented at our conference may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection. The report is as follows:

DR. ROBERT HINGSON'S REPORT

(By Dr. Robert Hingson, professor of anesthesiology, Western Reserve University School of Medicine, Cleveland, Ohio, president of Project Brother's Brother)

In our great medical center in Cleveland, Ohio while she was recovering from a minor illness, The Honorable Mrs. Bolton worked with a broken hand to plan a pilot program, an international emergency disaster plan; the first that Congress had ever undertaken. She worked on this plan as a memorial to her beloved brother because she felt his good works should be continued. So long before I went into the jungles this lady was planning my trip. She and Dr. Albert Schweitzer inspired me to go to work and we all went together in spirit and purpose even though we traveled separately by a few months, and we know the true story of the have-nots which cannot be fully described in the short time available.

* * * * *

As a physician, I am appalled that one-third of the world's family, more than one billion people are sick unto death at this very moment with diseases which could either be cured or entirely eradicated. It would be possible, if we wanted to, at this moment of history for the United States to rise up with its civilian technological strength reinforced by its governmental strength and to set a new image in all the emerging nations—even in North Vietnam. There is a way to prevent this continued march down this road to destruction which we are taking at this moment. The correct approach is a constructive and responsible road toward mankind's improvement. When mankind realizes human betterment is our intended road there will be a conference table.

* * * * *

In our first survey of Asia and Africa, our interfaith and interracial medical teams documented the problems. We found they were soluble . . . not beyond our own comprehension. We returned with respect for those special missionary boards now working on the problems. We told these boards that the problems could be easily solved. We had high praise for many of these small pilot lighthouse missionary stations operating in many nations. We felt however, that any missionary effort which had remained longer than twenty years was an insult both to itself and to the nation which it served.

Mankind has been led to believe that with today's technology he can be improved within a period of twenty years. We recommended that the missionary boards take a new look at any pilot lighthouse which had not advanced ten miles from its center and we suggested that something might be wrong with the approach or the program. As we made our original survey, at no time did we talk about democracy, freedom or private enterprise. We showed no paternalism. We talked to them about their problems. We went out under the banner of the Cleveland Plain Dealer's Operation "Brother's Keeper". We went first to Nigeria and an old Chief there gave me his son to educate. We already had four sons, all of them working toward a college degree. To have four sons plus an African son too, was a pretty big job for the Hingsons. I am pleased to say that one of our sons is here at this meeting from Johns Hopkins University. That son which the old Chief gave me to educate is now back in Nigeria as a practicing physician. He was trained at our medical school in Cleveland.

The old Chief was certainly happy to see his son return as a trained physician, but he asked us where we got our name, "Brother's Keeper".

"That name is an American Disease", said the Chief. "God didn't start anything called Brother's Keeper".

"Your correct name should be Brother's Brother".

So we went down to Columbus and paid $49.00 to change our project's name from "Brother's Keeper" to project "Brother's Brother". And we got on with the program. At this moment I have more invitations in my brief case asking for help than you could believe; ministers of health pleading with us to come to their nation to stamp out smallpox, measles, malaria and the numerous other diseases which we can eradicate. One of those letters is from Panama where we have a vital interest.

After our initial survey our medical team, Brother's Brother had to try its worth. We had to prove our theory. We selected a nation about the size of our home state of Ohio. We selected a nation which was closely related to American industry. We chose our partner nation of Liberia where they say that every rubber tree has a fifteen degree list toward Akron. Well the list is now leaning toward Republic Steel and United States Steel as the iron ore from Liberia pours in ever increasing amounts into the Great Lakes Seaway. During that first visit Mrs. Hingson and I stood on a hill which I later learned was composed of eighty percent iron ore, and we vaccinated every person on that hill against smallpox.

We also had another reason for choosing Liberia as a starting point. Liberia was a Christian nation, governed by President Tubman, a Christian, and we felt we would get the full cooperation of the government and the people. Then we made a call on the Navy and that is when Captain Manson and my brother sitting over there, Captain Hingson and I put our heads together. We had 30 tons of equipment which had to be moved 3,000 miles across the Atlantic and we only had $1,000 left in our budget. We needed the transport of the thirty tons of medical supplies and sixteen people in order to get on the job. My brother said well here are my classmates. We will just keep checking the list until we find someone who can take us there. Fortunately, my brother was given command of an ammunition ship, and with the command of Admiral George Anderson we sailed on an ammunition ship loaded with a new kind of ammunition on a new type of mission. This was truly a mission for the Great White Fleet being carried by a ship from the Navy's Great Grey Fleet.

Enroute to Liberia, after we arrived in mid ocean, we discovered that we had only 10,000 doses of smallpox vaccine and we had over 1,000,000 people to vaccinate. What would you have done? We could not turn around. Well we started experimenting with our jet guns whose nozzles have a hole in them the size of a human hair or a mosquito's nose. We took a look at the profile of the spray from these guns firing vaccine at 700 miles per hour. We saw, as you see here, as I pull the trigger that each shot literally sends out a cloud with millions of tiny particles. We reasoned that if one placed a barrel of rice in one small hole and covered it with dirt the rice farmer might not get more than a dozen shoots, but if the farmer was wise and broadcast his rice he would reap a harvest. So we decided to try the broadcast method. We decided to dilute the vaccine and asked Captain Hingsons' crew of 300 to serve as guinea pigs. And they did. Each of the crew of his ship, the USS DIAMOND HEAD, should be given a citation. We diluted the vaccine 1 to 10, 1 to 25 and 1 to 50 and every shot got a positive take. Thus, by diluting the vaccine, we discovered we could immunize the entire country as planned.

And when we arrived in Liberia, we set up our medical center eight miles from the center of Monrovia at a spot where 194 men, women and children suffered under 10,000 blisters of smallpox. Thirty had died since the last doctor had visited this place. Open caskets were stacked under the steps of houses. They had no covers. Dying patients lay on army cots. Flies and mosquitoes swarmed over this blanket of smallpox blisters.

Dr. Eugene Dibble of Tuskegee Institute, who was one of our original team, as we were using the entire American family and I feel we should have a great American negro physician herewith us today at this meeting just as we had with us on our team in Liberia. Seeing the great suffering, Dr. Dibble walked under a palm tree and lifted his hands in prayer.

* * * * *

For six weeks, twenty-three American doctors, technicians and medical students donated their time and talent in Liberia. Our teams include both white and negro doctors representing Protestants, Catholics and Jews. Think of inoculating over 300,000 Liberians against smallpox and other diseases which threatened that nation in epidemic propor-

tion. With our jet inoculators we were able to do it.

Think about immunizing all the children in the Gaza Strip against polio. We did that. Think about immunizing all the children in the Vatican City in Rome at a time when there was no poliomyelitis vaccine in Europe. We did that.

We returned to the United States so elated that I went to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and told him we could do away with most of the diseases which had plagued mankind . . . . not in the next fifty years, not in the next twenty years . . . but now. I told him what we had been able to do in Liberia in terms of preventive medicine.

The Surgeon General said, "Bob, where is Liberia?"

* * * * *

It is because of the work of people like Mrs. Bolton that we have advanced disease prevention as far as we have. Her writings and research in 1957 would be germane to this meeting. Before we were through in Liberia, we vaccinated one million people and it is because of such experiments as these that President Johnson was able to tell the Congress recently that smallpox is the one disease we can now eradicate from this earth.

But we could not have done this if Mrs. Bolton had not helped us to get started and if the Navy had not taken us across and if our own teammates had not been willing to make the personal sacrifices needed to do the job.

One year after our immunization program in Liberia I returned to the smallpox hospital where Dr. Dibble had prayed for guidance. I found two were playing checkers and a third member of the smallpox team was working on a sewing machine. They put their arms around me and said, "Dr. Hingson, there's no smallpox in Liberia. We have had no cases in four months."

Suppose you had one of these jet guns in your pocket and that this had happened to you in Liberia. We had been pushing our Doctors in 1965 and didn't have enough Doctors to go into Central America in 1966. We had only fifteen able to go but I had some three hundred volunteer high school and college students and we vaccinated 1,500,000. That young man sitting right over there (Dr. Hingson's son) and his brother vaccinated 22,000 a day.

Captain MANSON: How long did it take you?

Dr. HINGSON: Three weeks. We put one gun on one side and one gun on the other side of each person; we shot them tuberculosis vaccine on one side, smallpox the other side and then gave them polio vaccine by mouth.

Normally we do our work in partnership. The local people help us. They take care of our meals, they provide us with jeeps, when they have them, they put up our tents, they give us sandwiches and coca-cola. We put the jet guns in Venezuela. They are still going strong—into the third year now.

In Nicaragua, we vaccinated for smallpox, leprosy, tuberculosis and poliomyelitis.

As I was in the plane flying from Nicaragua to Honduras, the stewardess said, "You're wanted on the telephone."

"Where is your telephone?" I went up to the cockpit. This was a call from the Vice President of Nicaragua, Dr. Francisco. I had to talk back on the radio phone. I had to say "over" and wait. I am sure you know how to do that. The Vice President said after sometime, "We lost eleven babies last night. The whole hospital has polio. They are coming in at a rate of twenty five each day. Doctor can you come down to help?" The pilot said, "I'm just the guy to do it if you want to make an unscheduled landing, I'll take old 'papa' down to Managua." We landed in Managua and within a short time we were in this hospital. We had to send the Nicaraguan Air Force for iron lungs from Panama.

Just think what could have happened if we could have had a White Fleet to move in with iron lungs on board. They only had four iron lungs in Panama and we had four hundred children paralayzed from the neck down. Well we had to put one little head out this end of the iron lung, had to put another little head out the other. And you know the arm places where you reset an iron lung or utilize them to change the diapers of the sick baby, we had to put the babies crosswise in there. We had to put four little bodies into each one of the 4 iron lungs. Oh, we lost a good many. I put twenty five lost ones in one sack as I took them out. But we saved a lot of them. We had three professors; one from Harvard; one from Chicago; and one from a Mexican town. Then I got on the telephone and on the Western Union line and I sent 125 telegrams to Catholic charities. This is Catholic country. Catholic charities in New York sent us 465,000 doses of polio vaccine. The Doctors sent us 260,000 doses. The Methodists sent us 1,000 doses, and another charity sent us 25 doses.

Well we got the vaccine. Let me tell you, we administered 1,200,000 doses of polio vaccine in one week. Now Nicaragua could not have another polio epidemic tomorrow if it were to try.

Later we fired 210,000 shots of protective and life-preserving vaccine into the people of Honduras. Right next door in Costa Rica there were 10,000 children sick with the measles and they needed vaccine. I sent out a call for help. "We've got the guns, we've got the people, we've got the patients, we've got everything but the vaccine. If you give us the vaccine, we'll take care of it. I called a friend in Annapolis, Maryland. He said, "Dr. Hingson, we can't give it to you. We'll give it to you at a fair price. It's $2.95, we'll give it to you for $1.06." I said, "we can't do it. Our nurses don't make but $200 a month and some of them are barefooted. We can't make the payroll." He said, "Dr., the children will have to die."

I said, "No they won't die." I said, "Somewhere in this heart of America is compassion and I'll sign the note here." At this very moment we are $101,000 in debt because of that note but last week we raised $11,000. I raised $2,000 yesterday speaking fourteen times in Louisiana . . . and I am going back to Cleveland tomorrow to raise some more funds.

With our success in Liberia, with our success in Honduras, with our success in Nicaragua, and with our success in Costa Rica, you can readily understand why Panama would ask us now for total immunization of their country with its 650 miles of coastline. That is where the ditch is going to be built. Think what the Great White Fleet could do now. It could turn us into a one-ocean Navy. In an economic sense, the Great White Fleet, by demonstrating American technology to the developing nations could double the business of New Orleans, Mobile, Miami and Houston.

These are positive things that I know. The White Fleet will take some logistics planning, proper timing and support. White Fleet ships will need the helicopter that can go over that ridge and go down into the typical Indian village where thirty seven people died in one night. Think of the coastlines in Central and South America. If you were going to build a home in South Brazil, it would cost you $50,000,000. In that little area with thirteen million people, you could clear out five million diseases with $5,000,000, with the White Fleet to support it.

* * * * *

But I can tell you that I saw forty people killed by agents planted by Castro in the streets of Managua last month; that Mr. Castro wants to climb in the mountains of Central America all the way up and down. Mr. Calvo, the Minister of Health from Panama told me just last week in Washington that he is having trouble with the Castro sponsored rebels in the mountains in the Passo del Norte.

The Minister of Health is losing six hundred babies a week with measles. With $200,000 and logistical support we could immunize 1,100,000 people in Panama against measles, polio, tuberculosis, leprosy and smallpox. That's the kind of outlay we are talking about and I do hope that we can respond. We're making every effort to do it. I'm just giving you an example. The Great White Fleet must live! The Great Grey Fleet is active, I want to pay tribute to that. Every ship that moves at sea, one of these days is going to help wage peace, or we are going to be fighting "the real one." War ranks third behind famine and disease in its destructive force.

* * * * *

We talk about education; we talk about improved garden seed; improved agriculture and transportation; we talk about combined help, and these are the things that can tie areas of want and need very quickly to the United States. I reckon we could put Castro on the run if we just moved out into these vacuums of cess pools and sewer pipes which are just wide open and one final thought. Think what a wonderful thing it would be if all of those plagues of South America, including Castro's agents were separated by 1500 miles of quarantine!

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request with respect to the splendid report by Dr. John H. Proctor, of Litton Systems, Inc., who also participated in that conference on October 11.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection. The report is as follows:

DR. JOHN PROCTOR'S REPORT

(By Dr. John H. Proctor, Litton Systems, Inc., Fort Walton Beach, Fla.)

Most of us are well acquainted with the great nation building programs this country has engaged in *after* the shooting has stopped. The Marshall Plan and similar post World War II programs are well-known to all; but, nation building before and during the shooting is a newer experience dating primarily from the early 1960's and brought clearly into focus by our efforts in South Vietnam.

This country's international commitments and the nature of the threats to world peace and the technical advances of communication and transportation have involved new ways of employing our military forces and government employees as instruments of national policy. In like manner, this country's private business and private citizen groups have found that the manner in which they conduct their activities reflects upon the image of the United States. Indeed, action of the private sector is a potent force for enhancing or undermining the U.S. policy and position.

This appears especially true around the periphery of the Communist bloc in the underdeveloped areas of the Moslem world, Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia. The area of greatest concern during the next decade is within the belt around the equator ranging from 35° North to 35° South latitude.

Latin America, 25; not on sea, 2.

Africa, 53; not on sea, 13.

Near East and South Asia, 26; not on sea, 4.

Far East, 18; none on sea.

We have counted 122 separate states or significant territories in this region exclusive of Australia, New Zealand, and the Oceania collection of countries. Of these countries only 19 do not have sea coasts.

When one remembers that approximately 70% of the world's population live within 100 miles of navigable waters, access to people of this region by ship does not appear to be a problem.

This table depicts the status of this region in terms of free world population and Gross National Product:

PERCENTAGE OF FREE WORLD POPULATION VERSUS PERCENTAGE OF FREE WORLD GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

	Percent of population	Percent of GNP
Latin America	11	6
Africa	12	[1] 3
Far East	17	[2] 7
Near East and South Asia	35	6
Total	75	22

[1] South Africa, 0.7 percent.
[2] Japan, 5.3 percent.

Even for those of us who have seen these figures before, the picture is startling: 75% of the free world population has only 22% of the Gross National Product. Two nations, Japan and South Africa, has 6% of the 22%.

In the world today, regions and countries that are poor present a breeding ground for conflict. In the words of Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara:

"There is a direct and constant relationship between the incidence of violence and the economic status of the countries afflicted. . . . There is an irrefutable relationship between violence and economic backwardness and the trend of such violence is up, not down."

Nations with higher than optimal population growth, lower literacy rates, and lower life expectancy rates appear to be more prone to violent outbreaks internally. From 1958 to 1965 there were 164 "internationally significant" outbreaks of violence, each designed as a serious challenge to the authority or the existence of the government in power according to the Secretary of Defense. Only 15 of these were military conflicts between nations. In 1958 there were 23 prolonged insurgencies whereas of February 1966, there were 40.

Using the World Bank classification of a nation's wealth mentioned earlier, the outbreaks of violence occurred in 32 of the 38 very poor nations, 23 of the 33 poor nations, and 18 of the 37 middle-income nations.

The backdrop I have been painting of the problems facing developing nations and the U.S. has been with broad brush strokes—general or summary statistics. I *am* making the point that the situation grows more acute even in the face of the several brilliant action programs initiated since 1959 and the birth of the Great White Fleet idea. Other speakers today will describe these problems at a more personal, human level. But all of us, from each of our points of view, see only greater consternation for the next decade on the same problems. In short, our solution efforts singly and in combination have not relieved sufficiently the difficulties which have accrued from population growth and the inadequacies in meeting basic human needs for food, water, education, and jobs.

That programs to relieve the situation are justified has already been established since, in fact, we are conducting them: church missionary efforts, the Peace Corps, groups working through the United Nations, our military civic action and foreign aid program are a few examples. That more is needed appears obvious but there may be doubt in some quarters about whether the U.S. can afford to do more. Needless to say, my thesis is that we cannot afford *not* to do more. Most people view such projects from the altruistic viewpoint. Actually, there are at least *three* basic reasons why the Great White Fleet has continuing appeal and why it should become part of the programmed action for this country: Humanitarian, National Security, and Good Business.

HUMANITARIAN

One doesn't have to justify noble behavior. The differences between our standards of living and those of the less fortunate nations are appallingly large. One simply cannot disregard or "make do" and truthfully claim to adhere to the principals that increased the wealth of this country. We cannot advise and guide, we cannot be a leader and not do as much as we can to solve the plight of our friends. President Johnson continued our commitment to help Latin American nations build with their own hands in their own lands. "To my fellow presidents," he has said, "I pledge: Move boldly along this path and the United States will be at your side."

NATIONAL SECURITY

The stated objective of this nation has been not to acquire land by force or to crush a nation, but to provide a climate for nations to develop their own identity, to increase their own safety, and to improve their own standards of living. The U.S. has no imperialistic or colonialistic objectives. The form of the government we are assisting in a self-help program is of little consequence so long as it is not inconsistent with the objectives of free men. The U.S. Navy role in the last fifteen years has been to maintain and, as in Southeast Asia, to use its capacity to destroy while at the same time applying it capabilities constructively.

While the current belief in the absolute necessity for maintaining a seaborne nuclear deterrent is rarely challenged by thoughtful men, the legitimacy of the military involvement in nation building activity is questioned.

Reducing the causes of war will lessen the chances of our having to send troops overseas for combat purposes. In the event of a major showdown between the great powers, our friendly and helpful assistance to emerging nations today could pay important dividends later in terms of strong and helpful allies.

Today, I hope to hear more about how this great potential of Naval power might be constructively applied through the Great White Fleet concept.

GOOD BUSINESS

In addition to humanitarian and national security benefits to be expected from operations of the "White Fleet" and other nation building programs, there are benefits which can accrue to American business and industry. U.S. markets need to be increased, and they can be, provided the emerging nations can be made safe for business ventures and provided they can achieve a larger share of economic gain which can be sustained at a reasonable level. In short, there is self-interest from the "Yankee-Trader's" viewpoint arguing for sponsoring programs to assist the underdeveloped nations.

But we are learning that when the basic ills of mankind are to be successfully attacked, whether in public health, education, finance, family planning or agriculture, the best of our equipment and know-how and lots of money and man-hours are required. Simply, constructive instruments of national policy are expensive. The U.S. is not rich enough to do all the things that need to be done at the same time.

One of the hoped for results of this meeting is a relatively *inexpensive* initiation of the Great White Fleet idea—inexpensive in terms that businessmen can understand, those same businessmen who would not give their backing to another "give away" program.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, Capt. James Hingson, of the U.S. Navy, formerly in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, also delivered at that conference an outstanding report. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection. The report is as follows:

CAPTAIN HINGSON'S REPORT

(By Capt. James Hingson, U.S. Navy, Office of Chief of Naval Operations, Washington, D.C.)

I have brought with me some illustrations of types of ships which could be used in such a fleet. It will only take a few minutes to show and tell you that we have a number of vessels which would prove suitable for White Fleet operations. If an ammunition ship can serve, then almost any ship could serve.

First of all the Great White Fleet can provide a hospital or a medical field service. It has been proved time and again that we can have two hospital ships out in Vietnam now. They are air conditioned with the latest equipment, and provide the best type of medical service aboard ship.

Units afloat can actually provide better service than is ordinarily available in our modern hospitals ashore.

The White Fleet could be operated by MSTS or they could be operated as individual task groups under other agencies of government.

The Landing Ship Tank (LST) would be an excellent ship for the White Fleet. An LST is capable of doing almost anything. From an LST, the USS *Alameda County*, we unloaded and built a complete airfield at Cyprus within forty-eight hours.

This included setting up a complete airfield on Cyprus. Setting up radars, runways, generators, barracks, operational control centers and everything needed to operate land-based aircraft. LST's can be configured as hospital ships, tenders, in fact they can be fitted out, staffed and equipped to do anything. Also, they have a relatively shallow draft and can land virtually anywhere there are sandy beaches. There are numerous amphibious vessels such as LCU's, LCM's and ARSD's which would serve the purpose. Many of these are surplus to present military needs.

(Captain Hingson at this point was asked whether it would not cost more money to mothball a seaplane tender than it would cost to keep it operational. He replied as follows:)

Yes, it is more economical to keep the ships operating. We have at least a half dozen different types of ships which would prove suitable for White Fleet operations.

(Captain Hingson was then asked whether there was currently a seaplane tied up in Seattle. He replied as follows:)

Yes, and it would be better to keep the ship operational. It is better to operate a ship than to mothball it.

In conclusion, I would note that the Army's mobile hospital can be moved by helicopter and set up by four people in about thirty minutes. Helicopters can lift this entire hospital. Lifting heavy loads by helicopter is one of the ways we have licked the log jam in ports. They save a lot of time. The Great White Fleet when properly organized, staffed, and targeted can cover an entire nation in a very short time.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, another splendid report which was delivered on the occasion of the conference was presented by the president of Fairlea Metal Works, of Fairlea, W. Va., Mr. Edwin Ott. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The report is as follows:

EDWIN OTT'S REPORT

Since (the people of West Virginia) live in the mountains where life is pretty rugged under normal conditions we have learned to be concerned about other people. We also have a feeling in the mountains that our interest in the welfare of others is important to our own economic welfare and to the development of mankind.

I would like to make a few comments about the course of future events. For example, prophets tell us there will be another major war; perhaps another war will be of an atomic nature. This war might come within a few years, 50 years or perhaps 100 years. Nevertheless, they tell us that we face another major conflict. Should this happen, I cannot think of a better survival kit for mankind than the White Fleet.

We also hear that someday the world will face a major depression. We know, both from our statisticians and our intuition, that this is so. Periods of prosperity and depression follow in the cycle and it can be assumed that eventually we will have another depression. Therefore, again, I would say that we could use something like the White Fleet as a part of our survival kit.

At some point in time we must take into account the possibility that humanity may face tremendous food shortages. . . . The White Fleet is one possible answer to this problem.

When we offer man an opportunity to improve we offer him a chance to enhance his own dignity and self-respect. When we give him money we do just the opposite. Giving money away is not the answer. Offering man the opportunity to improve himself through his own education and hard work is the answer. This is true in Appalachia, and it likewise is true in every poor section of the world.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a similar request for the energetic and dynamic naval officer who is the father of the White Fleet concept, Capt. Frank Manson, who, as a naval officer back in the late 1950's saw the possibilities of the utilizing of surplus vessels and presented the idea for a White Fleet at the Naval War College. It attracted the attention of Life magazine and other major publications and was given nationwide publicity at that time.

Captain Manson has persisted in his advancement of that great idea and has at this time succeeded in founding a White Fleet Foundation which is engaged in a very imaginative pioneering effort in connection with several of the Indian tribes of our own east coast.

I would like to ask unanimous consent that his remarks might appear at this point.

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

There was no objection.

EXCERPT FROM CAPTAIN MANSON'S REPORT

The basic purpose of the White Fleet is to perpetuate man's freedom and his dignity, by offering on a global basis, a floating technology designed to help man overcome these hostile environments which bring on disharmony among nations and violence in the struggle for life's basic necessities.

I should also say at the outset that the White Fleet does not compete with any foundation or with any organization, civilian or governmental, which is now created to serve in common purpose with the basic principles for which the White Fleet Foundation was created.

It is our common hope and faith that when the White Fleet gets underway, these floating units will be formed into task groups around the globe; that these task groups will serve as a catalyst in each region of challenge; that these multi-purpose groups will help attract and bind the hundreds of humanitarian organizations into a concerted effort; that these floating units will help to coordinate the full spectrum of constructive programs to increase their effectiveness, and drastically reduce the overall expenditures of money, time, and manpower.

As I once discussed with Admiral Arleigh Burke in the Fall of 1957 during his tenure as Chief of Naval Operations that I did not then feel that the two hospital ships which I had proposed to him should be placed in commission at the price of placing two combatant cruisers out of commission, I have never felt that it would be wise to buy a White Fleet at the price of diminishing our defense capability designed to deter the onrush of the greedy who thrive on weak and undefended governments.

I say the White Fleet can be built for the most part from the scrap heap of U.S. surpluses; it can be salvaged from those ships and surpluses which are rusting and eroding away, items for which there is no market.

We need the sponsorship of some federal agency, an agency which is sufficiently broad in its charter and objectives to work with all elements of the White Fleet concept. We need some legal means of drawing surplus items needed in White Fleet operations.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a similar request with respect to brief excerpts from the remarks submitted on October 11 by Dr. John Tabb, director of planning and development of Old Dominion College, Norfolk, Va.; and Mr. Curtis T. Brooks, Jr., of the Chamber of Commerce of Norfolk, Va.; and Capt. O. C. Scellato, commanding officer, first precinct, Norfolk Police, and a trustee of the Federal Order of Police; and Mr. Harry Drew, president, MACE Club, Norfolk, Va.

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

There was no objection.

EXCERPT OF REMARKS OF DR. JOHN TABB

I have worked and am very familiar with the problems confronting our trust territories in the Pacific.

I feel the White Fleet might be able to contribute to the economic and social development of these islands and therefore recommend that this aspect of the White Fleet concept be given prompt and thorough study.

EXCERPT OF REMARKS OF MR. CURTIS T. BROOKS, JR.

With a background of twenty years service in the Chamber of Commerce profession at all levels, local, state and national, I would like for this Committee to know that one of our nation's important maritime states, the Commonwealh of Virginia, does have a sustaining interest in the Great White Fleet concept.

Captain Manson and I have had White Fleet discussions with our Governor, Mills E. Godwin, Jr., who indicated his interest from the point of view of commonwealth participation, as did Richard S. Gillis, Jr., Executive Director of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce in Richmond, Virginia. (Further) five corporations in the State of Virginia have already offered their goods and services to the White Fleet Laboratory ship which will operate on an experimental basis in the Tidewater area.

EXCERPTS FROM THE REMARKS OF CAPT. O. C. SCELLATO

Speaking for the Police of my own area and for Policemen of America who are trying to enforce the laws of our nation we see in the White Fleet, something which would appeal to young people, something which is constructive and which would keep them occupied in positive and helpful programs. Developing youth requires inspiration as well as developing nations. Therefore, I would strongly urge the establishment of a nationwide White Fleet program, which I feel would be as helpful to our own youth as it would be helpful to others.

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF MR. HARRY DREW

As President of Norfolk's MACE Club (Military and Civilian Emissaries), I would like for the Congress to know that the White Fleet concept has the unanimous support of our club. We have taken a vote and we are 100% for the concept. Coming from Norfolk, home of the world's largest naval base, and realizing the potential of floating our technology to the world's potential market places with the same skill we float our weapons systems, we feel the potential for improving our relationships with the emerging nations is limited only by our imagination and that we should pursue the establishment of the White Fleet as a matter of high priority.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I make a similar request with respect to the presentations which were made on October 11 by several other dedicated Americans, Mr. Hugh Kellum of Norfolk, Va.; Mr. Henry Santiago, of the Office of Navy Material, here in Washington; and an inventor and manufacturer from Norfolk, Va., Mr. V. L. Ott.

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

There was no objection.

EXCERPT FROM HUGH KELLUM'S REPORT

I first heard of the White Fleet in late June of 1967. Since I had some military experience in World War II and experience in national affairs since that time, this idea appealed to me from several standpoints.

First, ships were something to capture the imagination and public interest.

Second, with *my* background as a Quaker, it was obviously a force to wage peace and it was something to prevent and correct those conditions which lead to war.

Third, the idea was easy for me to understand. Since I am what I consider to be an average citizen, I thought this idea would appeal to people in my status.

Fourth, *if* the United States is to regain and hold world leadership, this White Fleet offers one of the prime answers to both our domestic problem and our international relations. I have, first of all, an interest in my country and a deep sense of the inheritance from my forbears. I want to perpetuate their ideals.

Captain Frank Manson said we could start in the Tidewater Area with a small research ship, a laboratory experiment where the environment would be comparable to conditions we might find in Central or South America or Asia or Africa. We have in the Tidewater Area everything from dismal swamp land to Tangier Island and one early self governing Indian tribe of Virginia—the Mattapony and Pamonkey Indians who are direct descendants of Powhatan and Pocahontas. We have numerous under developed areas in the Tidewater Areas where we can test out the concept of the White Fleet and the tools, methods, environment, responses and our own imagination and ingenuity in meeting these local challenges.

How can we better prove to the world our leadership than by cleaning our own house first? As Lincoln so well stated, "A house

divided cannot stand." It is, I say, most fitting to start here and now the White Fleet concept.

EXCERPT FROM HENRY SANTIAGO'S REPORT

The Navy becomes the logical *first choice* for the management and support of this fleet. There is one other reason for selecting the U.S. Navy. It along with the Coast Guard represent the finest in our Sea going community. For those elements where the Navy has no capability, selected volunteers can be recruited, similar to the procedures used by A.I.D., in fact it can be exactly the same as the AID procedures. Additional volunteers can be recruited for those elements where the Navy's expertise is presently (or projected to be) spread thin, with the Navy providing only the nucleus.

Specifically what are the Navy's resources which will, or could support the elements involved.

Ships & Operating Personnel—Presently the Navy has more than 500 ships in Mothball. Among these are LST types. These ships are preferred because they are small amphibious types requiring relatively small crews. In the event the ships in mothball cannot be released the Navy may be able to identify other ships belonging to itself or to another activity which could be made available.

For operating personnel, the Navy Community has over 560,000 reservists as well as a large complement of retired personnel in addition to the more than 700,000 active duty personnel.

Sea Bee Teams—At present the Navy has a group of Sea Bee Technical Assistance Teams (STATS) in operation. These teams consist of one officer and 12 men who operate at the village level. Their purpose is to teach the villagers to help themselves and to assist these villagers in building or accomplishing something that would otherwise be beyond their capability. The teams are set up and trained by the Navy but they are sponsored and receive support services from the Agency for International Development.

Medical, Public Health & Veterinary Teams. The Navy's Medical Community is large and well established. Because of the Vietnam War it may not be possible for the Navy to fully staff the team required, however perhaps only a nucleus of one officer and some enlisted corpsmen can be assigned. The Veterinary teams will have to come from another community since the Navy has no community of this type.

Other. The Navy's knowledge in almost all aspects of the Sea is apparent, traditional and well developed. Thus it would be capable of supporting a myriad of needs in this general area.

Support Establishment. The Navy's support establishment consists of over 400,000 civilians as well as special or limited duty Navy personnel.

There is no obvious second choice, however, since it would be desirable to have as the "lead" an activity knowledgeable of the sea and in the use of ships as well as having the tradition of leadership and discipline (in addition to possessing the support capability) the *second choice* would, in the author's view, be the U.S. Coast Guard. The ships could, if possible, be obtained from the Navy's mothballed fleet and reactivated with the Coast Guard providing the operating personnel, or the nucleus of these people (and personnel for the other elements where it is able), and coordinating the services provided by the other communities.

EXCERPT FROM V. L. OTT'S REPORT

I have been on the Mattapony Reservation and I have talked to Chief Custalow and I know of his many needs and the needs of his tribe.

This Chief is looking for an honest livelihood. This situation is also true of many peoples of many other nations.

When people such as the Mattapony tribe have had very little opportunity for education, their only salvation is working with their hands.

The following vocational skills are part of a program which will be offered to the Mattapony tribe. They will select the proper skills and trades which will help to fill their needs and put them on the road to recovery. Weaving, sewing, painting, ceramics, wood carving, working with shells, metal and wood making up jewelry are skills which will be offered to Chief Custalow by the White Fleet, prototype ship which is being designed as a vocational school ship. We provide the techniques and methods. They provide the creativity. It is my thought that one of the greatest things which should be taught, is the raising of vegetables for food, and that is using God's plan.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any personal doubt about the fact that if it were possible for every Member of this body to spend about 15 minutes in a personal discussion either with Capt. Frank Manson or any of these other dedicated men who have been working on this proposal for many, many months, we would very speedily adopt the legislation necessary to put this Congress on record in support of this concept and to provide what funds are necessary to get it moving.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma and want to join with him and associate myself with his remarks. I have known of his long interest and his excellent contributions toward the White Fleet concept.

As many of my colleagues know, I have spent a number of years in the military service and was fortunate to be assigned the command of the first nuclear submarine, the U.S.S. *Nautilus*.

Little did I realize the potential of this nuclear submarine until I was actually able to operate in new and interesting environments, in the tropics, under arctic ice packs, beneath large carrier task forces, in support of landing operations. Each new environment offered new challenges and new opportunities and taught us new lessons.

Now it seems to me with the White Fleet idea we have the same opportunities as those men of centuries past who started experimenting with the warship as a means of protecting the existing civilization against destruction.

Today, mankind faces a number of enemies. We face political and ideological enemies, but the central enemy of all mankind is poverty and those relatives of poverty—illiteracy, starvation, disease and lack of a means of self-support.

The White Fleet of 1967 is in the position of the first war fleets in recorded history. Much work lies ahead in refining the technical means of training men to train themselves. Ships of the White Fleet will need much experimentation and research to refine the means of communicating and motivating those who are flattened by the burdens brought on by ages of impoverishment.

But the time is at hand to begin. It is time for our Federal Government, our State and local governments, and our private industries to join hands in developing ships to help solve man's problems.

I know from my experience in the Navy that the ship can be a marvelous instrument of organization and achievement. There is no limit to what such a fleet could do in times of great emergency and on a continuing basis in the developing regions. This is something to which we should give our thoughts and resources.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent at this time that any Member wishing to do so may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend and colleague from New York [Mr. HALPERN], who is the author of H.R. 12509.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues one of the most commendable concepts of international relationships which has ever been broached in this body. The distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONSON], who I heartily commend for his leadership to achieve this concept, has perceptively pointed out not only the idealistic worth of the Great White Fleet, but the undeniable practicality of the project.

When the concept of the Peace Corps was first presented by the late President Kennedy, there were those who said that "Yes, it sounds like a fine idea, but it will never work." I think it is safe to say that these nay-sayers have been proved wrong.

I feel not the slightest hesitation in saying that the Great White Fleet, if implemented, will prove to be one of the most innovative, yet practical projects advanced by this country.

The idea was first conceived in 1959 by Navy Cmdr. Frank Manson, and was then widely acclaimed. His vision was of a fleet of ships, each one equipped to provide both training and service in a specific area of concentration. One might be a medical and public health facility; another an electrical power and construction center. These ships would be free to roam the world, carrying out concrete, specific, and immediately useful programs in areas with limited overland and air access.

Since the idea was first advanced in Congress, there has been general agreement that something of this scope should be tried, but, for whatever reasons, nothing concrete has been done. I feel strongly, as does my colleague from Oklahoma, that we can no longer afford to allow this imaginative project to remain unimplemented and unproductive.

This is not a starry-eyed proposal, but a viable, practical attempt by a great and caring nation to alleviate some of the social and economic ills of our less-fortunate neighbors in this world.

The method, I feel, is more than attractive. Not only aid and care will be provided, but training and education, the sine qua non for the development of heretofore underdeveloped countries.

Further, the resources, both material and nonmaterial, for the effective implementation of this project are immediately at hand. Former ships of war, now swaying at decaying anchorages, can easily be refitted to provide life, rather than death, construction rather than destruction. The spirit and willingness of volunteers to work in such projects as this has been amply shown not only in essentially private efforts, such as the ship *Hope*, but in Government efforts such as the Peace Corps.

Mr. Speaker, the resources are at hand, the people to utilize those resources are more than evident, all that is needed is the will and the vision on our part to put this country's intelligence, commonsense, and sense of dedication to work toward the realization of an effective, viable, and practical way of bringing modern medical care, education, technology, and productivity to those who so desperately need them.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] for the eloquent remarks which he has made in support of this program and for the constant manner in which he has campaigned for and spoken from the very first for this proposal. I earnestly hope that the day may not be too far distant when we shall have hearings before the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives and in the other body on this legislation.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 6, 1967.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: May I repeat to you what I have often expressed, and that is my warm appreciation for the opportunity you gave to me to serve on the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives.

This has been a most rewarding experience. Because I will be leaving the Congress shortly, I herewith tender my resignation from that Committee, effective immediately.

With warm regards, I am,

Sincerely,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 53, 90th Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Select Committee To Conduct Studies and Investigations of the Problems of Small Business, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

THE ECONOMIC PROGRAM: TIME FOR A NEW START

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the announcement by the majority leader just a few moments ago of the schedule for the remainder of the year reinforces what I have already felt, that the proposal for a surcharge tax bill in 1967 will not come to fruition.

Originally, it was to go into effect, for both individuals and corporations, on July 1. It was set forth in last January's state of the Union message, but no hearings were held on the proposal. A second attempt was made on August 3, 1967, when the President raised the proposed surtax to 10 percent and would have deferred the effective date for individuals until October 1, 1967. In September, the Ways and Means Committee declined to consider the matter further. A third attempt has been made within the last few weeks, following the British devaluation. Once again, the Ways and Means Committee refused to act.

Congress in general, and the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means in particular, are being criticized for this refusal. I propose this afternoon to review the economics of the year 1967, to ask whether monolithic insistence on the tax surcharge proposal has in fact been wise, and to inquire whether a different economic approach by the administration would not have been much more in accord with the economic needs of a nation dedicated—Vietnam or no—to a program of full employment without inflation.

To eliminate the suspense, Mr. Speaker—I believe that a different approach was in fact called for. But I take the floor not to pour coals of fire upon the administration, but to urge a rethinking by the administration in the weeks ahead while it prepares the major proposals which will be forthcoming in January in the state of the Union message, the budget message, and the Economic Report.

I believe that there is an economic program available to the Administration which can actually make contact with economic problems that confront us. If the administration will present such a program vigorously to the Congress, I believe that the Congress will respond. And if the Congress fails to respond, the administration will then have a valid economic issue which it can take to the voters in the 1968 election.

Let us first look at the three main characteristics of the economy in 1967:

A HUGE DEFICIT

First. A huge budget deficit looms, its exact size depending upon whose estimate is taken, and on what budgetary format is used. One does not have to be a doctrinaire budget-balancer to be alarmed at a deficit of this size at this stage of the economic game. A huge budget deficit adds unconscionably to the interest burden which future taxpayers are asked to pay. More immediately, borrowing by the Treasury to meet such a deficit inevitably tightens money and raises interest rates to an undesirable level, with most harmful consequences to homebuilding, small business, and State and local government borrowing.

A LESS THAN FULL EMPLOYMENT ECONOMY

Second. The economy still has some slack in it. Unemployment has risen to 4.3 percent of the work force, and only 84 percent of our industrial capacity is being used, compared to 91 percent a year ago. Increasing unemployment falls hardest on marginal groups in our society such as Negroes and teenagers. If an across-the-board tax increase is enacted, it will inevitably slow demand, retard economic growth, and cause more people to be thrown out of work, particularly Negroes and teenagers.

WORRISOME PRICE INCREASES

Third. Selective price increases are pushing up the cost of living at a rate in excess of 3 percent a year—too high both in terms of equity at home and our balance of payments abroad. Clearly, with our current unemployment and our current rate of industrial capacity usage, these price increases are not the result of present demand-pull inflation on an overall basis.

In the administered price cost-push industries—such as steel and automobiles, excessive wage and price increases have come about less because of excessive demand than because of inadequate demand: lowered corporate profits, themselves the result of inadequate overall demand, have induced management to raise prices in order to make up for lowered profits. In the increasingly large service sector of the economy, particularly in medical care, prices tend to outstrip productivity because of lack of attention to the supply side; we simply do not have an adequate program of Federal aid to medical schools, for instance, and the resulting shortage of physicians raises the price of medical care.

A third sector of the economy showing unnecessary price increases is in those industries, largely defense and space, where there is an excessive demand created by the Government itself.

Confronted by this 1967 economic scenario—a huge deficit, a less than full-employment economy, and worrisome selective price increases—what would have been, and what could now be, a sensible program to reduce the deficit and/or moderate price increases, with a minimum diminution of the demand needed to keep the economy moving forward? I have been suggesting all through 1967, and I suggest again, a four-point program directed at this end.

1. PLUGGING TAX LOOPHOLES

Point No. 1. A loophole-plugging tax program that should raise as speedily as possible $4 to $5 billion a year, with a minimum impact on the necessary overall level of demand. H.R. 13490, introduced last October 12 as the Tax Reform Act of 1967 for myself, Mr. REES, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. DOW, and Mr. MEEDS, would plug or substantially diminish 10 major leaks in

our present tax system, and would yield to the Treasury $4 to $5 billion annually in lost revenues. The bill, which is described in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 12, would plug the following loopholes with the following potential revenue gains:

Title II: Taxing capital gains untaxed at death—savings, $2.5 billion.

Title III: Eliminating the unlimited charitable deduction—savings, $50 million.

Title IV: Eliminating special tax treatment for stock options—savings $100 million.

Title V: Eliminating the $100 dividend exclusion—savings, $200 million.

Title VI: Eliminating the benefits derived from multiple corporations—savings $150 million.

Title VII: Removing the tax exemption on municipal industrial development bonds—savings, $50 million.

Title VIII: Reducing the mineral depletion allowance from 27½ to 15 percent on oil and from 23 to 15 percent on 41 other minerals—savings, $800 million.

Title IX: Establishing the same rate for gift and estate taxes—savings, $100 million.

Title X: Eliminating payment of estate taxes by the redemption of Government bonds at par—savings $50 million.

Title XI: Eliminating accelerated depreciation on speculative real estate—savings, $100 million.

IT WOULD INCREASE EQUITY

H.R. 13490 has two purposes: to increase equity in our Federal tax system, and to raise additional revenues in a manner that is least disruptive to the demand needed to take a full-employment product off the market.

The need for increased equity was well described by Chairman WILBUR MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee in the November 23, 1959, issue of Life magazine:

> [T]he laws are full of special provisions through which a shrewd or lucky taxpayer can often escape paying anywhere near his full share . . . If we have a tax system riddled with preferential benefits and falling on only a part of our economy, the heavy tax burden on those that must carry more than their share will limit our whole national program. As I see it, a fair and equitable tax system is not only desirable for itself but well may be an element in our national survival.

AND RAISE REVENUE WITHOUT FRACTURING DEMAND

What about the impact of a loophole-plugging measure on demand?

The administration's across-the-board tax increase would raise revenues only at the price of removing from the demand side of the equation funds which would otherwise be spent by consumers on goods and services, or by investors in new productive plant and equipment. The moneys returned to the Treasury by plugging tax loopholes, on the other hand, would very largely be moneys which now rest in the pockets of tax avoiders and contribute neither to adequate consumption nor to real investment. In large part, they go to less desirable uses, such as bidding up the price of already inflated real estate, contributing to activity in the stock market, or leaving the country in speculative foreign investment in companies, industrial equipment, or commodities, including gold.

There is considerable reason to suspect, for example, that much of the recent gold flurry in London, Paris, and Zurich was fueled by American flight capital that came into being in the first place because of our leaky, loophole-ridden tax system.

We would need to plug these tax loopholes as speedily as possible even were the budget deficit a great deal smaller than it is. The aim of the new economics is to produce full employment and adequate economic growth, stable purchasing power, and a roughly balanced budget all at the same time. But this requires that our after-tax income distribution be such as to maintain enough demand to take the country's full employment production off the market.

MALDISTRIBUTION OF INCOME IMPAIRS DEMAND

Increasingly, our income distribution system tends to favor the high-bracket taxpayer, who cannot find adequate opportunities for profitable capital investment and who thus tends to save a larger part of his income, as against the low-bracket taxpayer, who tends to spend what he gets. Thus the Government must either deficit-spend to make up for the portion of the income stream which never gets spent by reason of this maldistribution of income, or see the economy progressively become more stagnant.

A large part of the shortfall in demand, as I have indicated, comes about because our tax system is so shot through with these loopholes. To make matters worse, Federal tax reductions in the last 15 years have been heavily weighted in favor of the high-bracket taxpayer, as against the low-bracket taxpayer. These include the revisions in the general tax rate and the more liberalized treatment of depreciation of 1954, the accelerated depreciation and investment tax credit of 1962, and the tax revisions and reductions of 1964.

Moreover, the successive increases in the social security payroll tax took large bites out of the pockets of lower income people, who would otherwise have been spending that money. And meanwhile, regressive State and local property and sales taxes were taking an ever larger bite out of the same pockets. Only the excise tax decreases of 1965, and the provision of the 1964 act dividing the first $2,000 income bracket into four steps with much lower rates, did much to promote consumption among lower income groups.

Joseph Pechman and John G. Gurley of the Brookings Institution have carefully documented the effect of our jerry-built tax system in increasing the share of income retained by corporations, at the expense of lower-income individuals.

THE RELATIVE TAX BURDEN OF CORPORATIONS DECLINES

Federal corporate income taxes as a percentage of profits before taxes, plus capital consumption allowances, fell from 33 percent in 1954 to about 26 percent in 1965. The reduction in taxes paid by corporations at 1966 levels of profits and investment as a result of these measures was around $6.5 billion, and $8 billion if effects of depletion allowances are included. These generous depreciation allowances and the investment tax credit have boosted the rate of return on 10-year assets from 10 percent to 12.5—a jump of 25 percent.

Inflation has not only pared the growth in real spendable wage incomes. In the case of wealthy individuals, reported income is only a small part of their total income, which also includes changes in the value of their assets. These capital gains, to a large extent, escape taxation altogether. According to Federal Reserve studies, the distribution of wealth is far more unequal than the distribution of income. In 1962, the top 10 percent of consumer units, ranked by income, received 30 percent of total income and owned 45 percent of total wealth. The top 5 percent received 20 percent of total income and owned 38 percent of total wealth.

Among consumer units having incomes of $100,000 and over, 93 percent had a net worth of at least half a million dollars, and 37 percent had a net worth of at least $1 million. It is quite obvious that some inflation, say, of 5 percent in a year, improves their position relative to the consumer unit at the midpoint of the wealth distribution, having a net worth of $6,721.

Meanwhile, the distribution of income appears to be shifting away from consumer spending-oriented wage income toward savings-oriented corporation income. According to the Joint Economic Committee staff, employee compensation as a percentage of gross corporate product fell from 65.1 percent in 1961 to 62.9 percent in 1965; corporate profits after tax increased from 7.4 percent to 9.6 percent in 1965; corporate cash flow—capital consumption plus profits after income taxes—increased from 16.6 percent to 19.1 percent during this same period.

In manufacturing, the index of corporate profits after tax per unit of output rose from 88 to 118—1957–59 equals 100—from 1961 to 1965; and the index of capital consumption allowance per unit of output rose from 104 to 111. The profit rate after taxes for manufacturing corporations was 5.9 percent of sales in the second quarter of 1966, which was the highest since the fourth quarter of 1950. As a percent of stockholders' equity, after tax profits amounted to 14.7 percent—also the highest rate since the fourth quarter of 1950.

HIGHER INTEREST RATES DISTORT INCOME SHARES

There has also been a precipitous rise in interest rates. For example, the yields on U.S. Government bonds and notes of from 3 to 5 years maturities have risen from an average of 3.6 percent in 1961 to approximately 5.8 percent in November 1967. These higher interest rates have had important redistributive effects in themselves. But, in addition, the credit crunch of 1966 caused a drastic decline in construction activity, the impact of which fell most heavily on lower income groups.

Unemployment in construction is concentrated among the relatively unskilled and the nonwhite worker; and the short-

age in housing is felt most severely by the lower income groups. Any deceleration in the rate of formation of new houses forestalls the turnover process which enables lower income groups to move into better housing.

TIME TO SUBMIT A LOOPHOLE PACKAGE

The administration is not going to get a loophole-plugging package from Congress unless it asks for one, and vigorously works for it. Each of the special interests which profits by a particular loophole has its votaries in Congress, who will presumably fight to the end to protect that particular loophole. But if the administration will summon the overall national interest, I am by no means sure that Congress could resist a loophole-plugging package, even though the package might tread on a few toes.

For many years I and other Members have been urging the plugging of loopholes. This year, in 1967, with the horrendous budget deficit facing us, the time seemed ripe. Last February 3, when the Joint Economic Committee was considering the President's 1967 Economic Report, I asked Secretary of the Treasury Fowler:

Representative REUSS. The Economic Report mentions some scandalous loopholes in interest exemption of high-bracket taxpayers, and there are a lot more, such as abuses of capital gains, that aren't even mentioned. Why not send up a good loophole-plugging program that raises $3 to $5 billion, and let Congress take the onus?

Secretary FOWLER. Congressman Reuss, you will have an opportunity to deal with some of these problems, because in the President's Economic Message, he said that there will be a second tax measure which would come forward . . .

Representative REUSS. I would say that the long day's battle on loophole-plugging is not going to begin until the Administration sends up its loophole-plugging package, and there is enough in the collected works of (Assistant Secretary of the Treasury) Stanley Surrey, sitting behind you, to get together a great package.

Secretary FOWLER. I have him very busy on lots of things, but you will have your package, Congressman Reuss.

Today, with the year's end approaching, I continue to await the administration's tax-plugging package.

2. SELECTIVE EXPENDITURE CUTS

Point No. 2. The budget deficit should be diminished not only on the revenue side, by a loophole-plugging measure, but on the expenditure side, with cuts particularly in those areas where the Government itself contributes to inflationary price increases—areas such as defense, space, and unnecessary projects such as the supersonic transport plane.

Neither the administration nor the Congress deserves any medals for its approach to budget cutting. Both have been long on generalized pleas for cutting down on spending programs, but short on the specifics of what programs are supposed to be cut. The fiscal 1969 budget to be presented next month offers a new opportunity.

I hope that the administration will provide adequate sums for the great priorities of domestic need—housing, welfare, antipollution, aid to cities. Let the cuts be centered in those areas which are already inflated by excessive Federal demands on scarce scientific and engineering manpower, such as the areas I have just mentioned. This would represent a sensible reorientation of values. If the Congress wishes to buck such a budget, it will have to take the blame for it.

3. WAGE-PRICE GUIDEPOSTS

Point No. 3. A third sadness of the economics of 1967 has been the administration's jettisoning the wage-price guideposts. During the period 1961 to 1966, the wage-price guideposts, however haphazard their administration, contributed greatly to our excellent record of price stability. Wage-price guideposts are no substitute for sound fiscal and monetary policies, but they are a necessary adjunct to them.

This year's report by the Joint Economic Committee recommended not only maintaining the wage-price guideposts, but broadening the chances of their public acceptance by bringing in labor and management for both their formulation and their administration. As a matter of equity, some part of the increase in the Consumer Price Index should be added to the increase in productivity, on a short-run basis.

The Joint Economic Committee also recommended that the executive branch, through a new agency, "be authorized to hold factfinding hearings and make recommendations concerning wage-price behavior in the public interest."

Meaningful wage-price guideposts are particularly useful to combat the kind of price increases that we are now experiencing—price increases not due to overall demand, but to cost-push, particularly in the administered price industries. They need to be accompanied, as I have suggested, by action by the Federal Government to cut its expenditures in those areas where the Federal Government is itself causing the inflationary demand. Wage-price guideposts need to be accompanied, too, by specific action by the Federal Government on the supply side, particularly in the services where prices are rising. I am thinking here of adequate Federal programs to increase the number of physicians, dentists, nurses, and medical technicians, and expanded manpower training programs designed to increase entrance into the service fields, such as TV and auto repairmen.

4. STANDBY GENERAL TAX INCREASE

Point No. 4. As I have said, the administration's across-the-board tax increase proposal is the wrong medicine at a time like 1967. It would simply retard growth and employment, without very meaningfully coming to grips with the kinds of price increases that we in fact have. But I recognize the possibility that in the future the economy may in fact heat up to the point where a classic demand-pull inflation is in fact upon us. This could occur from—God forbid—escalation of the war in Vietnam, from a change in consumer buying practices in favor of less saving and more buying, or from causes which may not occur to us now but could come into being with astonishing rapidity.

If this happens, an across-the-board tax increase such as the administration has been proposing all through 1967 would finally make sense. I want to do everything possible to make sure that such a tax increase can be put into effect promptly, without waiting for months while Congress debates the witty diversities of a particular general tax increase. Accordingly, I repeat the recommendation made last March in this year's report of the Joint Economic Committee by Representative BOLLING and myself:

We therefore recommend that the Ways and Means Committee in the House and the Finance Committee in the Senate proceed at once to consider, and report to the respective Houses for enactment, legislation providing for a tax increase along the lines recommended by the Administration. But to satisfy those alarmed by recent bearish economic reports, it should follow the path recommended last year by our Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy, that the tax increase should go into effect *only* after a congressional joint resolution is passed.

Indeed, in view of the lateness of the hour, and the excessive burden on monetary policy, a temporary general tax increase, to be repealed or adjusted downward as soon as a loophole-plugging bill can be passed, should be seriously considered.

What I have been saying, then, is that a rational response to the economic situation which confronts us is not an immediate, across-the-board tax increase, but a combination of a tax loophole-plugging program, selective budgetary cuts, reinvigorated wage-price guideposts, and a standby general tax increase.

DO WE NEED THE TAX INCREASE TO PROTECT THE DOLLAR?

But we need to ask whether the recent excitement in the world of international money may have changed this, and made an immediate across-the-board tax increase suddenly more wise and desirable than was the case a month or two ago. The international money flareup was marked by the devaluation of the pound sterling; by the gold speculation in London, Paris, and Zurich; and by the anvil chorus of the European central bankers chanting that an across-the-board tax increase now was imperative.

None of these reasons, in my judgment, is persuasive.

The devaluation of sterling produced a healthier international money situation, not a more precarious one. Prior to the devaluation, there was a real danger of a flight from pounds into dollars, and of the dollar getting into the hands of foreign central bankers who would forthwith have demanded gold for their dollars. The British devaluation, by averting this danger thus improved the position of the dollar.

The gold speculation, now subsided for the time being, was caused not by the failure of the U.S. Congress to pass a tax increase, but by residual suspicions on the part of the speculators that the United States might be contemplating an increase in the price of gold. President Johnson's firm statement that the speculators were due for a disappointment helped restore calm. We could make our commitment not to increase the price of gold even more credible by removing the remnants of the archaic gold cover on

the dollar, which now immobilizes more than $10 billion of our approximately $12.9 billion gold holdings.

My bill, H.R. 6428, to remove the gold cover was introduced last March 1. It should have been passed months ago. With administration support, it should be, and could be, passed immediately.

As for the demands of foreign central bankers that we pass an across-the-board tax increase to humor them, it is enough to say that they have frequently been wrong. They were wrong when they successfully advocated deflationary policies in the United States in the late 1950's, with the result that we enjoyed both a stagnating economy and an inflationary price increase at one and the same time. They were wrong when they successfully urged deflationary policies upon the British labor Government 3 years ago. The British stagnated, but without the desired reduction of prices. In the end, it took a devaluation of the pound for Britain to achieve a better foreign trade position.

Indeed, one can argue that an across-the-board U.S. tax increase now could hurt the international position of the United States. For U.S. firms to compete internationally, and thus improve our balance of payments on trade, requires expanded investment in new productive techniques and new products for foreign markets. If anything, the stability of the dollar requires that we consider specific export tax incentives, the direct opposite of the administration's tax increase proposal.

If 1967 will go down in economic history as the year that the locusts have eaten, 1968 is another year. A new economic program may not be popular with the tax avoiders who so ardently resist loophole-plugging, with the defense and space contractors who by hoarding scientific manpower are contributing to inflation, or with the elements of both management and labor who oppose meaningful wage-price guideposts.

But it would, I think, be popular with the great majority of Americans who believe in the national goal of full employment without inflation, and who recognize sensible programs to that end when they see them. If we play it right, 1968 can be a year to be proud of.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Would not the gentleman agree that even if we plug the tax loopholes to the extent that the gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned, of producing $4 billion to $5 billion a year, that this would leave very large sectors of the economy, the very large income recipients, relatively undertaxed in comparison with the vast number of middle-class people?

Mr. REUSS. Yes; I certainly would.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, who lends such luster to our debates here and who has had such a fine career in economics before becoming a Member of the House, for the point that he is making, that quite apart from these loopholes which should be plugged, our income distribution system in recent years has shown a tendency to redistribute income away from wage earners and moderate-income taxpayers to those at the upper end of the scale. This has a tendency to skew income distribution in such a fashion as to make it doubtful that the spending power in any one economic period is sufficient to take off the market that which has been produced in that period.

I, who believe deeply in the private enterprise system, am most anxious to prove that Karl Marx was wrong, and that capitalism does not carry within itself the seeds of its destruction. But that makes it much more imperative that we review our income distribution system to see whether our total taxing system indeed brings about a system of distribution which results in enough spending power and enough real investment to make sure that we do not stagnate, but that we keep going forward.

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

Mr. REUSS. I will yield to the gentleman.

But first may I say, I am very pleased this afternoon to have two of the really first-rate economic thinkers in the House of Representatives here this afternoon, the gentleman from Maryland, with whom I have just had a colloquy, and now the gentleman from Ohio who is also a distinguished professional economist. I want particularly to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio on the scholarly, thoughtful and ably delivered address which he made earlier this week on this same problem of taxation, and the problem of where our economy is going.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHALEN. I thank the gentleman.

I wonder if I might rephrase what the gentleman has just stated with respect to the need for more equity in the tax system?

As I understand it, it is your belief that if an across-the-board tax increase as proposed by the administration is adopted its effect would be, especially among the middle and lower income brackets, to take away money that otherwise would be spent. Whereas, if greater equity is put into our tax system along the lines that you have suggested, it would affect only those in the higher income brackets whose additional income is not spent but is rather saved?

Mr. REUSS. That is precisely the point. A tax increase whose impact is largely on the moderate income taxpayer is going to sop up consumer spending power and real investing power which would otherwise come into being.

On the other hand, if you generate your revenues—and we are all willing to stipulate that we need to generate revenues—if you generate your revenues by reaching into enclaves and pockets where there are tax loopholes, you, by and large, are tapping money which, had it not been tapped by the tax collector, would not have been spent either for consumer goods or for real investment in plant and equipment.

I am not suggesting that this money, metaphorically speaking, stays in the mattress. What I am suggesting is that a large part of it goes into bidding up the price of real estate, bidding up the price of equities on the stock market, and into speculative investment abroad, including speculative investment just a couple of weeks ago in gold on the London-Paris-Zurich markets. There is strong reason to believe that part of that mad money was money which stayed in the pocket of some tax-avoider and thus was able to do his country a great deal of potential harm overseas.

So I think it is very important that our future tax system—and I hope we will get to it next year—will be one that leaves the maximum amount of real, effective demand in the economy consistent with getting the maximum amount of revenues into the Treasury.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Would the gentleman share my view that the unfair feature of our tax structure is that the great masses of people, the great majority of people, earn their money by working for employers and must pay the tax bill the Government presents to them; whereas the well-to-do, the person who is rich enough, can choose the way in which he gets his income, and he can so manipulate the way in which he gets his income that he can almost get out of taxes altogether, if he so desires?

Would the gentleman also agree with me in my reservation to the proposed increase in the surtax that if we go ahead and raise this tax—and I think there are perhaps many reasons why we ought to—we nevertheless take away all pressure to overhaul our tax system, and the tax system as it is now, with all its anomalies, will simply go on and on?

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman has made two extremely valid points: First, it is entirely true that tax avoidance is something which the high-bracket taxpayer especially benefits by. For example, in the last year for which we have figures, in 1965, there were several hundreds of Americans who made a before-tax income of more than $1 million a year. They were not just millionaires. They made more than $1 million. Of that number, 28 have such skillful lawyers that they were able to avoid all Federal taxation altogether. They did not pay a penny of income tax. That, from the standpoint of equity, certainly does not sit well on the workingman or the small businessman or, for that matter, the widow, who by and large is taxed on every penny of income which comes into the household.

The second point the gentleman made is equally well taken. I would be the first to admit that tax reform is not readily come by. But I would be very certain that if we put another bracket of taxation on the average taxpayer, the pressure to find new revenues would vanish. I do not think we would ever get tax reform.

So the first plank in what seems to me a sensible package in our economic platform for next month and next year is a meaningful and prompt program of plugging those loopholes and making more equitable the entire Federal income tax structure.

The second point is what I call selective expenditure cuts. Perhaps if the 435

Members of this body were given a sheet of paper and told to list their expenditure-cut preferences, no two would come out exactly the same. And I certainly do not want to press mine on my colleagues as the ones that should be made. But my own preferences are that those expenditure cuts not come out of the great areas of national domestic need—housing, welfare, antipollution, aid to cities.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on the matter of wage-price guidelines, would the gentleman agree that since the Government is such a large purchaser, the biggest purchaser in the land, that the Government can pursue more than merely moral exhortation in this matter of wage-price guidelines? It can, in its purchasing power, put some real muscle into their establishment and enforcement.

Mr. REUSS. Indeed it can, and in a perfectly proper, dignified, and democratic manner. I am not thinking of midnight telephone calls or investigations by police agencies. I am thinking, as the gentleman from Maryland is, of meaningful action in the Government's enormous role as the biggest purchasing agent in the land.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WHALEN. First I would like to compliment the gentleman for his fine remarks, and for what I believe is a very incisive investigation and exploration of what I consider to be one of the principal domestic issues confronting our country today. I believe more light certainly should be shed upon he question of the proposed tax increase.

I wonder if I might summarize the gentleman's views as I interpreted them, and then perhaps ask the gentleman either to agree or disagree with the summary.

First, it seems to me the gentleman did agree with the views which I expressed on the House floor on December 4, that a tax increase, the proposed 10-percent surcharge, is undesirable and not needed at this time.

Mr. REUSS. I entirely agree. It would increase the 4.3 percent unemployment and would cause further underuse of capacity, and it would not meaningfully come to grips with the various kinds of price increases which unfortunately we are now experiencing.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Has the gentleman from Wisconsin shared my experience? I have done as much reading and analysis of this problem as I could. Has the gentleman been able to find any assurance anywhere that if we were to put through this tax increase, either late this year or early next year, it would prevent inflation in 1968?

Mr. REUSS. No. I have not been able to find such an assurance.

I fear that next year, no matter what happens, we are likely to have a price creep on the order of 3 or even 4 percent. Partly that will be reaping the whirlwind which started a year or two ago.

I do not believe that an across-the-board meat-ax tax increase is a proper tool to combat the price increases which I regretfully see on the horizon.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Is it not true that the argument that a tax increase would check inflation is based on what economists have always called "other things equal"? If everything else remained the same and we raised taxes, it would have an anti-inflationary effect.

But is it not true the very impact of a tax increase would be to change all of these other things that we hope would remain equal? In other words, instead of getting expenditure cuts, they would not take place. Instead of closing tax loopholes, they would not be closed. Instead of doing what we can to eliminate an enormous range of bureaucratic inefficiency, especially in the Defense Department, these inefficiencies would continue, because no one would have the powerful incentive to stop them. So the real impact would be very largely dissipated in very large numbers of policies which would be continued and which would take place and even be carried on a little further than otherwise, and the pressures for inflation would move merrily on.

Mr. REUSS. I agree with everything that the gentleman from Maryland has said. I do not agree with some things that the gentleman has not said but which some other observers have said; namely, that the across-the-board tax increase proposed would be absolutely valueless in the first instance in dampening price increases. There are those who say it will automaticaly be passed on in costs and thus not make any meaningful contact with prices. It is unnecessary to buy such an extreme criticism of the tax increase in order to share the very real and I think soundly based observations of the gentleman from Maryland.

Now I yield again to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Maryland made a very important point. The principal argument we hear in support of the proposed increase is that it is necessary to thwart inflation. As the gentleman from Maryland pointed out, and as I mentioned on the floor on December 4, I think we have to recognize that we are going to have inflation in 1968 whether we have a 10- or a 20-percent surcharge. So I think it is important to recognize this and not accept carte blanche the argument that we need a tax increase every time the cost of living increases.

I have one other point to raise with the gentleman from Wisconsin in terms of my summation of your speech. This gets to the second question, which perhaps is really apart from the first issue; namely, whether or not we need a 10-percent surcharge. This is the need for tax reform.

I think the gentleman stated the case very ably. Also, if I interpret your remarks correctly, while tax reform will raise perhaps $4 billion or $5 billion in additional revenue, these $4 billion or $5 billion in additional taxes will not have the depressant effect which an across-the-board surcharge would have if put on the books at this time.

If the gentleman will yield for one question further, I would appreciate your elaborating a little further on your last point; namely, the idea of a standby general tax increase.

Mr. REUSS. Yes. I will be glad to. Perhaps it seemed to the gentleman somewhat inconsistent with my rejection of an across-the-board tax increase now. I would think that the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Maryland and myself would all agree, that if the country is actually faced at any particular time with a real demand-pull inflation, that is, too much money chasing too few goods, an across-the-board tax increase is precisely the medicine needed to get rid of that inflationary pull. What I am saying is, as I see the situation ahead, it could be volatile.

Perhaps the situation which the administration has been telling us is here now, but which I do not think is here now, could come into being later, sometime in 1968. If it comes, it might come very fast. Now it is an important value of our income tax withholding system that an income tax bite can take effect very fast, and sterilize income and prevent its being spent.

However, I would want to be sure the Congress could act with proper speed.

Mr. Speaker, I remind myself of the fact that it took some 6 months, from January to June—and I am not blaming anyone in particular—to do a simple thing like restoring the investment-tax credit earlier this year. I would not feel entirely comfortable if we bypassed the future problem of demand inflation and put it to one side.

In other words, I would like to have the Nation and the Members of the two congressional bodies given the opportunity to consider a general tax increase with its effective date postponed, and I would like to have it debated upon the floors of the respective bodies.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pass a prototype tax increase to take effect, if at all, only if the Congress finds that there is a full inflationary trend upon us. But I do not favor a general tax increase to take effect at present.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield further to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. WHALEN. This would not then give the President the authority to invoke the tax as has been proposed in previous years?

Mr. REUSS. I will state to the distinguished gentleman that President Kennedy made such a recommendation. To put it mildly, it was not favorably received here on Capitol Hill.

I do not think it is a realistic political subject in our day and generation. But I think that we can obtain the advantage of flexibility by some such device as I am suggesting. I thus add it to my package, because I want whoever listens to me to know that I am not debonair about the dangers of demand-pull inflation.

Mr. WHALEN. I wish to state, if the

gentleman will yield further, that I agree with the gentleman's analysis that it is possible that we might experience this demand-pull inflation.

As the gentleman suggested, first of all, there is the possibility of expanding our expenditures in Vietnam; and, second, the people may revert to their former rate of savings, which according to the Department of Commerce, would inject $8 billion into the economy. Certainly, we should be prepared for this possibility, although it does not exist at the present time.

Further, in my opinion, the gentleman from Wisconsin does have a very interesting proposal. However, I would like to reserve my decision upon it until further study.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's idea of a standby tax increase bears a resemblance to the statement which I believe was made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]—or, perhaps this is merely a rumor—to the effect that the gentleman was proposing a tax increase to go into effect if Congress were to cut spending by a certain stipulated amount.

Mr. REUSS. My suggestion is somewhat different, in that the appropriate trigger for an actual tax increase would be the state of the economy, and whether we had handled unemployment sufficiently so that we were pretty close to effective full employment, and whether we had increased our use of industrial capacity so that we were near the 91 percent use of industrial capacity which we enjoyed a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like to link the effective date of a tax increase to any particular expenditure cuts, even though, as I have indicated, wise expenditure cuts are essential. There is no direct relationship between the two.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I think in justice to one's statement of thought in this entire question, we, perhaps, ought to differentiate between the cost-push and demand-pull type of inflation, and recognize the fact that it is possible to bring about a cost-push type of inflation by taking money away through taxes. Certainly, this is possible.

Further, it is my opinion that one point which bothers a great many of us is the fact that in order to counteract a cost-push inflation by reducing the purchasing power through taxation, one probably would have to reduce the purchasing power so much as thereby to increase unemployment. It would be necessary to keep that level of unemployment at a point socially and politically acceptable as a means of viewing the cost-push problem.

I believe that is why so many of us are disturbed over trying to deal with cost-push inflation pressures by this taxation device. Would the gentleman agree with that general idea?

Mr. REUSS. I completely agree. One of the reasons why I envy the gentleman from Maryland and the gentleman from Ohio their life work in economics is that I believe, as we try to walk the tightrope of full employment without inflation, one has to mass all his weapons pretty carefully. Any 3-year-old can check cost-push inflation by causing a depression. That does not take any great genius. It does take some nice work with the various valves and gadgets so that we can come as close as we can to full employment, and to do so with a reasonably stable price level. To do that, I believe we have to do all we can against cost-push inflation.

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

REPORT ON CONFERENCE OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE ON EUROPEAN MIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATTEN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCCLORY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the recent Conference of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration—ICEM—from November 13 to 17 held in Geneva, Switzerland. This organization, founded in 1951, has provided continuing and useful service to our Nation and the more than 30 other member nations during the period since its establishment. The scope of ICEM operations can be more fully grasped when it is considered that more than 685,000 European refugees and escapees have been received and resettled through the ICEM program. At the present time, approximately 30,000 refugees per year benefit from the ICEM program.

The impact of mass migration of refugees—such as was encountered following the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, when 180,000 persons migrated from Hungary—has subsided. However, the movement of refugees and migrants from the nations of Eastern Europe continues to be a major problem and responsibility of the free world.

The ICEM conference was also attended by my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] who in addition had occasion to visit and study refugee problems in the Mideast about which he will report independently to the House membership.

The Geneva session was also attended by Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, who delivered a brief speech at the committee session on Monday, November 13.

The Judiciary Committee, which has primary responsibility in the areas of migrants and refugees, has been following the development of this organization and has supported the activities of ICEM since its inception. The inability of the House Judiciary Committee chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] to attend was noted at the Geneva session and disappointment was expressed because of his absence.

The position of the United States was ably represented at this meeting by our Ambassador to the United Nations operations in Geneva, Mr. Roger Tubby, and Mr. Elmer Falk, Director of the Office of Refugee and Migration Affairs of the State Department, as well as by other representatives in the area concerned with immigration and refugee problems; namely, Mr. DeWitt Marshall, District Director of U.S. Immigration from Frankfurt, Germany, Mr. Henry Falcher, District Director of Immigration from Rome, and others. Mr. MacGregor and I were assisted by Mr. M. James Cline and Mr. Don Benn of the Judiciary Committee staff. The analysis and careful coverage of the work of the ICEM as contained in the report of the House Judiciary Committee—Report No. 578—is evidenced by the fact that the Executive Director relied generously upon it in presenting his own report to the conference.

The Executive Director of ICEM, Mr. B. Haveman, of the Netherlands, announced his forthcoming resignation and intended retirement. This announcement generated a great deal of discussion regarding future activities of ICEM and raised the question of securing a successor at an early date to the present Director. Mr. Walter Besterman, the able and experienced Deputy Director of ICEM, appears to have the support and confidence of many representatives of the member states.

A great deal of time at the session was also devoted to the subject of the finances. It appears that even though ICEM has been receiving reduced contributions from the United States it has endeavored to carry on its full functions with diminished revenues. The delegates developed a revised budget and plan for expenditure which provided for a further reduction in the administrative personnel of the organization and authorized a transfer of funds from the migration loan fund and from the refugee loan fund, both of which have balances which may be devoted to operational expenses during the succeeding year. In addition, it will be necessary for the various member nations to increase their contributions by a total of approximately $350,000.

Support for the revised budget plan appeared to be consistent with the sound policy of living within existing revenues and establishing both a top limit on expenditures and a schedule of priorities.

While this was my first introduction to ICEM and its activities, I was impressed initially by the scope of ICEM operations and its relationship with such other international bodies concerned with refugee and migration problems as the United Nations, the Council of Europe, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, as well as nongovernmental organizations such as the International Council of Voluntary Agencies, the International Catholic Migration Commission, the International Rescue Committee, and the World Council of Churches.

It is important that the Members of the House should be aware of the significant contribution to our national welfare and interest made by ICEM and to contemplate both the difficulties and

the added expenses which would be encountered if ICEM activities were to be discontinued.

I noted, for instance, that a large percentage of the refugees who now turn from the Communist East to the free world West are both skilled and educated. They abandon their former homes with a fervent desire to progress in the freer atmosphere of the West. Their talents are in great demand in many of the Latin American nations, as well as in Australia. To the extent that we are able to provide technical and educational assistance through this multination refugee program, the pressures for unilateral financial and technical assistance can be reduced. This is particularly so in Latin America.

It is my expectation that the House Committee on the Judiciary will prepare a detailed report on this year's session of the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration which will be available later for distribution to all the Members of the House.

In addition, I would like to comment on one further aspect of my experience; namely, my visit to the ICEM refugee center in Latina, Italy. My visit included conferences with Mr. James Wagner of the Divsion of Immigration at our U.S. Embassy in Rome and Mr. Charles Rogers, director of ICEM activities in Italy. Both of these gentlemen accompanied me on my inspection tour of the Latina center. Some 800 refugees, mainly from Yugoslavia, were being processed at the Latina Refugee Center at the time of my visit. It is my understanding that a total of some 3,000 will have received assistance at Latina in the course of 1967.

Here, the refugees are interviewed by representatives of countries to which they may desire to emigrate and receive some language training in preparation for their intended environment.

The Italian Government makes an independent contribution and assumes a major responsibility for many aspects of the work at this refugee center. This is probably a responsibility which the Italian Government could not very easily renounce, since the refugees cross from Yugoslavia to Italy and require humane and compassionate treatment such as no nation could very well withhold. In addition, a large percentage of the refugees at the present time have suffered religious discrimination and seek the support which they find available in Italy and the Western World.

It was my feeling that the language instruction program at Latina was not adequate and that many of the refugees were merely receiving a type of institutional care while awaiting resettlement in the United States, Australia, Latin America, or elsewhere. There also seemed to me to be opportunities for utilizing more fully the time and talents of the refugees in supporting the operations of the center, including the improvement of its appearance and the accommodations available there. Such observations, however, should not be interpreted as criticisms since as I have indicated, a substantial contribution to the Latina refugee center and its activities is from the Italian Government itself and the ICEM role is limited both in financial support and in overall management.

In considering the work carried on at Latina—which is duplicated in other ICEM refugee centers in Austria, and elsewhere—it is well to keep in mind that if established and operated by our Nation independently the expense would probably be so great as to be virtually prohibitive.

Refugees with education and skills are sought and sorely needed in Latin America and other developing nations. However, it appears that too few migrate to the places where they are most needed. While ICEM policy appears to be to permit migration to countries where refugees desire to move, the most serious consideration should be given to encouraging resettlement of refugees in areas where they are most needed. The economic gap between the developing nations appears to be widening and ways and means must be found for narrowing this gap. Certainly, our Nation's participation in the work of ICEM can contribute to this end. Above all, we must reflect patiently and deeply on the continuing movement of peoples from one nation to another. This movement, while it may take on aspects in the future which are unlike any which have been experienced in the past, seems bound to continue in the years ahead. The usefulness of ICEM in serving our national, as well as the great international needs, is self-evident.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to all of my colleagues a careful review and appraisal of the ICEM organization and its activities.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the foregoing statement, I have a complete file of reports and proceedings of the Geneva conference, as well as the transcription of my daily summary which I prepared during the conference and notes and other memorandums, which I would be happy to make available to any of the Members who wish to inquire in further depth concerning the current status and programs of ICEM.

BUILDING BRIDGES OR DIGGING GRAVES?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, there is a saying, familiar to Communists, that should be familiar to all of us. It should be familiar to us lest it become not just a Communist cliche, but the obituary notice of the Western World.

The saying is this: That when the day comes to hang the capitalist world, the capitalists themselves will sell the hangman the rope.

Today, in the most respected reaches of our business world, in the most profound utterances of trade associations, in the debates of legislators, in the editorial columns of respected newspapers, there is precisely such a proposal being made.

We are moving, every day, toward the sale of the rope with which communism may hang us.

We are moving in this direction every time that we or a friend or an associate or a Congressman discusses seriously, or seriously proposes trading with the bloody-handed and bandit-headed regime of Red China.

Nearly a half century of tragic history has taught us the horrible consequences of bolstering, with our industry, the predatory planning of aggressor nations.

Nearly a half century of historic tragedies has taught us the terrible and inevitable payment that free societies can expect from tyrannies with which they trade.

Nearly a half century of the most evident history in this area has taught us that we cannot expect and, indeed, would not deserve another half century of the luxury of learning this lesson anew if we ignore it now.

Those who propose trade with Red China usually do so on the basis of two supposedly overpowering arguments. I will admit that they are overpowering—overpowering in their ability to withstand the attack of fact and commonsense.

The first argument is that trade with or aid to Communist nations builds bridges over which mutual understanding, trust, and eventually, peace may travel. The other is that if we do not sell to the Communists, others will, and that all we would be doing would be to pass up some very rich markets for the sake of political warfare or ideology.

One of the most dramatic answers to the bridgebuilding arguments can be found on any business day in virtually any working harbor of the Communist empire. Let me cite just one example. I read a dispatch from Stettin, Poland, as published in a Hamburg newspaper. Here is what it said:

> Weapons of the Polish armed forces are being shipped from the Stettin harbor in ever increasing quantities to . . . North Vietnamese harbors. Only freighters sailing under eastern bloc flags are being used for the passage. . . . The situation in the harbor of Stettin is characteristic of the results of the U.S.A. aid program to the communist regimes in Warsaw.
>
> While on one side of the Stettin harbor American wheat is being unloaded from freighters, on the other side of the same harbor weapons are loaded which are being used against American soldiers. There is agreement only in the issuance of credit: The Poles receive the wheat on credit and they in turn ship their weapons to North Vietnam on credit.[1]

There, in the most stark and understandable terms, is a picture of one bridge that our trade with communism has built; a bridge over which daily pours the commerce of war and destruction and on which, because it is so jammed with weapons, there is no room at all for peace, understanding, or trust.

There is, sadly, only room on those bridges for illusions at our end and the worst sort of Communist exploitation at the other end.

The second argument, of "why not, if we do not others will," is far less open to obvious lessons. Sadly, it involves a definition gap that shows four signs of being closed.

The definition is of the word "trade" itself. No one, I assure you, is more in

[1] *Die Welt*, Hamburg, 1 October, 1966.

favor of free trade as a civilizing agent than I am. No one holds more firmly than I the principle that capitalism and the free trade that inevitably it engenders is a force that can, over the years, do more than any other to keep the peace.

Capitalist nations, as history emphatically teaches us, are far too busy seeking power over their environment, over wresting the wealth that lies stored in the world and minds of men, far too busy with business itself, ever to embark on the wasteful, profitless adventure of aggression.

Yet, for all of that, I oppose trade with Red China in principle, in pragmatics, and in profit. Trade with Communist nations is not, to get to the nub of the argument, is not free trade in any sense of the word. It is not trade among free traders. It is not trade for trade's sake. It is part of Communist conflict planning—nothing more and absolutely nothing less.[2]

Let us look at just one fact, as overpowering in its stark lesson as the shipments of Communist arms was in the other example that I cited.

The fact is that we have yet to hear of the advocate of trade with Red China who is willing to enter such trade arrangements without—and mark this well—without elaborate assurances and insurance, even subsidies, from the U.S. Government.

In that fact alone we can clearly see the unarguable truth that even the most passionate advocates of trade with Red China are unwilling to seek that trade on a straight commercial basis and on straight commercial terms. No. They know as surely as we do that trade with Red China would not be commercial, but that it would be nine-tenths political. They know that communism and commerce are as alien as Leninism and love of peace.

Despite this, at the very top of our business community, and most notably in at least one of our largest business organizations, there is continued pressure for this Red trade which is no trade at all.[3]

Passing over that fact, however, these advocates of trade with Red China fall quickly back on the argument that others will trade if they do not—regardless of the nature of that trade.

Examine that argument closely. Is it that they fear the loss of real profits? Well, if this is so, why do they couple their pleas with pleas also for Government insurance, Government subsidies, and fantastically long-term credit arrangements which in normal commerce would negate all hope of regular profits? The reason is a nightmare of wrongway reasoning.[4]

What such advocates say, in actual effect, is that they want this trade with Red China simply as an excuse for Government supports which will help to make practical the opening of a market which otherwise would remain useless by strict business standards.

As to the eagerness of others to open that market if they do not—the argument is questionable. Other businessmen in the free world do not seem absolutely optimistic about the worth of trade with Red China.

They have seen more closely than we, perhaps, what dealing with Red China actually means. The British, for example, long have maintained diplomatic relations with Red China. For their pains they have got little more than constant abuse of their diplomats. As to trade, it should first be asked what Red China has to offer that is so immensely attractive.

They have such exotic and famed exports, of course, as hog bristles. But is the free world teetering because of a lack of them?

The one product they definitely do not have with which to engage in this trade, of which so many seem so fond, is cash. Their hard currency situation is, to put it mildly, miserable, and if there is neither product nor profit in trade—why trade.

Look at Red China's gross national product as an indicator of the sort of mercantile midget upon whom some of our merchants are lavishing such extravagant attention. It now stands at something less than a per capita rate of $95. By comparison, ours is $3,020, and even Cambodia's is $120. I mention the per capita rate particularly because, despite the fact of Red China's incredible population of some 750,000,000 persons, the productivity of that population is less than impressive.[5]

But even beyond the economic statistics of the dealing that is proposed, what is the long-range prospect of trade with Red China, the long-range impact on the security of all the other markets of the world and, indeed, of the world itself.

Let me emphasize that I do not ask this question as a matter purely of morality, political ideology, or patriotism. I ask it simply as a businessman should ask it—in terms of the continuation of a free market in which we may deal.

Red China today is deeply divided by several basic problems. One is the political turmoil, the power struggles, which show every sign of keeping the country on the edge of chaos for years to come The other is how to support the wide-ranging revolutionary, or, I should say, subversive activities upon which Red China has embarked, particularly in the so-called underdeveloped nations. Finally, there is the difficulty of supporting a tremendously expensive nuclear weapons program in the midst of an economy which is itself, overall, fairly primitive and decidely underdeveloped. All of this, in turn, is wrapped in the stark and simple question of how to feed a population which already has far overreached the agricultural production of the country.[6]

In short, Red China is a nation split between the grinding demands of simply keeping fed and the most rarified demands of nuclear weaponry.

Just look at the alternative outcomes of this tension.

Suppose that Red China remains isolated, as she now is, without a substantial influx of U.S. trade.

For one thing, her technological base will be stunted. Red China depends almost absolutely on Western technology for what industrial base she now enjoys and, particularly, for the base under her nuclear developments. Without Soviet equipment and technicians, as a matter of fact, this nuclear development still would be a paper dragon rather than a real and present danger. With Soviet aid in this area supposedly ended, therefore, Red China must depend upon the very nations she is sworn to destroy for the continued know-how with which to destroy them.

It will not do, either, to argue that trade could be maintained in such a way and with such good as to not strengthen the destructive capacity of Red China. There are no such goods.

The thimble that enables a housewife to sew more comfortably does not end there in its impact. It relieves steel demands elsewhere in the economy. It frees metal that may jacket a bullet, for instance.

The food that may feed a schoolteacher enables also the feeding of a soldier. The cloth that makes a dress frees other cloth to be used for battledress. The electronic tube that is traded just to power a record player relieves another tube to be used in a radar station. And so it goes. There is no possible way to trade with any nation in such a way that the goods traded do not, if only by relieving production facilities, enhance that nation's ability to wage war if war is that nation's will and way.

It is true, of course, that she might draw upon the trade of other nations for the plant and technology that she so badly needs. It also is true, however, that the greatest ready reserve of such plant and know-how in the entire world is right here in the United States. Trade with other nations would pose far greater problems for the Chinese than a sudden, supreme opening of American genius to be exploited by the men in Peking.

In particular, the United States represents virtually the only mass supplier of foodstuffs, and in this area it is not true to say that if we do not deal with the Red Chinese others will. Food is short in the world today. In Red China it is short to the point of famine. Again, the granaries of the United States represent the only truly massive ready reserve.[7]

Let us suppose that along with cutting Red China off from American supplies of food, technology, and plant and equipment—not to mention the consumer goods with which to quell the restlessness of a rebellious population—let us suppose that American diplomacy made it perfectly clear to our friends and enemies alike that we do not regard trade with Red China as free trade in

[2] Aleksey M. Rumyantsev, Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya Moscow, January, 1966.

[3] U.S. Chamber of Commerce, committee reports, 1966–67.

[4] Barron's, 16 January, 1967.

[5] The Asian World Magazine, February, 1967.

[6] An Economic Profile of Mainland China, Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Congress, 5 March 1967.

[7] World Food Budget, 1970; U.S.D.A., Foreign Economic Report No. 19.

any sense, that we regard it instead as merely tactical maneuvering in communism's plans for aggression.

There was a time, and not far back at that, when it was quickly accepted by many nations that trade with Red China simply supports aggression. That time was when we were at war in Korea. It was possible, then, to join many nations together in an embargo against Red China. Yet, today, Red China is engaged in an act of aggression no less surely, even if a bit less blatantly, than in Korea. Every reason behind the embargo of Red China during the war in Korea applies now during the war in Vietnam. And it is no excuse to say that our allies, today, do not share that view as enthusiastically as they did during the Korean war. It is no excuse, simply because we are talking first and foremost about U.S. trade with Red China. Surely this Nation should recognize that every reason which applied in Korea applies in Vietnam.

I cannot believe that it is beyond the reach of our persuasive powers, both economic and political, not to mention moral, to convince first one and then others of our allies, or even our enemies who receive aid or trade, that Red China is beyond the pale.

Surely it should not be difficult to convince our friends in Latin America that Red China represents a direct threat. Just recently the Mexican Government uncovered a massive Red Chinese operation, inside Mexico, to support and foster revolutionary activities against the Government there.

In our sister Republic of the Philippines there are reports of increased Red Chinese activity in support of Communist guerrillas there.

Africa abounds with instances of Red Chinese support of the most violent actions.

European statesmen have long been aware of Red China's looming threat. But against American indifference what have they to go by except an uneasy desire to steer a sort of neutral course, waiting to see which way the wind of American policy shifts this week or next.

If, instead of vacillation, both in Government and by industry leaders, the United States offered a clear call to face the facts of Red Chinese aggression, there is surely some hope that the response would not only be forthcoming, but forthcoming gratefully.

Already we have a precedent that is so obvious that it pains most Americans to see it wasted. We have the precedent of Red Chinese support of the war against us in Vietnam. It should not be beyond our consideration at all simply to cut all ties of trade and aid to any nation which continues to trade with Red China while she kills our men in Vietnam.

Oh, yes, there would be grumbling. But can anyone seriously believe that there are many nations who would prefer to deal with Red China rather than with the United States? If there are, they should be accorded the privilege.

At any rate, consider more of the alternative of tightening rather than loosening trade with Red China.

Would it, as some say, end any chance we have of improving relations with Red China? Would trade, in short, tend to mellow the Red Chinese leaders?

Let me ask these questions in return. Did trade with Hitler mellow nazism? Did trade with Mussolini mellow fascism? Did trade with the warlords of an imperialist Japan prevent Pearl Harbor?

The answers are so obvious that it continually amazes me that serious men would speak of dealing with Red China on the basis of hopes which they never suggested when dealing with other totalitarian and aggressive powers. On the contrary, trade with the leaders of Red China would reinforce, not weaken, their dedication to aggression, simply because it would reinforce their own positions of strength at home amid times of shortages and strife. Also, an increase of trade on our part would set in motion a spiral of relations with Red China in which our allies could be expected to join, thus destroying whatever solidarity against the bandit regime in Peking there might now be.

At present, Red China sacrifices virtually every other segment of her economy to her adventure in nuclear weaponry. With no Western supplies to make the shortfalls in her neglected sectors of the economy, the cost of the nuclear program would fall more heavily every day upon the shoulders of the long-suffering masses of China. Shortages would grind down to completely empty shelves. Hunger would grind down to widespread famine. A static standard of living would grind down to virtually a cave culture. Every single pain and sore of political discount would become a major wound, festering into revolts and resistance.

Overseas subversive activities would steadily be eroded by the weakening of the base depended upon to support them. The nuclear threat which now hangs like a sword over our heads would, at the very least, be blunted. How could it be otherwise in a starved and parched economy, walled off from the Western transfusions its sickness so clearly requires.[8]

The rule of thumb which such an action would follow is one that might well become a marching order of any sensible resistance to communism, any resistance which envisions bringing communism to terms with reality short of war.

The rule is this: Communist regimes should be made fully to pay the price of being Communist. As simple as it sounds, it has complex and significant meanings. To best appreciate it, look at the situation as it now stands. Communism, rather than paying the price that communism should pay, has been saved and served at every turn by the generosity or the greed of non-Communists. There is not a Communist regime on earth that has shown the skill to beat, torture, or exhort true technical innovation out of their captive peoples. They have all had to have outside help.

The whole of Soviet industry rolls on Western technology. Soviet purchases from the free world have characteristically been of pilot plants which they can copy. They have never joined the international copyright conventions so that such industrial theft has been easy.

As study after study has shown, this has all meant that the entire Communist world has been able to hold itself together mainly with bonds forged in free world factories.[9]

The captive nations of Eastern Europe, which have so often outstripped the productivity of the Soviet, have similarly done so on the remaining technical capital left in their unhappy lands from pre-Soviet times.

In one area where the Communists of many lands have particularly insisted on hewing to their ideological lines—the area of agriculture—we can see the failures most vividly. The Soviet Union remains a nation where some half of the population is chained to the land, and even so cannot feed the other half properly. Capitalist nations have long since freed their people from such grinding toil and find that very small percentages of the population, working with modern tools and technology, can more than adequately feed the rest of the population.[10]

And what has enabled the collective farms of communism to continue their food folly? Obviously, it has been the shipments of food from free market areas.

Under our rule of thumb, we would insist that a regime that so mismanages its affairs, and so restricts its people, pay the full price of its ideological insanity. In the case of communism, the first installment would be hunger, pure and simple. Communism cannot feed its people or its captives. Why should we?

Industrially, the picture is roughly the same. And if communism cannot adequately clothe its captives or its citizens, why should we? If communism cannot build factories for its future, why should we?

There is an answer one often hears. There are those who say that it would be cruel to let the subjects of Communist regimes suffer hardships just because of the shortcomings of their leaders. Examine that very closely before its emotional appeal sweeps you away.

Is it truly more cruel to refuse to support a tyranny than to feed and equip it? Would the people of Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, even Russia or Red China, truly be better off if we continue to support the tyrants over them? Or would they be better off, in the very near future as well as the long run, if we weaken the hold that the tyrants have over them simply by weakening the chains and the tools which those tyrants use?

Would it have been better to have supported Hitler all along, rather than have any of those he had enslaved suffer?

Is it better to force a declining standard of living on aggressor nations now, or is it better to wait until they are strong and then have all of us suffer in the flames of war?

Is it better for us to bleed slowly to death in Vietnam than to bring the war closer to the civilian population of the north?

Such questions are questions which should be answered in logic, not in the haste of shortsighted emotionalism.

---

[8] Economic Profile, op cit.

[9] Werner Keller, *East Minus West Equals Zero*; G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1962.

[10] Economic Profile, op cit.

And precisely such questions need to be answered in regard to Red China. Is it truly better to support her, to trade with her, to try and leach some illusory profits from her—and then face in the future a Red China armed to the teeth with modern weapons sweated out of an economy that would have failed without us—to face a Red China whose leaders have said they are perfectly willing to lose 400 million persons as long as from the loss they could assure the destruction of America?

In answering those questions we need to look very closely at the other of the alternatives mentioned in regard to trade with Red China.

Let us suppose, in considering this alternative, that trade barriers are lowered and that commerce with communism on the mainland of China becomes a matter of business as usual.

In the very first place, there would be at least one immediate domestic impact. The rank and file of American taxpayers would be expected to put up, in one indirect way or another, the added money that would be needed to insure those who are so eager to deal with Red China—but eager only so long as they can get Government assistance.

Also, there would have to be adequate financing of the extremely long-range credit arrangements that all Communist nations demand as one price of their dealing in the market place. Often, these terms run to five and 10 times as long as normal commercial credit.

Is that a sign of honest and open trade? Hardly. It is just another sure sign of the political nature of this so called trading which more often than not simply turns out to be aiding.[11]

Red China, also, would feel immediate domestic impacts. The hardships that might have to be endured to divert food and weapons to Vietnam would immediately be alleviated. The regime could use this breathing spell either to reinforce its domestic policies or to sharply increase its supplies to North Vietnam.

Should they pick the latter course, one wonders how an American businessman would work it into his annual report; how he would explain to his stockholders that the sales chart was moving up thanks to an arrangement which, as surely as a fuse setting off dynamite, would kill the sons and husbands of those very same stockholders.

Internationally, of course, the trade arrangement should have a dramatic effect also. Red Chinese efforts to subvert Latin American nations, for example, could move ahead far faster with homefront pressures relieved by American trade.

Red China's often repeated political warning that she would seek one, two, three, or a dozen Vietnams with which to bleed America around the world, would thus be made more possible by American shipments to the enemy.[12]

How many Americans would die in this trade? How much is an American life worth on a balance sheet? How much American blood is required to keep someone's books theoretically in the black?

Would trade mellow the Red Chinese? Did it mellow Japan's warlords when we sent them scrap iron? Did it mellow Hitler when Chamberlain offered him an olive branch? Does a dictatorship ever mellow when its hold is made more firm by outside help? Has one ever? The answer is a brutal no.

Internally, of course, trade with Red China would have profound effect. Red Chinese planners could carefully allocate resources to what they regarded as the highest priority items, making up with U.S. goods shortages in other areas. Under such a plan, it is fairly safe to assume—and fairly dangerous to assume otherwise—that the top priority would be nuclear development.

The major portion of what engineering skill Red China can muster could be diverted to weapons development. Plans for other production could be bought wholesale from the United States, then copied in whatever quantity needed.

There are those who immediately shout that we would send them no war goods. Of course not. We would simply send them the goods and equipment that would free all of their own productive energy for war.

There are those who say that Red China simply could not afford all of that, and that the market would be limited to simpler goods and less of them. But what is there that Red China could not afford if the credit terms are right? What is the limit to the number of contracts she would sign if the date of payment could be deferred say 5 or even 10 years?

By what stretch of a Pollyanna imagination can anyone suggest that given ample technical support from the United States that Red China could not write her own ticket on payments or on politics in the next decade?

In all such arguments we are simply being asked to bolster, to back, to build up the one power on this earth of which there is not the slightest vestige of doubt that it seeks ultimately the destruction of the United States, and that it regards war, even nuclear war, as a perfectly reasonable way of achieving that goal.

No matter how you rationalize it, we are being asked to sell Red China the rope with which to hang us.

Let me review the alternatives:

First. To add to, rather than relieve, the pressures now working against the Communist conquerors of the mainland of China; to hasten the downfall of the aggressive regime now in power over 750,000,000 human beings.

Second. To support the tyrants in Peking, to make it possible for them to divert their energies more to the production of subversion and weapons, and to permit them long-term credits with which to do it.

Let every politician or businessman who seeks trade with Red China be frank that he is choosing the second alternative. And let us be equally frank in telling him that we do not agree that this illusory trade should be paid for not only with our taxes but ultimately with our lives.

Let us make it clear to every politician who seeks our votes that we do not intend to send men to Congress so that they may support Red China; that we do not intend to give our votes to the digging of our own graves.

Let us make it clear, where appropriate, also, that we do not intend to give our votes to the board of directors who would buy a moment's illusion of profit with the risk of a lifetime's terror under the threat of a Western-supported Red China; and let us make it clear also that we do not intend to give our dues payments to organizations whose search for novelty leads to the support of trade with a regime that today represents the actual spearhead of Communist aggression around the world.

There is no honest and open, cash-on-the-barrelhead trade that America should reject.

But there is no subsidized, politically motivated trade with Communists that we should ever accept. We do not profit from such trade. Rather, we could well perish from it.

Remember, the noose tightening around us, if some had their way, would be stamped "Made in the U.S.A."

For my money—that is the worst deal in the world. And it could be our last.

[11] Barron's, op cit.

[12] Associated Press, 19 May, 1967.

PRIMITIVO GARCIA

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention of my colleagues in the U.S. Congress to an act of heroism that deserves our deepest respect and the widest possible circulation. A 23-year-old man, Primitivo Garcia, is dead as a result of his efforts to fight off hoodlum purse snatchers who had knocked down his pregnant teacher, Mrs. Margaret Kindermann. The tragic event occurred at night and on the street just after Primitivo and his brother, Alfredo, left a school building where they had been attending night-school class in English language instruction.

Seldom in my experience has there been such a response in Kansas City as there has been to this terrible occurrence. I have conveyed my personal respects and sympathy to the Garcia family, but want to share this episode with you. A promising young man is dead and our community is doubtlessly deprived of a solid and involved and conscientious individual. The best tribute to Primitivo Garcia would be that all of us provide the moral and financial support needed by the Kansas City Police Department under its able chief, Clarence M. Kelley, to make certain our streets are safe. No society is secure unless the most basic necessity is fulfilled—that residents can walk the streets of their community without fear and in complete security.

In this connection, the story can best be told by the eloquent proclamation issued by the board of directors of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Kansas City, Mo., and an article published in the Kansas City Star in its November

16, 1967, edition after the shooting but before young Garcia died. They are as follows:

[From the Kansas City Star, Nov. 16, 1967]

A BULLET FOR HIS INVOLVEMENT

Americans are criticized for not getting involved in unpleasant things that do not endanger them directly.

A young man from Chihuahua, Mexico, who would like to become a U.S. citizen, did not display this trait last night.

Primitivo Garcia, 23 years old, was leaving Westport high school after attending an English course when he saw a group of youth knock down the young woman who was his teacher.

He became involved. He pulled one youth away from Mrs. Margaret Kindermann, and engaged the youth in a fight.

Today, Garcia was in poor condition at the General hospital after surgeons removed a bullet from his abdomen.

Mrs. Kindemann, who is expecting a child in March, was back teaching her fifth grade class at Kensington elementary school.

And three youths, two 17 years old and one 18 years old, were being held by police, after witnesses identified them from police mug shots.

They are Bruce W. Scott, 17, of 3801 College avenue, John E. Dowden, 18, of 3625 Benton boulevard, and his brother, James Dowden, 17, of 3325 Benton boulevard.

Primitivo and his brother, Alfredo Garcia, had been attending English classes at the night sessions at Westport since October 1. It is the first step toward naturalization.

The young men are two of 10 children of Mrs. Gregoria Garcia. Eight of the children have migrated to Kansas City from Chihuahua during the last 11 years. Their father, who operated a grocery store in Chihuahua, died about five years ago.

Mrs. Garcia, Primitivo, Alfredo, and a younger sister, Irene, came to Kansas City about three years ago. They live in a modest but immaculate frame house at 2738 Holly street.

Alfredo, who was with his brother last night, said it seemed natural that Primitivo should dash to the aid of Mrs. Kindermann.

Mrs. Kindermann said she was standing in front of the Oak street entrance to the school waiting for her brother to pick her up when two boys jerked her purse from her. After being tossed around, the purse landed across the street.

There were plenty of people around, so I crossed the street and started to pick it up," Mrs. Kindermann said.

"I wasn't afraid because I saw two friends of mine (the Garcia brothers). They didn't say anything. It was like they were there to say 'We are here, Mrs. Kindermann, don't be afraid.' So, I wasn't afraid.

"Then I realized it was a gang of boys, not just two boys. And they knocked me down.

"When they knocked me down, they probably didn't know I was pregnant. I started to get up and said, 'I don't want to get hurt, I'm pregnant,'" Mrs. Kindermann remembered.

She said she was able to get up and one of the youths in the group handed her her purse.

By this time, Primitivo was pulling at one of the boys.

Alfredo said his brother had said nothing. He just reacted.

Alfredo said he had tried to restrain his brother, but Primitivo would not be restrained. Alfredo said his brother could not tolerate seeing Mrs. Kindermann knocked down.

After she had started away, Alfredo said, the action was refocused between the group of youths and his brother.

"I had thought, 'well that's all over,' and started across the street," Mrs. Kindermann remembered. "Then I heard one threaten something about a gun and I turned around and I saw a boy shoot."

She said she didn't realize Primitivo had been shot at first.

"I thought they were just trying to scare us," she said.

"I was walking away thinking, 'I must thank them for helping when they come to school next Monday.' And then Primitivo came staggering up to me.

"All of a sudden, he forgot all the English I had taught him. And so did Alfredo," she said.

She left Alfredo with his brother, ran in the school and called the police.

She said the Garcia youths are good students.

"They have been doing a nice job, they are very interested in learning English," she said. "They seem very enthusiastic."

[From the Kansas City Star, Oct. 27, 1967]

CONDITION OF GARCIA YOUTH NOW CRITICAL

Primitivo Garcia, the youth who was shot November 15, while trying to help his teacher who was being molested by several youths, was reported in critical condition today at St. Mary's hospital.

Garcia was transferred to St. Mary's Saturday from the General hospital, where he had been listed in fair condition. At St. Mary's, however, he was listed in serious condition, and a spokesman said the difference in listings reflected a difference in terminology between the two hospitals.

Today a hospital spokesman said the reason for the worsening of Garcia's condition involved many technical terms which, Garcia's doctor felt, the layman would not understand, and no explanation regarding Garcia's condition would be released.

In a letter signed by James W. Benjamin, president of the Kansas City Bar association, Garcia has been cited for his courage and willingness "to become involved."

"Perhaps the spirit which you have evidenced . . . will encourage others to be willing to be 'involved' in more than a passive way as good citizens and brothers toward their neighbors," the letter said.

Homer M. Ballard, vice-president of the People's bank, said that, as of this morning, the fund for Garcia totaled $10,161.

On November 29, 1967, at a special meeting of the Board of Directors of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Kansas City, Mo., called for the purpose of making this Proclamation, the following was adopted:

"Resolved, that Friday, December 1, 1967, should be proclaimed Primitivo Garcia Day, and that this day should be used to publicize and exemplify this courageous young man's actions.

"Resolved further, that the Junior Chamber of Commerce is honored and proud to bestow on Mr. Primitive Garcia posthumously our Outstanding Citizen Award, and that it be proclaimed that Mr. Garcia be cited for his valor and bravery, and that he did show and conduct himself in a manner truly in keeping with the concept of Americanism, even though he was not yet a citizen of this country.

"Finally, let it be proclaimed that the Junior Chamber of Commerce is proud of this young man, and that we wish to have him cited locally, nationally and in his mother country for his valor and bravery.

"BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
"JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE."

SUPPORT FOR H.R. 14228—TO AMEND THE ANADROMOUS FISH CONSERVATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my strong support for H.R. 14228, which would amend the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act of 1965 to encourage joint research and development projects by any two or more States in a lake basin.

I am one of 11 cosponsors of this important legislation, which was introduced by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman JOHN DINGELL, chairman of the Fisheries and Wildlife Subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Anadromous fishes, of course, are those that ascend rivers from seas or lakes for breeding purposes. An outstanding example of the potential importance of these fish is found in the recent case of Coho salmon in Lake Michigan. These fish were introduced into Lake Michigan primarily to help solve the alewife problem, but they have become a tremendous asset to the entire region.

The Coho salmon have adapted remarkably well to Lake Michigan, and have become a leading attraction for both commercial and sports fishermen. The tourist industry has experienced a great boom as a result. The value of these benefits cannot be measured in dollars, but it obviously would far outweigh the cost involved.

H.R. 14288 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to increase the Federal contribution for joint research and development programs from 50 percent to a maximum of 75 percent. It would also increase the overall authorization from $25 to $30 million, and boost the maximum contribution for a single State from $1 million to $1.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily recommend this legislation to the attention of my colleagues.

AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my extreme gratification at the passage yesterday of H.R. 13054, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967.

This is a long-overdue piece of legislation that will strike hard at one of the most serious problems facing our Nation—that of the over-40 age group which is so often the victim of unemployment. Although the United States today has one of the lowest unemployment rates in history, there is still a consistent average of some 850,000 persons aged 45 and over who are unemployed.

Of the billion dollars paid out each year in unemployment insurance, more than three quarters of it goes to persons aged 45 and over. These persons constitute 27 percent of all the unemployed, and 40 percent of the long-term unemployed.

The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 will enable the Secretary of Labor to launch a massive education and information program that will reduce the very real barriers to the employment of persons between the ages of 45 and 60. It also will make it illegal for employers, labor unions, or employment agencies to discriminate against workers in this age group.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will protect the rights of some 40 million Americans, aged 45 and over, who face the possibility of losing their jobs through automation or other reasons beyond their control, and then would be confronted with the barrier of age discrimination in trying to find new employment.

I think that this body has taken a great step forward in the battle to insure lives of security and dignity for all Americans.

OUR CONTINUING COMMITMENT IN THE HOME HEMISPHERE

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, on November 30, Mr. Covey T. Oliver, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, and U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, delivered a most enlightening and informative address to the Pan American Society of the United States—a sort of 5-month progress report on his stewardship over what he calls "our continuing commitment in the home hemisphere."

In estimating the importance of this commitment, Secretary Oliver asks us to keep in mind that:

This hemisphere is our home. This is where we live, and ultimately, it is here we must judge our own actions, and it is here we will be judged by others.

As an up-to-date analysis of our progress, as well as the distance we still have to go, to achieve the worthwhile objectives of the Alliance for Progress, I include this excellent speech in the RECORD:

OUR CONTINUING COMMITMENT IN THE HOME HEMISPHERE

(Address by Covey T. Oliver, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs and U.S. Coordinator, Alliance for Progress, at the Pan American Society of the United States, Inc., New York, N.Y., November 30, 1967)

Our nation is nearing the end of a year marked by a singularly intense stocktaking—of measuring our physical and moral resources against a multitude of national and international demands.

This survey has, at times, been painful—marked by a fear that perhaps we are not up to our myriad commitments. Some say we cannot continue to dissipate our energies on a number of fronts but must retrench and focus our attention on those problems of a demonstrably immediate nature. Some contend that our international commitments outside of Viet Nam should be curtailed or postponed until that conflict is ended or until we have solved the immense problems of our own cities and our own poor. President Johnson recently pointed out that there can be no absolute answer as to which claim on our resources should take priority, but that each man must make his own assessment and accept the responsibility for the consequences of his decision.

Tonight I would like to review with you what our commitment is in Latin America and how I believe this understanding fits into the broad spectrum of commitments—to ourselves and to other nations of the world.

In size and grandeur of concept, the task the United States and the other members of the Organization of American States have set for themselves under the Alliance for Progress has rarely, if ever, been equaled in history. But magnitude and nobility do not, by themselves, necessarily justify the expenditure of resources that may be required to finish the task. We in the United States must continually ask ourselves. What are we trying to do in the Home Hemisphere? Have our past efforts paid off? Is further effort justified when there are other urgent demands?

I will tell you what I believe are the answers to these questions. You, of course, must judge for yourselves. I would only ask that you keep in mind as you hear other arguments regarding what we can or should be doing, that this hemisphere is our home. This is where we live, and ultimately it is here we must judge our own actions and it is here we will be judged by others.

Just what *is* our commitment in Latin America?

Our present commitment was formalized in Punta del Este in 1961 and reaffirmed and strengthened by the American Presidents gathered in the same city last April. In the words of the Alliance Charter signed in 1961, we and our Latin American neighbors have pledged:

". . . to enlist the full energies of the peoples and governments of the American republics in a great cooperative effort to accelerate the economic and social development of the participating countries of Latin America, so that they may achieve maximum levels of well-being, with equal opportunities for all, in democratic societies adapted to their own needs and desires."

This is indeed a grand concept. Some would say it is too grand—that it promises more than can be delivered. I contend that, at the time this commitment was undertaken, it was barely enough to overcome the despair and distrust that had been bred into millions of Latin Americans by generations of neglect.

On the other hand, others reading the words of new hope for the hemisphere recalled the great success of our first massive development effort—the Marshall Plan—and thought of finishing the job in Latin America in a decade. But, by the time the American Presidents met in Punta del Este last April, all of us had taken better measure of the problems we faced. I am sure that each President himself had, at some time, been a little awed as the full extent and intricacies of the problems became apparent. It was no doubt to moments like these President Johnson was referring when he quoted to his colleagues from Ecclesiastes that "he who increaseth wisdom, increaseth sorrow."

But Presidents are, by force of office if not by natural temperament, a singularly positive breed, and it was not the disappointments and moments of doubt that characterized their mood. Instead, they reviewed the first phrase of the Alliance—the time of building institutions and defining courses of action—and affirmed that the right way to development had been found. Willingly, they shouldered even greater development burdens on behalf of their peoples and, in their final declaration pledged:

". . . to give vigorous impetus to the Alliance for Progress and to emphasize its multilateral character, with a view to encouraging balanced development of the region *at a pace substantially faster than attained thus far* . . ."

The role of the United States in this redoubled effort was delineated in the Presidents' Action Program: We assured the Latin American leaders that we would:

Support with increased resources their own increased efforts in education and agriculture;

Help them build the multinational infrastructure projects that would knit the vast region together;

Back up their concerted efforts to realize their dream of a Latin American Common Market; and

Harness our science and technology to the whole range of their development programs.

Our role, then, is one of support—and rightly so. I cannot emphasize too strongly that Phase II of the Alliance for Progress will be carried out *by* Latin America. It was largely they who outlined the Summit Action Program. It is they who drew up the timetable for economic integration. And it is they who will have to exert the major effort to see that the promise of Punta del Este 1967 is brought to fruition. While the theme of the Alliance is hemispheric cooperation, the final product of our efforts will be uniquely Latin and "other" American. The societies which they are building must function according to the needs and aspirations of their peoples. It follows that some, not all, of the experience of the United States can be applied to the task. Some, not all, of our knowledge and power is needed; it might not even be welcomed. The identification of which experience and what knowledge and how much power we should offer is one of our major continuing studies. We have learned much in our first years of working together; we still have a long way to go. In a way, we are working together to build a diverse hemisphere, and I believe this is as it must be. Diversity within our own country helped make us the strong nation we are. The same quality within our hemisphere should present no problem.

There, in brief, are the bounds of our formal commitment in Latin America—a commitment, we must remember, which grew naturally out of geographical incidence, a common heritage of liberty, and our own realization that the continued well-being of the United States depends on the well-being of our neighbors. Now what does all this cost, and can we continue to support any program at all in view of our other commitments?

Since the inception of the Alliance in 1961, this country has allocated for Alliance use each year about $1.1 billion or a total of more than $7 billion. Before leaving for the Summit meeting, President Johnson recommended to Congress an expanded assistance program to provide an additional $300 million annually for the next five years. This additional money would be used to back up our assurances of support for increased Latin American development efforts. Now 1.1 or 1.5 billion dollars a year is a lot of money, and I do not wish to denigrate what any one of those dollars means to the U.S. taxpayer who earned it. I think, however, that when we come to measure our nation's responsibilities against its resources, a broader perspective is called for.

Our Gross National Product is now approaching $800 billion every year. Our projected program of increased assistance to Latin America of $1.5 billion would have amounted to less than two-tenths of one

per cent of our national wealth. The funds authorized by the Congress this year represent even less. And when we recall that over 80 per cent of our assistance to the Home Hemisphere in 1967 was loaned—not granted—it is clear we are not depriving ourselves by our current efforts. In fact, it is estimated that our current annual assistance to developing countries in the region amounts to less than one-sixth of what we as a nation will spend on gifts to ourselves this Christmas. With this in mind, it is hard to call up the picture of Uncle Sam as munificent donor to the hemisphere.

The total annual GNP for Latin America as a whole is now approximately one-ninth of our own. We continue to develop from this broad base at a rate almost twice as fast as Latin America's. In other words, the gap between the economic well-being in this country and in Latin America continues to widen. Unless we counter this by helping Latin America to build up its capacity to use and benefit from its resources, this nation will soon be the only rich country in a neighborhood of desperately poor. We rejected this course of inaction in 1961 when we joined with Latin America in drawing up the Alliance for Progress.

Nevertheless, we as taxpayers have a right to demand that the dollars we do make available are spent wisely. Let us look at what Latin America did during Phase I of the Alliance—how they used $7 billion.

During the first five years of the Alliance, and in spite of an increase in population of approximately three per cent annually, seven of the nineteen Latin American members of the Alliance averaged better than the target growth rate established by the Charter of Punta del Este: 2.5 per cent annual increase in per capita GNP. Exports from Latin America in 1966 were 35 per cent above the 1961 level, and imports increased by 23 per cent during the same period. In an effort to improve Latin America's trade prospects, the United States is currently working with other developed countries to draw up a generalized system of temporary preferences for products from all developing countries. Trade among the members of the Latin American Free Trade Association in 1966 was 125 per cent above the trade level in 1961. In the Central American Common Market, which got on its feet since the Alliance started, intro-regional trade mushroomed from $32 million in 1960 to an astonishing and highly encouraging $186 million in 1966. This growth gives us an indication of the incalculable value of economic integration—a glimpse of what we can expect as the Latin American Common Market becomes fully operational by 1985.

These are some of the signs of long-term economic development. What was accomplished in the same period to provide direct assistance to the people? Since 1961: 746,000 agricultural credit loans have been disbursed, primarily to small farmers; 24,000 classrooms were constructed; 130,000 teachers received training; and 13 million textbooks were distributed.

Roughly 75 per cent of this work was done from 1964 to 1967. This reflects an increasing ability on the part of the Latin American countries to utilize properly funds for projects that directly improve the standard of living.

Those are just a few indications of progress that readily lend themselves to statistical measurement. The most important effects the Alliance has had—increased understanding and good will, and growing political stability—are more difficult to gauge. Nevertheless, it is evident that the countries of Latin America—historically dependent on the *coup* as a solution to difficult problems—are becoming increasingly aware of the value of constitutional change and democratic procedures. This, despite the social strains brought about by basic changes in economic structures, despite the large rural migration to urban areas, and despite the demands of an exploding population.

Since early 1966, twelve countries of the hemisphere have held successful elections, three of which replaced nonconstitutional regimes with constitutional governments. There has been no unconstitutional change of government in Latin America for the past eighteen months. Guyana and Barbados have joined the hemispheric family of democratic nations and Trinidad-Tobago and Barbados became the first new members of our inter-American system since the Charter of the OAS was signed in 1948. In 1967 the present democratically elected government of Guatemala celebrated its first anniversary in office despite serious threats from both the right and the left. Paraguay recently adopted a new constitution which was drafted with the participation of all major opposition groups.

And the Administration of President Balaguer has given the Dominican Republic the longest period of constitutional government in forty years. This breathing space has enabled that country to begin the arduous task of solving its basic economic difficulties, and a good start has been made. By any measure, the tremendous achievement of the Dominican people against heavy odds must stand as a shining example of what can be accomplished when dedicated leadership, supported by appropriate assistance from other members of the Alliance, resolutely sets out to bring democratic order and economic stability out of chaos.

The foregoing, I believe, presents a true picture of the progress we have made under the Alliance. To be sure, we have not begun to solve all our problems. Cuba, for example, remains an outcast that has seen its pretentions to Latin American leadership dissipate even faster than its purported economic gains. How best to meet the continuing threat of Cuba is only one of the many problems that remain. Yet the overall progress has been unmistakable, and it gives us reason for optimism.

If our progress in Latin American is so evident, why is it that some responsible observers still do not seem to be convinced that we should now support an expanded development program in Latin America? As I said, the answer to this question is extremely complex and includes many factors outside the area of my responsibility. Some of the criticisms directed against our present program are within my purview, however, and I would like to address myself to two which are often heard: one is the accusation that the United States is contributing to a Latin American "arms race", and the other that our programs emphasize economic development and the reform of public institutions to the detriment of our efforts to improve the social well-being of the people.

First, the so-called arms race.

Let me outline some of the reasons for our present military assistance policy in Latin America:

1. We accept the fact that the responsibility for the defense of any free and independent nation ultimately rests with those chosen by the country to insure its continued existence. This responsibility cannot be relegated, least of all to nationals of another country.

2. We and the majority of Latin Americans agree that the greatest threat to continued political stability in the hemisphere at this time is posed by internal disorder and subversion. Accordingly, our military assistance to the region is directed toward helping each country assure domestic tranquility during a time of massive structural change and to counter the activities of alien or alien-supported insurgents. Our programs are also designed to allow for the incorporation of the defense establishment in the development effort during periods of relative peace.

3. The defense needs will vary from country to country and from time to time, but any country with a defense establishment will have to keep its military equipment operational through expenditures for maintenance and replacement. We support efforts by developing countries to keep these expenditures at a minimum consistent with the relative demands of development and defense.

Within these limits, I believe that our military assistance program has been a success. Today, Latin America spends less on defense than any other area of the world except Africa south of the Sahara. During a period of increased attempts by Cuba and Cuban-supported elements to subvert a number of countries in the region, defense expenditures have actually decreased.

In 1947, military expenditures in Latin America accounted for 23.5 per cent of total government expenditures. This dropped to 12.7 per cent—almost halved—by 1966. During the same period, defense budgets as a percentage of GNP dropped from 3 to 1.8 per cent. Even more germane when considering the so-called arms race is the fact that only about one-tenth of these relatively small defense budgets is spent for military hardware—the rest going for salaries, maintenance, allowances, and other recurrent expenditures. The defense establishment also provides training to many who might otherwise never have learned to read and write or acquired a skill useful to them in civilian life. Furthermore, it must be remembered that a significant portion of money labeled for defense is spent in the civilian sector for such things as road building and other projects in the civic action programs undertaken by the military.

I think we can all agree that these figures add little meat to the spectre of Latin American countries rushing headlong into debilitating and unnecessary military expansion.

Within this context, let us consider the question of modern military aircraft sales to Latin America.

As is evident from the budget figures I have quoted, these countries have spent comparatively little in recent years to re-equip their air forces. This postponement was in line with the desires of all Alliance members to preserve the maximum resources for use in development efforts. Now the military aircraft in some countries are more than ten years old and are increasingly difficult and expensive to maintain. Technological advances in the field have left them with aircraft for which spare parts are no longer manufactured. Available replacements are, of course, more advanced than the planes they now fly.

Several South American countries have been considering for several years what military aircraft to purchase. They have held discussions with us and others. One possible replacement, the Northrop F–5, made in the U.S. meets the internal security and counter-insurgency needs of smaller countries. Alternative designs, without exception, are far more advanced and far more expensive. There are some who urge that we refuse to cooperate in assisting Latin American countries meet what these countries regard as their minimum requirement. Some urge that we not have anything to do with the matter, because if we do offer a moderate alternative, we would not be exerting our maximum influence against diversion of scarce resources from total development.

The question, however, is not susceptible to any simple solution. We are often faced with unhappy options. We can suggest a rule of reason, but we cannot dictate the defense requirements of another country. If we refuse to cooperate, the countries concerned may decide that their replacement needs require that they buy an alternative aircraft, perhaps in Western Europe, at an even higher cost to their development efforts. Introduction of such sophisticated aircraft

into the region could well escalate arms spending to a new and much higher level. It could also force the purchase of aircraft with performance characteristics Latin America agrees it does not need just to obtain the more limited performance it believes it requires. These are just the developments we wish to avoid.

We will continue to review this problem and as the Secretary has explained to members of the Congress, we shall well and faithfully execute the legislative requirement that we ensure that aid recipient countries do not significantly sacrifice economic and social development through unnecessary military expenditures.

Furthermore, we welcome recent initiatives by Chile and Colombia to define realistic limits to arms modernization that would be acceptable to all Latin American countries.

Development, as the President has pointed out, is not yet a fully mastered body of knowledge. Perhaps it is a field in which we will never be able to do everything by doctrine. In the Home Hemisphere we are working and learning together. We have come a long way—especially considering certain historical and psychological aspects of hemispheric relations—we have come an amazingly long way in dealing with each other, as if the traditional privacy of national internal affairs did not exist. But there are limits to this approach. These are fixed by human and national dignity, a requirement of modesty since no one nation has all the right answers, and an honest identification and then suppression of what Mr. Justice Holmes might have called our continued tendency to play God.

A second criticism holds that we and our Alliance partners are so busy with economic manipulations that we ignore the real goal of the Alliance which is to bring a better life to each person in the hemisphere. This is also fallacious. The decision made by the Latin Americans to work together for rapid development is itself a reflection of considerable growth in political and social consciousness. The impressive national plans drawn up by the countries of this hemisphere presuppose acceptance of the concept that social conditions must be bettered. But in order to improve social conditions, practically the whole range of national institutions must be reformed and new institutions established. Loans to small farmers cannot be disbursed unless some mechanism is set up to do so; houses cannot be built until the builders, the savers, the investors, and the buyers are all harnessed in a coordinated effort; new hospitals cannot be lit and new factories that offer increased employment cannot function without more power stations to generate the necessary electricity; and no farmer will ever be convinced that he should produce more if the existing transportation system means that the results of his extra effort will rot on his front step. The full effect of slowly growing infrastructure projects may not be immediately apparent to the millions who wait. But without them, an assistance program twice its present size would have no lasting effect. Let there be no mistake, we in the Alliance are working for people.

These are among the reasons why I am disturbed by recent attempts to ignore our continuing commitment to Latin America on the grounds that we cannot afford to meet it at this time or that Latin America does not deserve our extra effort. I cannot believe these attempts reflect the majority opinion in our country. Coming as they do at a time when we and our neighbors are expecting greater achievements, when the groundwork for rapid advancement has been laid, when the first fruits of our common efforts are beginning to ripen, these efforts to retrench strike a serious blow at the very keystone of our hemispheric relations—the Alliance for Progress. Already, many of my Latin American colleagues have expressed their concern that the United States may be turning its eyes away from Latin America, or that this country is returning to the outmoded paths of paternalism and protectionism.

When I accepted my appointment as Assistant Secretary, I told many of my friends that I approached the assignment with wary optimism. After five months on the job and after confronting some of the problems of the office, I can say that I am more challenged than ever but no less optimistic. This nation is not perfect, but I firmly believe it is great. I also believe that this greatness rises from basic idealism and willingness to help our neighbor. I do not believe this country will abandon this precept—especially as regards the people of our Home Hemisphere. I, for one, will do all I can to speak out, to counter misinformation and temporary lapses in fortitude as long as may be necessary to complete the task of building a new hemisphere composed of nations that have at last achieved ". . . the maximum levels of well-being with equal opportunities for all, in democratic societies adapted to their own needs and desires."

THE HALPERN HAND

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to salute a colleague "on the other side of the aisle," especially when one of his many talents gives his friends and associates a great deal of enjoyment.

The November 21 issue of the Roll Call carries a wonderful article about our distinguished colleague from New York, SY HALPERN, and his accomplishments in the art form. He is not only an expert caricaturist, but obviously, an excellent portrait artist.

I am particularly pleased to insert below the text of the Roll Call article, entitled "The Halpern Hand," a most fitting title. Unfortunately, the examples of the Congressman's art appearing in the Roll Call cannot be reproduced here, but I would suggest that it is well worth the effort to find a copy of the November 21 Roll Call. The photographs of the portraits of the attractive Mrs. Halpern, of Congressmen HALLECK and ARENDS, and of Speaker MCCORMACK, suggest that a look at the originals would be an inspiring experience.

The article follows:

THE HALPERN HAND—SY HALPERN COMBINES CREATIVE MIND AND ARTISTIC HAND TO PORTRAY HIS FELLOW SOLONS ON CANVAS

(By Diana Schmidt)

Caruso did some of the most rib-tickling caricatures of his day, and still managed to sing quite a bit of opera. Rep. Sy Halpern (NY), a caricaturist of equal fame, has nudged more than a few funny-bones, and still managed to accomplish quite a bit in the field of politics.

The talented artist-legislator recalls that he first began to sketch in elementary school, where he would copy pictures of Washington, Lincoln, and other awe-inspiring notables in the margins of his history book. The knack persisted, and in high school the young sketcher became art editor of the school paper.

By now, young Seymour Halpern was making himself known to the world at large. Pursuing his other hobby, autograph collecting, he made a sketch of P. C. Wren, the celebrated English author of "Beau Geste," and sent it to him. Wren responded with enthusiastic praise, and offered to sponsor a Halpern painting in an art show to be held at the Authors Club in London. The 16-year-old artist submitted "the typical American girl," which won first prize. Another project of this period was a life sketch of Helen Keller, who signed the sketch after posing for the youth at her Forest Hills home.

Graduating from school, young Halpern landed a job drawing cartoons for the Long Island Daily Press. Soon the paper began sending him to political and civic functions, to interview and sketch leading personalities. As he began to get his feet wet in political waters, the future Congressman also began to branch out into artistic independence. He wrote to prominent people, requesting interviews for sketches. They posed, or he would send sketches for autographs. Mahatma Gandhi didn't answer Halpern's letters at first, but eventually the correspondence grew to 22 letters. He couldn't break the ice with George Bernard Shaw until he sent a caricature, slyly making Shaw appear rather devilish. GBS responded with, "Have I deserved this?"

In the meantime, Halpern sought no formal instruction in the field of art. He read books on art—everything from do-it-yourself to heavy theory, practising what he read. Or, if he wasn't "hitting it," he would attend occasional classes at the Brooklyn Museum of Art for "little pointers" in color and application. During his newspaper career he worked mostly with pen and ink and lithograph crayon, but since then has worked mainly in the media of oil and pastel on canvas.

Rep. Halpern has become by now one of the most sought-after artists on Capitol Hill. Most of his work has been portraits, more meaningful, he believes, than "a group of apples on a table." His most recent painting is an oil portrait of Speaker John McCormack, begun eight months ago and presented in final form two weeks ago. The Speaker sat four times for the portrait during Congressional recesses throughout the year.

Other political figures whom the Congressman has painted include former President Eisenhower, House Republican Whip Les Arends, former Minority Leader Charles Halleck, and Thomas Dewey as governor of New York. When Rep. John Taber (NY) retired as a senior Congressman, Rep. Halpern presented him with a portrait on behalf of his Congressional colleagues. Currently, the Congressman is at work on a portrait of Minority Leader Gerald Ford and one of the family of Rep. Catherine May (Wash.).

Rep. Halpern estimates that he spends 30 to 40 hours of actual working time on a portrait, spread out over long periods of time, as he ekes out "an hour here, and two there." The portrait of Congresswoman May and her family has been in the making for over a year, and the Congressman notes that he has spent "hours on Ford's chin." He paints at his home in New York, and also at his Washington residence, where large windows admit ample light for the purpose. It is impossible to paint at night, however, since electric light distorts color. So he sometimes takes advantage of the dark hours to make preliminary sketches on canvas.

Painting provides excellent release from the tensions of a busy Congressman's duties. "Painting puts things in their proper perspective," comments Rep. Halpern. "When I am isolated with my work, nothing matters but a nose, or eyelashes, or the catchlight in an eye."

The Congressman has never painted commercially. Though he continues to insist he is only an amateur, his work invariably impresses the critics. When he was a state senator, his paintings were exhibited at various times at Grand Central Galleries, the New York City Golden Jubilee, the Gertz Art Show, the Queens Botanical Gardens, and Riverside Museum. Rep. Halpern never tries to sell his work, but has painted portraits to serve as grand prizes in charity raffles. As state senator he used to paint the winners of Cerebral Palsy raffles. During one TV charity talkathon, a donation of as much as $3500 was offered in exchange for a Halpern portrait.

"I like to express myself to people I like and who I know would like a painting," says Rep. Halpern. The delight of the recipient is sufficient recompense to the artist. He just wishes he had time to do many more portraits.

FAILURE OF THE FCC TO ACT IS COSTLY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, for quite some time now, I and many other Members of the House have been trying to get some action by the FCC to resolve the plight of the small businessman, the police, and other users of two-way radio who are desperately in need of an adequate amount of frequency spectrum in order to be able to effectively use their two-way radios.

A year and a half ago my Subcommittee on the Activities of the Regulatory Agencies, of the Small Business Committee, heard the testimony of numerous small businessmen about the almost unbelievable congestion on their radio channels which has resulted from the failure of the FCC to update its allocation of the frequency spectrum.

This problem of congestion due to an inadequate allocation of frequency spectrum which the small businessmen face is also a problem for the police and other users of two-way radio. In view of the emphasis placed by the President and by the Congress on the need for safer streets and better law enforcement, I think it is important that we be aware of how critical is the need for additional frequency spectrum by all of the users of two-way radio.

As far back as November 1965, the police commissioner of New York City wrote the FCC:

> Our need for additional frequencies is most urgent, and our entire program for improved law enforcement is dependent upon obtaining additional radio frequencies.

Pursuant to my request for information, I have just recently been advised by the chiefs of police of many cities that this is still a critical problem due to a lack of action by the FCC. For example, Newark, N.J., has only two frequencies for the use of its approximately 300 radio-equipped police vehicles and only one frequency for its 125 walkie-talkies. This means that all of the instructions from headquarters to as many as 150 vehicles must go out on one message channel and, at the same time, the men in those 150 vehicles may be waiting in line to reach headquarters with equally as vital information. One message each way to each vehicle would mean 300 messages in 60 minutes.

The Newark Police Department says that it needs twice as many frequency channels as it has to maintain an effective police communication system and it cites a number of instances where the lack of available frequencies prevented its men from carrying out their assigned duties. For example, police dispatchers have been delayed in giving out assignments and the assignments have backed up. Field personnel frequently could not come in with important messages. Administrative command personnel were hampered in getting on the air to direct or control the movement or deployment of personnel or revise tactical operations. Field personnel in the outer periphery of the city were unable to hear if the messages were being transmitted for want of mobile relay facilities. Time was lost because simultaneous transmission and receiving was not possible. Immediate contact with other law enforcement or local agencies was hindered by use of telephone and lack of an intersystem radio network.

The Newark police chief also said:

> The allocation of radio frequencies is a serious problem to law enforcement because of the lack of available frequencies.
>
> In our own case, even during normal operations, we are seriously handicapped because of the lack of available frequencies. It was a serious problem during the recent disturbance in our City and the solution to this problem is a reallocation of the frequencies, particularly to those larger cities who have considerable mobile equipment in the field.

Look at Chicago's problem. According to its superintendent of police, it has only 29 frequencies on which to dispatch approximately 1,800 vehicles and keep in contact with outside agencies. He also reports that the Chicago Police Department is engaged in a development program involving personal radios. The program is based upon having a radio in the police car to receive messages from policemen with personal radios and relay them with greater power to headquarters. To accomplish this will require 13 more frequencies. He also states that his department feels that it should plan for four-frequency radios for the field forces instead of the present two-frequency radios and that this will require additional frequencies. Then he points out:

> There is also the necessity for information flow to the beat patrolmen. It seems self-defeating to have the National Crime Information Center, the Law Enforcement Teletype System and our own computer files and then not be able to give the information received via these devices to the beat patrolmen because of lack of available transmission time.

No wonder he concludes:

> As you can see, the Chicago Police Department, as many other departments, has a frequency problem and law enforcement can be seriously hampered by lack of adequate facilities.

A letter from the police chief of Los Angeles is so significant that I include it in the RECORD as part of my remarks at this point:

CITY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 23, 1967.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Your letter of August 15 makes inquiry regarding whether or not "the Los Angeles Police Department has had sufficient radio spectrum space available to meet normal needs, as well as emergency needs." Succinctly, our answer is "No."

The Los Angeles Police Department has been plagued with radio frequency shortage problems over the past decade. The situation has become ever-more-acute since the Watts Riots in August of 1965.

That riotous period required total utilization of the Police Department's radio communications system and clearly demonstrated that additional message capacity was essential to the public safety of the City of Los Angeles.

As one specific example of how the radio frequency shortage has adversely affected operations of the Los Angeles Police Department and the community it serves, consider our lack of a much needed "City-wide emergency frequency."

Since the Watts Riots, it has been apparent that we have had a critical and immediate need for one frequency to be used as a City-wide emergency frequency. Many hundreds of hours of staff and technical time were spent in developing Police Department plans leading to optimization of the police radio system. Next, the City of Los Angeles authorized an expenditure of several hundreds of thousands of dollars to purchase new multi-frequency radios for all patrol cars. These multi-frequency radios have now been designed, purchased and installed. Each patrol unit now has a radio with immediate ability to switch between four frequencies: divisional frequency, City-wide emergency frequency, Tactical frequency one, and Tactical frequency two.

However, despite repeated studies and a frequency-sharing request to the Federal Communications Commission, *the Los Angeles Police Department still has not been able to activate its planned City-wide emergency frequently because of a lack of a frequency* which can be assigned to that use.

In 1966 correspondence with Congressman Corman, Chief Thad Brown of the Los Angeles Police Department stated: "The plight of the police service in having an insufficient portion of the radio spectrum allotted to their essential public-service use is known to various staff members of the Federal Communications Commission. Several studies have been made; others are in progress—but the difficulty lies in the fact that relief is needed now.

"Most certainly, law enforcement—and the Los Angeles Police Department in particular—would be appreciative of any efforts you might expend towards making available a more reasonable portion of the radio spectrum for essential law enforcement and public safety radio communications."

Chief Brown has been succeeded by Thomas Reddin as Chief of the Los Angeles Police Department. Chief Reddin would like to further emphasize the above remarks, by stating that the lack of radio frequencies for critical public-safety service has become acute, and that any efforts which members of Congress might assert in solving the problem would be a service to America's public-safety agencies as well as the communities they protect and serve.

THOMAS REDDIN,
Chief of Police.
NOEL A. MCQUOWN,
Deputy Chief.

How much more emphatic can the problem be made than Chief McQuown's statement in reply to an inquiry as to whether or not the Los Angeles Police Department has had sufficient radio spectrum space available to meet normal needs, as well as emergency needs. He wrote:

Succinctly, our answer is "no."

The Los Angeles Police Department has been plagued with radio frequency shortage problems over the past decade. The situation has become ever-more-acute since the Watts riots in August of 1966.

At the other end of the country, the chief of police of Paterson, N.J., said:

I am concerned with . . . the fact that apparently no remedy is in the foreseeable future that may correct the present conditions caused by lack of frequencies. To answer your questions, we do not have sufficient radio frequencies to meet our normal needs. It is a fact that lack of radio space is a problem, and inadequate contact with our Police forces and other helpful forces. This did hinder our efforts during the civil disturbances which befell our city recently.

The chief of police of Passaic, N.J., has written me:

We are indeed dismayed with the Police Radio Service and the fact that evidently no plans have been formulated to correct the problems caused by the lack of frequencies. In reply to your inquiries, in our opinion, there are not enough frequencies available to us for our needs to be met.

Since there is a lack of radio space, the result is insufficient communications with our forces, police and other. We felt that this reduced our efficiency at the time of disturbances during the past summer.

The commissioner of public safety of Mount Vernon, N.Y., which is just outside New York City, wrote:

During our recent disturbances during July, our one frequency was a specific example of various instances where a shortage of radio space hampered our men in the efficient performance of their duty and delayed or prevented prompt and effective response to emergency and instantaneous disbursement of personnel to the constantly changing target and high hazard areas.

Two years after its original plea to the FCC for additional frequencies, the police commissioner of New York City reported to me that the problem still had not been solved. He said:

The New York City Police Department has been faced with a serious shortage of radio channels for some time and has been hampered in its functions not only during periods of disorders but in its daily operations.

In the New York Metropolitan area all of the radio channels allocated to the police services are saturated and this has been confirmed by a recent Federal Communications Commission study. In order to obtain some relief it was necessary for us to apply for a waiver of the F.C.C. rules to permit us the use of 10 additional frequencies which are allocated to the Forestry-Conservation Services. The Commission granted our request and we are now in the process of activating these sorely needed channels. We have been operating with only 8 radio frequencies for our fleet of over 2200 police vehicles, as well as 15 launches and 5 helicopters . . . .During peak periods in order to reduce the backlog in our radio dispatch room, it frequently was necessary to operate on a one-way basis with the cars calling in their reports by telephone instead of by radio. No doubt the 10 additional radio channels will help to alleviate this situation but we still will be operating an excessive number of units per channel.

We also feel that every officer including the foot patrolman should be equipped with a miniature two-way radio in order to maintain essential and immediate communication at all times. This is particularly important during periods of civil disorders or other emergency situations. We have at present 550 of the personal-type radios in use operating on six 15 kc. split frequencies. We have budgeted for an additional 1,700 of these units. Obviously, there will be a need for more radio channels and repeater systems to accommodate this needed coverage.

With regard to particular problems during disorders, it was necessary to operate numerous mobile and portable radios in the Brooklyn area on the same radio channel as other units operating in the Harlem area. This created problems of mutual interference and limited communications.

As you know the Federal Communications Commission has under study the feasibility of shared use of VHF–TV channels and the possibility of reallocating some of the UHF–TV channels to other services such as Public Safety. We feel that in major metropolitan areas, the latter course of action is one logical solution inasmuch as hundreds of additional radio channels are required, not only for present systems but to implement new systems and new concepts which are being developed to assist law enforcement in its fight against increasing crime and lawlessness.

We are anxiously awaiting the F.C.C. decisions with regard to providing additional radio spectrum to the police services and as soon as more channels are allocated we intend to apply for many more frequencies. Additional frequencies also will be required to change from a simplex to a duplex mode of operation which will enable us to take advantage of such new techniques as mobile teleprinters and computerized dispatch of police vehicles. New York City has earmarked considerable funds for the modernization and improvement of its communications facilities and one of the major limitations is the critical shortage of radio channels.

Note that he said:

Hundreds of additional radio channels are required—

Not just the 20 pairs provided by the splitting of the channels in the 450 megacycle band.

In Washington, D.C., according to the Chief of Police, even the incident of a group of disorderly juveniles who threw missiles through store windows caused the following result:

For several hours during this episode, the radio channel of operation for the affected area was taxed to its full capacity. The radio frequency shortage in the metropolitan area has been recognized for the past five years, especially in the radio frequencies allocated to public safety.

He went on to point out that in order to expand its communications system to provide centralized radio communication with all the patrolmen and to take care of the increase in mobile units for the next 7 years, his department needed four additional radio frequencies and there were no police frequencies available in the area for his department to use.

Even the city of Cambridge, Md., is sorely troubled by too many radio users on the same channel and its chief of police advised the FCC recently:

For the past two or three months our radio transmissions are being blocked out by a radio belonging to the Prince Georges County Police located at Seat Pleasant, Maryland. Their call letters are KGC749 on same frequency as our department 154.95. During the recent riot trouble we had here in Cambridge, Maryland it was very difficult to keep or get in touch with our cars and men by radio due to the interference from station KGC749.

I have also been in touch with the City Police Easton, Maryland and the Garden State Parkway Police, New Jersey who is on the same frequency 154.95 and who is also having trouble with their transmission being blocked by the station KGC749.

The police chief of Arlington County, Va., has said in a letter:

I am writing this letter to you in response to a plea for additional frequency space to help the present communications problem confronting us, and alleviate future frequency congestion that could curtail our responsibilities dealing with public safety.

As our police department grows, it is apparent that the present allocation of radio space will not be sufficient for future police operations in this Metropolitan area. Also we have already felt the need for the allocation of more frequency space to our community.

In order to combat crime in our everyday work, and allow effective response to emergencies, such as controlling violence which has beset our major urban areas, it is imperative that radio communications are instantly available to each and everyone of our men. Insufficient radio spectrum to do this job headlines the police radio communications problems.

I also received a very fine statement of the problem from the chief of police of Ecorse, Mich.:

During the recent civil disorders in the Detroit Metropolitan Area, we were confronted with many new problems. However, I believe the biggest problem of all was the lack of proper communications. We found that even though we received assistance from surrounding police departments in the way of manpower and cars, we were hampered by lack of communications with these same men and cars. I would like to point out that we did make good use of the telephone and portable radio but this was expensive, very inconvenient, and time consuming—time being of the utmost importance in this type of situation. A delay in relaying a message could mean the loss of life or property.

* * * * *

I believe that the only solution to this problem is to have the Federal Communications Commission set aside more radio spectrum for all law enforcement agencies.

Similarly, the inspector of police in Flint, Mich., advised me:

Your letter of August 15, 1967, came at a very opportune time as we, Command Officers of the Flint Police Department, believe that more radio space must be made available for Police Agencies. We have been considering a request to the Federal Communications Commission for additional frequency assignment to handle normal operations which have increased rapidly in the last several years. With the completion of L.E.I.N. (Law Enforcement Information Network) and the National Crime Information Center, additional radio traffic is anticipated.

This is not a problem limited to New York, Washington, Chicago, Los Angeles, and other big city areas, however. The need, in the near future, for additional frequency spectrum is also reported by the chief of police in Tucson, Ariz.:

We just recently received authorization for two additional radio frequencies, giving us a total of four. These four frequencies will carry us for approximately two to three

years, at which time we will have to increase our frequencies, due to the growth of the community and the services we must render. I might add that the securing of these two additional frequencies was only accomplished after a great deal of extremely hard work on the part of the city's Communication Superintendent. In obtaining these frequencies we were also informed that the future was quite bleak of obtaining additional frequencies for our needs.

If law enforcement agencies are to render the instantaneous services necessary to the constituents we must have sufficient radio spectrum space set aside so that future expansion will not be restricted.

Note particularly his statement that the frequencies which they have just obtained will only carry them for approximately 2 or 3 years at which time they would have to increase their frequencies due to the growth of the community and the services that they must render, and they have been advised that the future was quite bleak for obtaining these frequencies.

The chief of police of Houston, Tex., has said:

Degradation of our radio communications, due to the lack of compatable frequencies, coupled with the close geographical reassignment of frequencies, cause serious interference problems. During recent acts of violence in our city, interference from five other cities was noted, some of which were as far away as two hundred miles. Radio communications assisted materially in containing the violence, however, the above mentioned communications problems could have severely handicapped our efforts had this violence been allowed to get out of hand.

The situation that confronts us in the police communications field can be summarized very simply. The effectiveness of police work is directly dependent upon the communications backbone available to the department and officials involved. If we have a good system, the likelihood of public interest being protected is increased. As population grows in our area, as automobile usage, criminal activities and so forth continue to grow, demands on our police officials and on their radio systems will continue to increase, and their jobs will be increasingly difficult. There are already serious frequency shortages in the police field. In the Houston area we are already having trouble finding compatible frequencies for our police needs. It is essential, therefore, that we be concerned at this time with these radio needs, not only in terms of present, but over the next decade.

A memorandum from the police department of Cleveland, Ohio, reports that they were unable to obtain FCC permission to construct and use a public emergency radio call box which was to be erected on the highway at locations far removed from the police telephone cable and used to transmit emergency messages.

The interference situation is the same in Youngstown, Ohio, according to its chief of police:

Our present radio spectrum is not sufficient as we are receiving interference from Pittsburgh, Penna., which is located 70 miles from our city. We also receive interference at our base station from the local radio and television stations.

We plan to install a new radio system in the department which will include more channels to increase our mobile units. Therefore, we will require more radio space for the new system?

The chief of police of Greensboro, N.C., reports:

At the present time, we are trying to find two clear channels on which we could install a command net operation in a mobile repeat fashion. This type system would enable us to set up a temporary command post at most any location and be able to communicate with all personnel within the area which have radios on the specific channel. However, due to the congestion and shortage of frequencies in the land mobile service and specifically in the Police-Public Safety Radio Service frequencies allocation, we have been unable to obtain a recommendation from the coordinator for the police frequency of North Carolina.

The rapid increase in police communications and the resulting need for additional frequency spectrum is factually stated by the Minneapolis superintendent of police:

With calls for police service going up rapidly in Minneapolis from 130,000 in 1964, 141,000 in 1965 and 157,000 in 1966 we will have to expand from our present two nets to three and later to four. This will take additional frequencies and space on the spectrum.

From the chief of police of Kalamazoo, Mich., I have received the following comment of concern:

We are concerned with the radio frequencies allocation as a whole.

At the present time we share our local channel with the City of Pontiac, Michigan and with all the suburban police departments in the Chicago and Cook County, Illinois. This situation creates considerable interference problems to our own local radio traffic.

The chief of police of Phoenix, Ariz., reports that—

The Phoenix Police Department was fortunate to obtain 5 radio frequencies in 1964, the last in the area that were compatible with multi-frequency operation.

* * * * *

With the normal growth of Phoenix, additional frequencies will be needed within the next 3 to 4 years for voice communication. In the near future, teletype printers in police cars and automatic car locaters will require additional radio spectrum.

* * * * *

I feel that the Public Safety needs more radio space now and that Phoenix must have additional frequencies in the near futre.

William A. Johnson, the superintendent of police for the city of Grand Rapids has written me:

Our own Grand Rapids Fire Department has a simplex frequency for City operation which at times during "skip" is badly "cluttered" by traffic from the City of Chicago Police Department, a heavy user. The result is the maintaining of a poor watch by the Fire Dispatchers with the attendent danger of missed calls. The Grand Rapids Fire Department also serves all outlying departments on a second frequency which is badly overloaded, particularly by the large number of users in the immediate area. Some years ago Mr. Edwin Denstaedt of Detroit, the frequency co-ordinator for Fire, advised our radio engineer that there were not enough frequencies available to allow the splitting of this outlying system.

And from Sioux City, Iowa, the chief of police has expressed his concern about the frequency spectrum shortage as follows:

I would like to take this opportunity to express my growing concern about the channel crowing of the Public Safety radio frequencies. We share our frequency with the cities of Pipestone, Minnesota; LaVerne, Minnesota; New Ulm, Minnesota; and Davenport, Iowa, and should a mass civil disturbance occur in Sioux City, this outside traffic could easily disrupt our communications network here and render it ineffective. This has occurred during routine daily work, but I can foresee serious problems if we urgently needed to utilize our radio and were unable to do so because of foreign interference. My department relies on the radio system and without it, I feel that law enforcement deteriorates badly.

I, for one, would like to see some relief from the frequency congestion that exists.

Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks, the full text of the various letters which I have received from departments of police throughout the country with regard to this problem will be inserted in the RECORD.

All these problems of congestion resulting from a failure of the FCC to allocate an adequate amount of frequency spectrum to the users of land mobile radio were summed up by the FCC in its last annual report. In that report, at page 48, it admitted that—

The condition is not unlike that of a main highway on a summer weekend, so overcrowded with vehicles that traffic has come to a standstill.

The adverse effects on the public interest of bringing this type of radio communication to a standstill are enormous. It is significant that in its report to the House, the Select Committee on Small Business said at page 171:

It is recommended that the Federal Communications Commission undertake, at once, such action as may be necessary to allocate additional radio frequency spectrum to small business and other users of land *mobile* radio.

The President's Crime Commission, after a thorough study of the problem, recommended, at page 254 of its report, entitled "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society," that—

The FCC should develop plans for allocating portions of the TV spectrum to police use.

Communications must be maintained with foot patrolmen and with police officers who have left their cars. Police officials are unanimous in their desire for small portable radios so that patrolmen can call for assistance in an emergency and so that supervisors can maintain closer contact with those they supervise and make more effective use of the entire police force.

Yet we have no action by the FCC, except studies and more studies, to bring these recommendations of the Congress and the President's Crime Commission into reality. I, and other Members of the Congress, have continued to press the FCC on this matter at every opportunity. When the FCC appeared before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member, in the spring of this year, a number of the appeals from the public for action by the FCC were made a part of the hearing record, and the Chairman of the Commission admitted that—

There is a pressing need for the provision of more channel capacity and more channels for a mobile service.

The FCC has studied the problem. The Congress and Presidential commissions have studied the problem and made similar recommendations for action by the

FCC. How much more does it take to move the FCC to action?

Have we created an instrument of Government which is unresponsive to the needs of the people and to their elected officials even when it admits the path it must take? If that is the case—and I hope it is not—it is my prediction that the FCC will face some searching questions when it appears before the various committees of the Congress early next year.

If we are to be faithful to the people of this country, to their needs and their problems, we must find a means of providing the frequency spectrum which the police and other users of land mobile radio so desperately need. We would be remiss in our duty if 6 months from now we could receive the same type of letters from police chiefs and testimony from small businessmen concerning this problem which we have received in the past.

I want to assure the Commission that I intend to pursue this matter and I believe that I speak for a great many of the Members of the Congress who have also become concerned about the failure of the Commission to carry out its obligation to the public interest in this area.

Only last week, the long-awaited report of the Advisory Committee for the Land Mobile Radio Services was issued and presented to the Federal Communications Commission.

The digest of the report closed its conclusions with the following language:

> Therefore, the Advisory Committee concludes that if the public is to continue to receive the benefits, services and efficiencies provided to it by all areas of the land mobile services—which can only be so provided—benefits, services and efficiencies which are indeed in the public interest, convenience and necessity—additional frequency spectrum must be allocated for this use.

The Committee Chairman was Commissioner Kenneth A. Cox. In his letter of transmittal, he closed by pointing out that—

> The Advisory Committee's work is now finished, and the next step is up to the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I would have only one word to add to Mr. Cox's succinct conclusion. That word is "now," and I would have the members of the FCC know that the word is heavily underscored.

The letters referred to follow:

CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.,
August 21, 1967.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Through our membership in the Associated Public Safety Communications Officers (APCO), we are fully aware of the frequency congestion in the Land Mobile radio services and the studies such as those of the Land Mobile Advisory Committee (LMAC) and other efforts that are being put forth by NABERS (Business), and APCO's proposed Project No. 3, a study of frequency congestion in the Chicago area with a grant from the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance of the Department of Justice.

While we do not experience any appreciable amount of interference from other stations on our police radio system, it is primarily because we operate duplex (separate base and mobile frequencies) which allows our dispatchers to monitor their cars on a channel which is limited to mobiles only, thus avoiding competition with other high powered base stations. Such duplex operation does limit our effectiveness by preventing communications between mobile units, which is a lesser problem than operating simplex (all on one frequency) and putting up with the resulting interference.

However, there is more and more talk of the FCC instituting a system of "open occupancy" rather than the "block system" of frequency assignments that has prevailed for years. This probably would eliminate the protection we presently enjoy with our duplex system.

Through our centralized Radio Service Bureau, we service numerous other Public Safety and Public Works radio systems that have been beset with severe interference problems. Recently our forty car Grand Rapids Water and Light radio system went to considerable expense to change frequency to escape the interference from Milwaukee Power and Light and the Detroit Underground. The constant chatter of these big users frayed the nerves of the monitoring personnel to the point that it became necessary to change. In addition, emergency calls had to wait their turn or were being blanked out. Some time ago the City of Wyoming Police Department (a Grand Rapids suburb) found it necessary to change frequency at considerable expense to escape interference from the City of Woodstock, Illinois. Such frequency changing is a gamble at best, with the possibility of another large user being assigned the same frequency at any time.

Our own Grand Rapids Fire Department has a simplex frequency for City operation which at times during "skip" is badly "cluttered" by traffic from the City of Chicago Police Department, a heavy user. The result is the maintaining of a poor watch by the Fire Dispatchers, with the attendant danger of missed calls. The Grand Rapids Fire Department also serves all outlying departments on a second frequency which is badly overloaded, particularly by the large number of users in the immediate area. Some years ago Mr. Edwin Denstaedt of Detroit, the frequency co-ordinator for Fire, advised our radio engineer that there were not enough frequencies available to allow the splitting of this outlying system. Today the F.C.C. and our frequency co-ordinating committees are advocating combining of small departments in an area and the use of a single frequency; all because of the frequency shortage, we presume.

We are unable to give you any specific examples of failure of communications due to frequency congestion during the recent riots in Grand Rapids. Of course, many transmissions had to wait their turn and it would have helped to have been able to operate car to car on a "clear channel" simplex frequency.

In weighing our situation in the Grand Rapids area, consideration should be given to the fact that we are quite far removed from densely populated areas such as New York, Philadelphia, Wayne County, Chicago and Los Angeles.

We appreciate your letter and this opportunity to contribute our bit to this pressing problem.

Sincerely,

WM. A. JOHNSON,
Superintendent of Police.

CITY OF TUCSON, ARIZ.,
September 1, 1967.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: In your letter of 15 August you requested information concerning radio frequency allocation and problems associated with same, especially those associated with civil disturbances. I would like to first point out that the reported civil disturbance in our community was nowhere near the magnitude reported by the electronic and printed press. It was a minor disturbance and required little more than routine police attention.

At the present time we feel that we have sufficient radio frequencies available to us. We just recently received authorization for two additional radio frequencies, giving us a total of four. These four frequencies will carry us for approximately two to three years, at which time we will have to increase our frequencies, due to the growth of the community and the services we must render. I might add that the securing of these two additional frequencies was only accomplished after a great deal of extremely hard work on the part of the city's Communication Superintendent. In obtaining these frequencies we were also informed that the future was quite bleak of obtaining additional frequencies for our needs.

If law enforcement agencies are to render the instantaneous services necessary to the constituents we must have sufficient radio spectrum space set aside so that future expansion will not be restricted.

I trust the above will be of assistance to you, and if we can be of further assistance do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

BARNARD L. GARMIRE,
Chief of Police.

POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Sioux City, Iowa, September 26, 1967.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Thank you very much for your recent letter expressing concern regarding the civil disturbances that have taken place in many of our nations' cities.

We have been fortunate in the Sioux City area and have not yet been plagued with a problem of this type. I am wondering if your letter should have been sent to Waterloo, Iowa, because I do know that a problem did occur in that city this summer.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my growing concern about the channel crowding of the Public Safety radio frequencies. We share our frequency with the cities of Pipestone, Minnesota; La Verne, Minnesota; New Ulm, Minnesota; and Davenport, Iowa, and should a mass civil disturbance occur in Sioux City, this outside traffic could easily disrupt our communications network here and render it ineffective. This has occurred during routine daily work, but I can foresee serious problems if we urgently needed to utilize our radio and were unable to do so because of foreign interference. My department relies on the radio system and without it, I feel that law enforcement deteriorates badly.

I, for one, would like to see some relief from the frequency congestion that now exists.

Thanking you for any assistance you may give us in this matter, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES O'KEEFE,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF PHOENIX, ARIZ.,
September 25, 1967.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: The Phoenix Police Department was fortunate to obtain 5 radio frequencies in 1964, the last in the area that were compatible with multi-frequency operation. These 5 frequencies have been adequate for our needs to date and were sufficient to handle our recent civil disturbance.

With the normal growth of Phoenix, additional frequencies will be needed within the next 3 to 4 years for voice communication. In the near future, teletype printers in police cars and automatic car locators will require additional radio spectrum.

There are no unused VHF police frequencies left in the Salt River Valley; therefore, any expansion in Phoenix, Scottsdale, Mesa, Tempe or Glendale will require UHF equipment at considerable extra cost, including two sets of equipment in many cars (1 on UHF and 1 VHF).

During the past four years, the Phoenix Police Department has had a problem with interference from the Special Emergency Service. One instance: Doctors' Directory was read by and understood as "policeman needs help—urgently." Another instance, a local ambulance company's transmission was read on police frequency as "officer hurt—needs help urgently." On both occasions, considerable police manpower was diverted until situations were checked out and clarified. We have had considerable interference from Doctors' Directory and have desensitized our own system to some extent to prevent this type problem.

I feel that the Public Safety Service needs more radio space now and that Phoenix must have additional frequencies in the near future.

I also feel that legislation or FCC regulations to prevent unauthorized monitoring of police frequencies is necessary. Present FCC regulations are not adequate in this area. Phoenix has had instances of burglars, wrecker drivers, ambulance services, as well as news services, monitoring police calls and causing or increasing the police problem as a result of this monitoring.

Very truly yours,

PAUL E. BLUBAUM,
Police Chief.

POLICE DEPARTMENT,
New York, N.Y., September 15, 1967.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: This is in reply to your letter of August 15, 1967 requesting information concerning our situation with reference to police radio channels.

We have been aware of your active interest in this very serious problem and appreciate your efforts in behalf of law enforcement communications. I am sure that your discussions with the Federal Communications Commission have helped to make that agency aware of the urgent need for remedial measures.

The New York City Police Department has been faced with a serious shortage of radio channels for some time and has been hampered in its functions not only during periods of disorders but in its daily operations.

In the New York metropolitan area all of the radio channels allocated to the police services are saturated and this has been confirmed by a recent Federal Communications Commission study. In order to obtain some relief it was necessary for us to apply for a waiver of the F.C.C. rules to permit us the use of 10 additional frequencies which are allocated to the Forestry-Conservation Services. The Commission granted our request and we are now in the process of activating these sorely needed channels. We have been operating with only 8 radio frequencies for our fleet of over 2200 police vehicles, as well as 15 launches and 5 helicopters. We found that some of our base stations were clocking as much as 10 hours of daily transmission time and assuming approximately equal air time for the mobiles, some of our channels were in use as much as 20 hours a day. During peak periods in order to reduce the backlog in our radio dispatch room, it frequently was necessary to operate on a one-way basis with the cars calling in their reports by telephone instead of by radio. No doubt the 10 additional radio channels will help to alleviate this situation but we still will be operating an excessive number of units per channel.

We also feel that every officer including the foot patrolman should be equipped with a miniature two-way radio in order to maintain essential and immediate communication at all times. This is particularly important during periods of civil disorders or other emergency situations. We have at present 550 of the personal-type radios in use operating on six 15 kc. split frequencies. We have budgeted for an additional 1,700 of these units. Obviously, there will be a need for more radio channels and repeater systems to accommodate this needed coverage.

With regard to particular problems during disorders, it was necessary to operate numerous mobile and portable radios in the Brooklyn area on the same radio channel as other units operating in the Harlem area. This created problems of mutual interference and limited communications.

As you know the Federal Communications Commission has under study the feasibility of shared use of VHF–TV channels and the possibility of reallocating some of the UHF–TV channels to other services such has Public Safety. We feel that in major metropolitan areas, the latter course of action is one logical solution inasmuch as hundreds of additional radio channels are required, not only for present systems but to implement new systems and new concepts which are being developed to assist law enforcement in its fight against increasing crime and lawlessness.

We are anxiously awaiting the F.C.C. decisions with regard to providing additional radio spectrum to the police services and as soon as more channels are allocated we intend to apply for many more frequencies. Additional frequencies also will be required to change from a simplex to a duplex mode of operation which will enable us to take advantage of such new techniques as mobile teleprinters and computerized dispatch of police vehicles. New York City has earmarked considerable funds for the modernization and improvement of its communications facilities and one of the major limitations is the critical shortage of radio channels.

I wish to express my appreciation to you for your interest in this problem and I sincerely hope that an early solution will be found.

Sincerely,

H. R. LEARY,
Police Commissioner.

DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
Ecorse, Mich., October 4, 1967.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Regulatory and Enforcement Agencies, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: This is in response to your letter of September 15, 1967, expressing your concern over the shortage of radio spectrum for local law enforcement agencies and how such shortage is hampering their operations.

During the recent civil disorders in the Detroit Metropolitan Area, we were confronted with many new problems. However, I believe the biggest problem of all was the lack of proper communications. We found that even though we received assistance from surrounding police departments in the way of manpower and cars, we were hampered by lack of communications with these same men and cars. I would like to point out that we did make good use of the telephone and portable radio but this was expensive, very inconvenient, and time consuming—time being of the utmost importance in this type of situation. A delay in relaying a message could mean the loss of life or property.

I might explain how we made use of the portable radio and how much easier it would have been to have had an assigned frequency which all base stations and police cars could monitor. During the recent emergency, any message that our base station would transmit could be received only by our own police cars and six other assisting police department cars. This meant that only a minority of the assisting cars were receiving the messages. We were able to overcome this problem to a small degree by using our portable radios, tied into our frequency, in the police cars equipped with radios but not on our frequency. (Example: Cars of the Wayne County Sheriff, Michigan State Police, Livonia Police, etc.—these cars were all equipped with radios but were not on our base station frequency and therefore, we had to place one of our portable radios in one of their cars so that they could receive our base station broadcasts. In turn, they used their own radio to relay our base station messages to their other cars assisting in the area.)

Our base station did have radio contact with the Detroit Police Department through "B" Channel on our base station radio only. Any messages received from the Detroit Police Department on our base station "B" Channel would have to be re-broadcast to our police cars, as well as the assisting cars of other departments which were on the same frequency or equipped with portables.

The cars from other departments which were not on our frequency or not equipped with one of our portable radios, were of little use to us, other than patrol. We were unable to give them assignments and if they encountered a situation where they needed assistance or had to report the location of a fire, they would have to rely on the public telephone or find a fire box.

I believe that the only solution to this problem is to have the Federal Communications Commission set aside more radio spectrum for all law enforcement agencies. It must be set up so that all agencies are able to receive and transmit on the same frequency. I would suggest calling it the Detroit Metropolitan Area Spectrum (DMA), the Michigan Spectrum (MICH), or the United States Law Enforcement Spectrum (USLE).

I hope this gives you an idea, John, as to our problems. If I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Respectfully yours,

CONNIE.

ARLINGTON COUNTY, VA.,
POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Arlington, Va., October 9, 1967.

Congressman JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: I am writing this letter to you in response to a plea for additional frequency space to help the present communications problems confronting us, and alleviate future frequency congestion that could curtail our responsibilities dealing with public safety.

As our police department grows, it is apparent that the present allocation of radio space will not be sufficient for future police operations in this Metropolitan area. Also we have already felt the need for the allocation of more frequency space to our community.

In order to combat crime in our everyday work, and allow effective response to emergencies, such as controlling violence which has beset our major urban areas, it is imperative that radio communications are instantly available to each and everyone of our men. Insufficient radio spectrum to do this job headlines the police radio communications problems. We respectfully request you, as Chairman of the House Small Business Subcommittee on Regulatory and Enforcement Agencies, to contact us by letter or in person to further assist you in gathering more information.

Yours truly,

Maj. WILLIAM G. FAWVER,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF NEWARK, N.J.,
September 6, 1967.

Mr. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: The following information has been prepared in response to your request of August 22nd, 1967:

We presently have authorization for two (2) frequencies, and a third one for limited use without a base station. We have approximately 300 vehicles that are radio-equipped, and 125 walkie-talkies.

Communication with other police agencies is either via telephone, teletype, or telegram if long distance and not urgent.

We feel that six (6) frequencies are necessary to maintain an effective system for this department. Four (4) channels within 625 KC of each other for mobile equipment and two (2) channels within 625KC of each other for walkie-talkie equipment.

Specific instances where the lack of available frequencies has prevented our men from carrying out their assigned duties are:

1. Newark Riots.
2. Slaying of Patrolman Gutekunz.
3. Visits of V.I.P'S. e.g. President Johnson and President Kennedy, to Newark.
4. The large fire in the Central Ward. (whole block on fire)
5. Severe weather conditions e.g. snow storms.
6. Radio Cars in a chase.

During these incidents at peak workload periods:

1. Dispatchers were delayed in giving out assignments by vying to get "On the Air." Assignments backed-up.
2. Non-emergency assignments were disrupted or delayed and non-essential messages dispensed with.
3. Field personnel frequently could not "Come in" with important information or messages.
4. Administrative Command personnel were hampered in getting "On the Air" to direct or control the movement and deployment of personnel or revise tactical operations.
5. Field personnel on the outer periphery of the City "Cut Out" transmissions in progress. They were unable to hear the other person "On the Air" for want of mobile relay facilities.
6. Time was lost because simultaneous transmissions and receiving was not possible with existing facilities.
7. Immediate contact with local enforcement or City Agencies was hindered by using a telephone for lack of an inter-system radio network.
8. Demands for transmission time by the increased number of mobile units, operating on the same frequency interfered with communications.
9. Much "Air Time" was taken up with repetitions of information already transmitted on "Record Checks" and "Stolen Cars." Other authorized vehicles interfered with transmissions.

Very truly yours,

OLIVER KELLY,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF FLINT, MICH.,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY,
September 5, 1967.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of August 15, 1967, came at a very opportune time as we, Command Officers of the Flint Police Department, believe that more radio space must be made available for Police Agencies. We have been considering a request to the Federal Communications Commission for additional frequency assignment to handle normal operations which have increased rapidly in the last several years. With the completion of L.E.I.N. (Law Enforcement Information Network) and the National Crime Information Center, additional radio traffic is anticipated.

During the recent disorder in this City, with only one transmitting frequency at Headquarters, some delay in transmission was experienced. Three additional employees, all officers, were assigned to the Communications Division. Their assignment was to segregate telephone calls to determine their importance and aid in dispatching of patrol cars. At the time of the Disturbance, this Department had approximately 110 radio cars in operation, each having two-way communication. Further, having only one transmitter, hindered surveillance work to a degree, especially if the car being followed became involved with heavy auto traffic. This surveillance work is vitally important in time of disturbance as it aids the Police Department in checking on leaders, potential troublemakers, and out of town people entering the City, to aid in the disturbance.

Communications between the Flint Police Department and the Flint Fire Department was a direct telephone line previously installed. When the Fire Department received a fire call their operator would contact the Police Dispatcher who would send a Patrol car to check first, to determine if there was a fire and secondly, to assure the fire trucks could get in and out of the area. The patrol car would relay the true information to the Radio Dispatcher who would in turn call the Fire Department.

Communications between the Flint Police Department and the Michigan National Guard was mainly with Liaison Officers at respective headquarters and the telephone was utilized to exchange information. It should be noted that the National Guard was not deployed in Flint during the time of Civil Disorder. Had this Organization been utilized. a police car with two (2) way communication would have been assigned to that Headquarters.

The Michigan State Police were deployed at this time and to overcome the communications problem between this Organization and the Flint Police Department, a transmitter on the State Police frequency was installed in our Communications Division and a State Police employee operated same.

The Citizens Band Operators were also utilized. A mobile receiver and transmitter being set up in the Communications Division. Units of this Organization acted as permanent observation points on the perimeter of the City and reported their observations. They also set up other fixed posts, i.e., Naval Reserve Center, etc.

Thus, we of the Flint Police Department, are desirous of obtaining two (2) additional frequencies for our base transmitter to aid in our normal everyday operation and have a reserve frequency for critical time. Any aid that you may extend toward this goal will be highly appreciated.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. SMITH,
Inspector of Police.

CITY OF MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.,
September 14, 1967.

Re your letter dated August 15, 1967, referring to radio space.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Regulatory and Enforcement Agencies, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: Thank you for your concern as to adequate Radio Space to meet every contingency.

Our City of Mount Vernon, N.Y. has a population of 76,010 (1960 census) in four square miles, with 27% negro population in 1965. We are separated only by a boundary line from New York City. We have two New York City subways that stop at the city line, also two railroads, three parkways and one state route that pass through Mount Vernon.

We have just installed a new 80 watt General Electric Radio System to replace our old 50 watt system in 28 Police Department vehicles and our base station at Police Headquarters on *one frequency* 155.37 M.C.

We presently have six portable transmitters and receivers for our foot patrolmen and will select a proposal on bids for ten more portables on September 19, 1967.

During our recent disturbances during July, our one frequency was a specific example of various instances where a shortage of radio space hampered our men in the efficient performance of their duty and delayed or prevented prompt and effective response to emergency and instantaneous disbursement of personnel to the constantly changing target and high hazard areas.

It is also difficult in using one channel to have confidential communication by our Detective Bureau and superior officers, whereas an adjacent channel, not open to the uniform force and the public, would be of great value.

Presently tow truck operators, criminals and others listen in on our one channel. We suspected that during the civil disturbance that our messages were being monitored.

I therefore feel that as a police force in a thickly populated metropolitan area that an adjacent channel would be of great value.

Thank you for your inquiry and interest in our radio problems.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE F. KUMMERLE,
Commissioner of Public Safety.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
August 29, 1967.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
16th District, Michigan,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Reference is made to your letter of inquiry dated August 15, 1967, pertaining to the availability of frequency space for land mobile radio, especially for police forces of our metropolitan area.

As you know our city has not encountered a civil disturbance of any magnitude that could be classified as a riot. We did have a group of disorderly juveniles throw missiles through a number of show windows in store fronts in the early morning hours of August 1, 1967. This episode was met by deploying available manpower in the area affected and resulted in the arrest of eleven juveniles and twenty-one young adults.

For several hours during this episode, the radio channel of operation for the affected area was taxed to its full capacity. The radio frequency shortage in the metropolitan area has been recognized for the past five years, especially in the radio frequencies allocated to public safety. During this time two additional frequencies have been assigned to provide three channels to service our mobile units.

At present our department is in the process of expanding its communication system to provide centralized radio communication with all foot patrolmen and to meet the increase in mobile units for the next seven years. To provide for this improved service we found our department needed four (4) additional radio frequencies in the 150 Mhz band.

Finding no police frequencies available in this area we petitioned the Federal Communications Commission for a waiver to use three (3) Forestry Conservation and one (1) State Police Radio Frequency. This waiver was granted the department by the Federal Communications Commission on August 9, 1967. However, the Forestry Conservation users from the States of Maryland, Virginia and West Virginia have filed protests with the Commission on the assignment of these radio frequencies for our use. It is expected

that this appeal will be adjudicated by the Federal Communications Commission within the next thirty (30) days.

From the result of specific professional study of the matter it is felt that with the four additional radio frequencies requested our department will have adequate radio coverage to service its contemplated expansion and improvement of communications for the protection of the public and the suppression of crime.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. LAYTON,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 23, 1967.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Your letter of August 15 makes inquiry regarding whether or not "the Los Angeles Police Department has had sufficient radio spectrum space available to meet normal needs, as well as emergency needs." Succinctly, our answer is "No."

The Los Angeles Police Department has been plagued with radio frequency shortage problems over the past decade. The situation has become ever-more-acute since the Watts Riots in August of 1965.

That riotous period required total utilization of the Police Department's radio communications system and clearly demonstrated that additional message capacity was essential to the public safety of the City of Los Angeles.

As one specific example of how the radio frequency shortage has adversely affected operations of the Los Angeles Police Department and the community it serves, consider our lack of a much needed "City-wide emergency frequency."

Since the Watts Riots, it has been apparent that we have had a critical and immediate need for one frequency to be used as a City-wide emergency frequency. Many hundreds of hours of staff and technical time were spent in developing Police Department plans leading to optimization of the police radio system. Next, the City of Los Angeles authorized an expenditure of several hundreds of thousands of dollars to purchase new multi-frequency radios for all patrol cars. These multi-frequency radios have now been designed, purchased and installed. Each patrol unit now has a radio with immediate ability to switch between four frequencies: divisional frequency, City-wide emergency frequency, Tactical frequency one, and Tactical frequency two.

However, despite repeated studies and a frequency-sharing request to the Federal Communications Commission, *the Los Angeles Police Department still has not been able to activate its planned Citywide emergency frequency because of a lack of a frequency* which can be assigned to that use.

In 1966 correspondence with Congressman Corman, Chief Thad Brown of the Los Angeles Police Department stated: "The plight of the police service in having an insufficient portion of the radio spectrum allotted to their essential public-service use is known to various staff members of the Federal Communications Commission. Several studies have been made; others are in progress—but the difficulty lies in the fact that relief is needed now.

"Most certainly, law enforcement—and the Los Angeles Police Department in particular—would be appreciative of any efforts you might expend towards making available a more reasonable portion of the radio spectrum for essential law enforcement and public safety radio communications."

Chief Brown has been succeeded by Thomas Reddin as Chief of the Los Angeles Police Department. Chief Reddin would like to further emphasize the above remarks, by stating that the lack of radio frequencies for critical public-safety service has become acute, and that any efforts which members of Congress might assert in solving the problem would be a service to America's public-safety agencies as well as the communities they protect and serve.

THOMAS REDDIN,
Chief of Police.
By NOEL A. MCQUOWN,
Deputy Chief,
Commander, Technical Services Bureau.

CITY OF NEWARK, N.J.,
August 17, 1967.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: In reply to your letter of August 15th, 1967, as indicated in your letter, the allocation of radio frequencies is a serious problem to law enforcement because of the lack of available frequencies.

In our own case, even during normal operations, we are seriously handicapped because of the lack of available frequencies. It was a serious problem during the recent disturbance in our City and the solution to this problem is a reallocation of the frequencies, particularly to those larger cities who have considerable mobile equipment in the field.

Sincerely yours,

OLIVER KELLY,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF CHICAGO, ILL.,
September 1, 1967.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: I read your letter with interest. It is gratifying to see a member of Congress concern himself with a problem that can only increase with the urbanization of our country and with the development of more sophisticated and complex electronic devices used in the war on crime.

To help you understand our situation I will give you a brief description of the Chicago Police System. At the present time, Chicago operates its communication system in a duplex mode using a total of twenty-nine frequencies: sixteen zone, eight city-wide, three car-to-car, one motorcycle and one point-to-point. Zone and city-wide frequencies are base transmit 450 mc. and base receive 150 mc. We dispatch to approximately 1,800 vehicles and keep in contact with outside agencies via these frequencies.

During normal operations these frequencies are not often overloaded. However, in civil disturbance situations we have experienced times when it becomes extremely difficult to maintain communications between headquarters and field units and vice versa. The few times when this occurred were in August, 1965; June 12 to 19, 1966; and July 12 to 21, 1966. As yet this year we have not experienced an extended overload period.

At the present time we are engaged in a development program involving personal radios. Our concept is based upon the use of the personal radio transmitting to the mobile radio (in the beat car) and mobile radio repeating this signal at greater power to the department base station. To accomplish this, thirteen link frequencies will be needed (we are licensed for nine) and if we are to provide the flexibility we have with our present system, thirteen more will be required to accomplish the necessary switching.

We also are concerned with the possibility of two or more large disturbances occurring at the same time and feel that we should be planning for four-frequency radios for field forces (we now have two-frequency capability) and the addition of city-wide frequencies five and six. This would require four more frequencies—two in the 450 mc. range and two in the 150 mc. range. You can see that if we pursue this approach we will need seventeen new frequencies.

There is also the necessity for information flow to the beat patrolmen. It seems self-defeating to have the National Crime Information Center, the Law Enforcement Teletype System and our own computer files and then not be able to give the information received via these devices to the beat patrolmen because of lack of available transmission time.

As you can see, the Chicago Police Department, as many other departments, has a frequency problem and law enforcement can be seriously hampered by lack of adequate facilities.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide our assistance in this matter and feel that relief can be provided through Congressional interest and action.

Sincerely,

JAMES B. CONLISK, Jr.,
Superintendent of Police.

CITY OF PASSAIC, N.J.,
September 14, 1967.

Congressman JOHN D. DINGELL,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Thank you for your letter dated August 15, 1967 about frequency space availability for land mobile radio with respect to police departments.

We are indeed dismayed with the Police Radio Service and the fact that evidently no plans have been formulated to correct the problems caused by the lack of frequencies. In reply to your inquiries, in our opinion, there are not enough frequencies available to us for our needs to be met.

Since there is a lack of radio space, the result is insufficient communications with our forces, police and other. We felt that this reduced our efficiency at the times of disturbances during the past summer. I might add there was no way to distinguish routine matters from critical problems which created confusion in our department. If we had had an adjacent channel frequency we could have had a two-frequency operation which would have been a great help to us. However, this problem is still with us.

It is also possible for citizens to obtain police radio receivers whereby confidential police matters can become common knowledge. If in some way the unauthorized possession of such a receiver could become a Federal violation, the amount of "eavesdropping" would be considerably reduced. Needless to say, this would make it easier for law enforcement agencies to carry out their duties. Also, all too frequently Public Safety FCC applications and grantings with the frequency applied for are published regularly and this information is therefore easily obtained by anyone.

We appreciate your taking a stand on this matter and hope that your efforts will produce some new regulations regarding the control and assignment of Police frequencies.

Very truly yours,

JOHN F. CAMPBELL,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF PATERSON, N.J.,
September 12, 1967.

Congressman JOHN D. DINGELL,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: I respectfully acknowledge receipt of your letter of 8–15–67 concerning the availability of frequency space for Land Mobile Radio in all of its uses.

I am concerned with the Police Radio Service and the fact that apparently no remedy is in the foreseeable future that may correct the present conditions caused by lack of frequencies. To answer your questions,

we do not have sufficient radio frequencies to meet our normal needs. It is a fact that lack of radio space is a problem, and inadequate contact with our Police forces and other helpful forces. This did hinder our efforts during the civil disturbances which befell our city recently. We were unable to separate the major problems from routine problems. As a result, a bottleneck was created. A suitable adjacent channel frequency enabling us to have two-frequency operation would have been a tremendous help. This problem still exists.

The fact that radio receivers utilizing Police frequencies are so easily available is a major problem. If it were possible for this to be a Federal violation possibly requiring a registration and a license, we would at least know where they are located in most cases. I would therefore recommend a veil of secrecy be placed upon Public Safety FCC applications and grantings and that frequencies not be published for public dissemination.

I wish to thank you for your interest in this matter and am hopeful that some good will come of your efforts. If I can be of further service, please do not hestitate contacting me.

Respectfully,

JOHN T. O'BRIEN,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF HOUSTON, TEX.,
August 29, 1967.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of August 15, 1967, in which you express concern about the availability of frequency space for land mobile radio in all of its uses, but most especially for the police forces in the metropolitan areas, has been reviewed.

Degradation of our radio communications, due to the lack of compatible frequencies, coupled with the close geographical reassignment of frequencies, cause serious interference problems. During recent acts of violence in our city, interference from five other cities was noted, some of which were as far away as two hundred miles. Radio communications assisted materially in containing the violence, however, the above mentioned communications problems could have severely handicapped our efforts had this violence been allowed to get out of hand.

The situation that confronts us in the police communications field can be summarized very simply. The effectiveness of police work is directly dependent upon the communications backbone available to the department and officials involved. If we have a good system, the likelihood of public interest being protected is increased. As population grows in our area, as automobile usage, criminal activities and so forth continue to grow, demands on our police officials and on their radio systems will continue to increase, and their jobs will be increasingly difficult. There are already serious frequency shortages in the police field. In the Houston area we are already having trouble finding compatible frequencies for our police needs. It is essential, therefore, that we be concerned at this time with these radio needs, not only in terms of present, but over the next decade.

The Federal Communications Commission should review the frequency situation in detail and develop all pertinent information so that we will know with some assurance just what the frequency requirements are now, what they will be in the future, and how they will be met. This is essential and consistent with the requirements of the law that the Commission allocate frequencies in the public interest and encourage greater use of radio to protect life and property.

Your interest in our needs for more radio frequency space is greatly appreciated and I trust that this information will be of some benefit to you.

Sincerely,

H. B. SHORT,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF GREENSBORO, N.C.,
August 23, 1967.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In response to your letter of August 15, 1967, I appreciate your concern for the congestion of the radio spectrum, particularly in the area of land mobile service. I have noted in several publications that you and your Committee have asked probing questions of the Federal Communications Commission and I hope you will continue your efforts in this direction until some relief is granted by the Federal Communications Commission.

You asked if we had any specific occasion where a lack of frequencies prevented adequate contact with our police officers or other law enforcement groups within the City. Perhaps it should be pointed out that even though we have had civil disturbances, they have not been of the magnitude of those in Detroit, Newark, and other areas; consequently, we have not had the problem of coordinating with the National Guard, Army, etc. However, we feel that if such a problem presented itself, we would need to have additional communication capabilities in order to properly carry out our objectives.

At the present time, we are trying to find two clear channels on which we could install a command net operation in a mobile repeat fashion. This type system would enable us to set up a temporary command post at most any location and be able to communicate with all personnel within the area which have radios on the specific channel. However, due to the congestion and shortage of frequencies in the land mobile service and specifically in the Police-Public Safety Radio Service frequencies allocation, we have been unable to obtain a recommendation from the coordinator for the police frequency of North Carolina.

We are aware of the Committee which has been set up within the Federal Communications Commission's staff to look into the possibilities of reallocating frequencies now assigned to UHF TV to land mobile service. We feel that this is one solution to the problem and certainly should be pursued diligently. It is further our feeling that communications in the police service is of greater importance than those of the entertainment area and, consequently, should be given priority in considering the reallocation of radio frequencies.

We have recently contacted our Congressman, Horace Kornegay, requesting his support along these lines. We will be glad to give further assistance if any is needed in this area.

Sincerely,

PAUL B. CALHOUN,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
August 22, 1967.

Representative JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Regulatory and Enforcement Agencies, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DINGELL: Our Minneapolis metropolitan area and Hennepin County has 39 separate law enforcement bodies most with frequencies of their own and their own radio set-up. These frequencies are scattered over the bands making it difficult or impossible to have one overall emergency net that all jurisdictions can receive and broadcast. I feel adjustments and expansion of band are necessary to give us proper radio coverage.

While communications didn't cause us any real problems during our civil disturbance this was because our disturbance was confined to a small area and only involved Minneapolis Police and Fire and later on Minnesota National Guard. I feel that communications would be a problem if our disturbance had been spread out and involved very many jurisdictions in the County.

With calls for police service going up rapidly in Minneapolis from 130,000 in 1964, 141,000 in 1965 and 157,000 in 1966 we will have to expand from our present two nets to three and later to four. This will take additional frequencies and space on the spectrum.

I hope this information will be helpful to you and your committee.

Sincerely,

CALVIN F. HAWKINSON,
Superintendent of Police.

CITY OF CAMBRIDGE, MD.,
August 16, 1967.

Congressman JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: In reply to your letter of August 15, 1967, I submit the following information and enclose a letter which I sent to the Federal Communications Commission.

The only problem that we had in connection with our radios was the constant interference from the Prince Georges County Police at Seat Pleasant, Maryland. When they transmit they block our transmissions completely and it was very difficult for us to keep in contact with our cars and men during the riot trouble. As you can see from the enclosed letter that we are not the only station with the same problem. The Easton Police Dept. have been in touch with the FCC on the matter for we have had the problem for two or three months, but so far the FCC has done nothing about it.

I would appreciate it if you could do something about this problem that we have with the Prince Georges County Police radio. I thank you for your letter and I hope you'll be able to do something on our problem.

Yours truly,

BRICE G. KINNAMON,
Chief of Police.

KALAMAZOO POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Kalamazoo, Mich., August 31, 1967.

Representative JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your inquiry of August 15, 1967 as to problems in communications during our recent civil disturbance.

No difficulties were encountered by this department as far as lack of communications which in any way hindered us in quelling our disturbance.

We are concerned with the radio frequence allocation as a whole.

At the present time we share our local channel with the City of Pontiac, Michigan and with all the suburban police departments in the Chicago and Cook County, Illinois area. This situation creates considerable interference problems to our own local radio traffic. This interference is often related to weather and atmospheric conditions but due to increased radio traffic on the interferring stations, the conditions are aggravated and there are times we have difficulty in receiving our own local units.

This is further aggravated when small departments and villages with only a few miles to patrol are licensed for output of 500 watts when good engineering practices indicates 50 watts of power is more than adequate.

After consultation with our departments radio engineer we would like to make the following recommendations.

1. That the problem of frequency allocation be reviewed and more channels be made available in the 150 MC–160 MC area.

2. That the problem of frequency alloca-

tion be determined on a regional instead of national basis. This would take into account the difference in radio communication problems in various areas of the nation.

3. That the television broadcasting industry be required to show cause why 82 channels allocated across the nation should not be drastically reduced.

4. That the FCC take cognizance of the fact that on the basis of the narrow band technical standards now in effect, it is possible to open up 400 additional police on public safety or business channels on each TV channel vacated.

5. That Business Radio service, special industrial radio, VHF marine radio, forestry products and all other commercial users of radio be moved out of the 150–160 MC band to channels acquired from TV channels. That the 150–160 MC band be made available only to police and public safety units and local government radio service.

If any of the above recommendations can be brought about I am sure a marked improvement will be made for police communications.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN A. FOX,
Chief of Police.
Lt. HAROLD LIGMAN,
Commander, Service Division.

CITY OF WOODHAVEN, MICH.,
August 1, 1967.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Due to the recent racial disturbance in the City of Detroit the past week, I would like to relay my thoughts to you on ways that may benefit all concerned in case of any future emergency which may arise at any time and in any community.

First, the lack of communications was an apparent factor in the past incident in Detroit. I believe there should have been direct communication not only to the Police Departments involved but to all Police Departments in the Tri-County area.

In the past incident in Detroit all the Police Departments in the Wayne County area were asked to send their available men to River Rouge as an outbreak was expected there. Our Department sent no men because of lack of communication to our Department. The request being sent out through the Wayne County teletype system of which our Department does not have. Whether other Departments lack this teletype machine I do not know.

The curfew hours, the closing of gasoline stations, etc., were not standardized as should have been, also one community not knowing what the neighboring community was doing.

Therefore, I propose that a Tri-County system be set up and all Police Departments to have a teletype machine with headquarters to be in Detroit which is the largest city and also is centralized. Any emergency arising in any community to be teletyped to all Police Departments from the command station and to comply with any and all orders. The Departments which cannot afford the teletype machines should be helped by State and Federal Grants.

Secondly, and most important, all Tri-County Police Departments to be on a standardized radio communication system.

The set up to be as follows:

1. An emergency frequency for all Police Departments to tune in on when ordered.

2. A State Police frequency, to be tuned in by Local Departments.

3. A County frequency, to be tuned in on by Local Departments.

4. Local frequency, as is now being used by the Departments.

The command post in Detroit to have authority to direct any or all Police Departments to switch to the emergency frequency or the State or County frequency as is needed. As an example, a community with four Police vehicles could be ordered to have two or three vehicles to switch to the emergency frequency for standby orders and the other vehicle or vehicles to remain on their local frequency to continue the patrol of their community.

Due to the high cost of the added frequencys to the present radio systems of the communities, the monies to be allocated by State and Federal Grants.

I cannot stress too strongly the need for direct communications to all Police Departments for the safety and welfare of others.

I hereby request to you Mr. Dingell to call a meeting of all area Police Chiefs and other High Government Officials to try to solve or keep to a minimum any other such emergency such as we have just witnessed.

Very truly yours,

GUST ZOUYRAS,
Chief of Police.

VOYAGEURS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Minneapolis Tribune of November 5, 1967, pointing to the dangers to our national forests of the precedent being pushed in California, and elsewhere, for the exchange of national forest lands to timber companies in exchange for holdings within a proposed national park.

At this time the peril arises in connection with a Voyageurs National Park.

National parks, if they are to be procured and set aside as national treasures, should not be purchased by the dissipation of anything as precious as the national forest lands. To many people of the Nation, these lands are fully as valuable, and often more so, than the national parks to be purchased.

The article follows:

LEVANDER SEEN SETTING CONDITIONS FOR VOYAGEURS PARK

(By John Heritage)

Sources close to Republican Gov. Harold LeVander believe that he may soon give conditional support to the proposed Voyageurs National Park on the Kabetogama Peninsula.

The conditions, however, may be so tough that they could produce a stalemate, the sources believe.

One of the conditions LeVander reportedly is considering is that federal land ownership in Minnesota not be increased to create the park.

Since a national park would increase federal ownership, the only way this stipulation could be met is if the other federal agencies in the state—probably the U.S. Forest Service—were to release some of their lands.

The Forest Service would probably oppose such a move, as would some major conservation groups. And it could prove to be a point of deadlock.

LeVander will be urged to impose a "no federal land increase" provision by some state officials and by northern Minnesota timber companies which oppose a park at Kabetogama.

On the other hand, some LeVander officials favor a park at Kabetogama, east of International Falls, Minn., as do several other Minnesota groups and economic interests, and these sources will urge him not to take a position that may stymie the National Park Service proposal.

A provision for relinquishing other federal lands to offset the gains made by establishing a park is contained in a bill passed last week by the U.S. Senate to create a redwood national park in California.

In the redwood measure, one of the hottest issues before Congress, U.S. Forest Service lands in California would be given to timber companies which in turn would give up their lands within the proposed park.

Eight conservation groups, backed by the Forest Service, believe the trade provision is a dangerous precedent, and they reportedly plan to fight it if and when the bill is brought before the House next year. They believe the trade amounts to "robbing Peter to pay Paul."

The trade provision in the redwood bill was a condition made by California's Republican governor, Ronald Reagan.

LeVander's support is key to establishing a national park in Minnesota.

A number of state administrative, and possibly legislative, moves would have to be made to clear the way for the park.

Federal-state land exchanges, which may be needed to bring the peninsula under federal ownership, would have to be approved by the Land Exchange Commission, made up of LeVander, Atty. Gen. Douglas Head and State Auditor Stafford King.

Sale of any state-owned lands to the National Park Service would also have to be approved by the commission. State trust fund lands, some of which are on the peninsula, can be sold only at public auction.

And there are other policies, regulations and state laws that would touch on creation of the park.

According to a recent Minnesota Department of Conservation report, a National Park Service official said that if a land exchange proves impossible, the Park Service might agree to let Boise Cascade Corp., an Idaho-based timber firm with large holdings on the peninsula phase out its timber operations there, for perhaps up to 50 years. The Park Service would gradually acquire the lands that had been harvested.

Boise Cascade, which owns 49,000 of the proposed park's 107,000 acres, opposes the park there. Acquiring its lands, either through private, state and federal exchanges or by purchase, would be necessary.

In imposing the "no federal increase" condition, LeVander might ask the federal government to give up lands in the Superior or the Chippewa National Forests in northern Minnesota administered by the U.S. Forest Service or other Forest Service or U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) holdings.

John Wernham, supervisor of the Superior National Forest, said Friday he would be opposed to such a land release, which might involve 100,000 or more acres.

LeVander will hold a special meeting on the park issue in the Virginia, Minn., area Nov. 28.

Significantly, he is confining the meeting to a discussion of the National Park Service proposal—the Kabetogama Peninsula site. Opponents of Kabetogama are pushing several other sites.

THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION TAKES AN IMPORTANT STEP IN BEHALF OF PROGRESS FOR THE AMERICAN CITY

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the White House today announced the creation of an Institute for Urban Development that can provide important new progress for the American city.

This Institute will explore new ideas and technology, new methods and techniques for modernizing urban areas and finding new solutions to some very old urban problems.

The President has asked a group of distinguished Americans to help form this Institute. They are:

Mr. Irwin Miller, chairman of the board of Cummins Engine; Mr. Arjay Miller, president of the Ford Motor Co.; Mr. McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation; Mr. Kermit Gordon, president of the Brookings Institute; Mr. Richard Neustadt, director of the Kennedy Institute of Politics at Harvard; and Mr. Cyrus Vance.

This Institute will bring together a wide variety of disciplines—architects, administrators, builders, city planners, engineers, sociologists, and others, to provide evaluation and direction of the Nation's urban problems and existing programs.

There is no question about the need for such an institute. And I believe that its formulation may be one of the more important developments for urban progress created by this administration.

I congratulate President Johnson for conceiving this Institute. I am certain that millions of American city dwellers will be watching its progress with extreme hope and interest.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON: CHAMPION FOR AMERICA'S HEALTH

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson signed into law this week the 31st—and one of the most significant—health measures in his 4 years in office—the Partnership for Health Act. This record makes President Johnson the Nation's greatest champion for a healthier America.

The Partnership for Health Act joins the efforts of Federal, State, and local governments in three comprehensive programs to rid America of the sickness which robs so many of a normal life.

States and communities are freed from restrictions of health grants and allowed to provide the health services they themselves deem most urgent.

The new bill also provides strict standards for clinical laboratories, to insure the elimination of erroneous laboratory results.

Last, this act provides for a 3-year effort to fight rat infestation in our Nation's slums. This is a signal victory for the Johnson administration, for only a few months ago a rat control bill was laughed out of Congress. As the President noted, the partnership for health bill shows that the American people have not taken the rat control problem lightly.

This bill is a triumph for creative federalism. It is a victory for the American people, for the strength of a nation can be measured in the health care its citizens receive—and President Johnson and two Democratic-led Congresses have raised the health care of America to its highest level in history.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the RECORD the President's remarks made upon signing into law the partnership for health bill:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT SIGNING CEREMONIES OF THE PARTNERSHIP FOR HEALTH LEGISLATION

Mr. Vice President, Secretary Gardner, Chairman Staggers, members of Congress, ladies and gentlemen:

As President there is nothing that I enjoy more than coming here to the East Room and signing health bills.

First, I think it is somewhat of a recommendation and a compliment to the Congress for having passed them. Having spent so many years in Congress, I look for every opportunity I can, in good conscience, to compliment them.

This is the second health bill that I have signed this week. That makes me very proud and I think this is something that will make the American people very happy.

This is the 31st health bill that I have signed in the last four years. I think that is of some significance because it shows what we are thinking about in this country and it shows what we are doing about it.

The bill that we will sign shortly is a little different than some of the others that we have had. Its purpose is not to create a new program, but to try to consolidate some old ones. It gives our States and it gives our communities new power to mount a total war against sickness and against disease—and they need that power.

Some two years ago a noted medical researcher said: "The human body comes in only two shapes and three colors. I don't expect there will be any changes . . ."

But even if the human body is quite limited in both shape and color, the human body has also unlimited capacity for affliction. As medical science has discovered more and more of the new ways to cure the body's ills, the Federal Government has responded with more and more health programs, as the number of these measures has indicated—each with a pinpointed target, each valid and each valuable for its own purpose. But the result, after dozens and dozens of health bills enacted in a relatively short period—more health bills have been enacted in the last four years than all the preceding years of our Government put together—the result has been a programmatic and bureaucratic night mare that we frankly must face up to.

In this Partnership for Health measure, we begin to try to cure some of this red tape. We begin to try to free the Public Health Service from the burden of paperwork so it can fight a more important battle, the battle against disease.

This bill contains a three-part strategy to help them fight that battle against diseases:

First, it offers assistance to States and communities to develop broad-based plans for health. We give them that obligation and responsibility and call upon them to do their planning.

Second, as quickly as these plans are ready, it provides Federal funds to help carry out these local plans.

Third, it establishes a national program for research and development in health services. Even as we discover new ways to cure disease, we are testing better ways to bring these cures to the people.

So the bill contains two proposals:

It opens the way to strict Federal and State standards for clinical laboratories. It will help to eliminate the patient of the needless anguish of tests he has had to undergo that might be faulty. We do know from recent studies that as many as one out of four tests performed by some laboratories have been wrong tests.

This bill also deals with a subject that you have heard about and read about and some people have laughed about—the subject of rats.

Throughout history rats have been the prime delivery system for our filth and the worst diseases that human beings have. To little children in the slums rats have really been the Public Enemy No. 1.

Some important people—I am told—thought it was a joke when we sent up the Rat Control Bill a few months earlier. Some joked about it.

The bill we sign today shows that American people are not laughing about it. And it shows that the Congress and the country were listening.

Now it is the turn of State and community leaders to listen. Now it is time for the health officers to show that by this partnership we mean business.

This is the second consumer bill that I have signed this year. We still have ten to go, Truth-in-lending, Pipeline Safety, Flammable Fabrics and Wholesome Meat.

I had some encouraging words a few moments ago about that.

This Wholesome Meat Bill can relieve every American family from the fear that every frankfurter and hamburger they give their children could be rancid or have something wrong with it.

So, I thank the Congress for what you have brought me to sign and I invite you to give me other work to do.

THE FLORIDA LEGAL SERVICES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, as the House-Senate conferees conclude their deliberation and finalized the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the enthusiastic endorsement of the legal services rendered under that act by the president of the Florida bar. Mr. William P. Simmons, Jr., is a highly respected attorney in my State of Florida and has long worked, energetically to provide legal assistance to all those who are in need.

Mr. Speaker, I offer Mr. Simmons' letter concerning the Florida Legal Services for insertion at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all those who read and are concerned with the welfare of this Nation's citizens:

THE FLORIDA BAR,
Miami, Fla., November 28, 1967.

Re: Florida Legal Services, Inc.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CLAUDE: I appreciated your letter commending the Florida Bar for setting up

this corporation to coordinate and encourage legal aid on a statewide basis. I agree that we have made a great step forward and we have been given assurance that an OEO grant can be made to our new corporation, provided, of course, that federal funds are available.

I know that you have supported the appropriations to continue the funding of the poverty program and I commend you for it. We are especially anxious that funds be available for legal aid because the legal aid part of the poverty program has been the subject of practically no criticism but on the other hand a great deal of commendation. We desperately need to continue the federal funds for legal aid.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WM. P. SIMMONS, Jr.

CARDINAL SHEHAN'S PRAYER AT INAUGURATION OF MAYOR D'ALESANDRO OF BALTIMORE

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as we all are in need of inspiration and spiritual guidance, I would like to share with my colleagues in the Congress the prayer delivered by His Eminence Lawrence Cardinal Shehan yesterday at the inauguration of Thomas D'Alesandro III as mayor of the city of Baltimore.

Baltimore is the largest city south of the Mason-Dixon line, the second largest port, and according to the 1960 census, the sixth largest city in the country. It, therefore, is a matter of national interest when that great metropolis—a center of commerce, manufacturing, the healing arts and sciences, and culture—installs a new head of its local government.

It so happens that when Cardinal Shehan was Archbishop of the Diocese of Baltimore, he also delivered the invocation during the inaugural of the present mayor's father, Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., in May 1947, a former Representative from Maryland. I am sure many of us well remember this distinguished man who served so ably in this Chamber from January 3, 1939, until his resignation on May 16, 1947, to become mayor.

His Eminence Lawrence Cardinal Shehan, a prince of the Roman Catholic Church, on December 5, 1967, made the following prayer:

PRAYER FOR THE INAUGURATION OF MAYOR THOMAS D'ALESANDRO III

We pray Thee, O God of might, wisdom, and justice, through whom authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted, and judgments are decreed, assist with Thy holy spirit of counsel and fortitude all those to whom has been entrusted the civil government of the people of this country.

We pray for the President of these United States, that his administration may be conducted in righteousness and be eminently useful to Thy people over whom he presides.

Let the light of divine wisdom direct the deliberations of Congress, and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government.

We pray for the Governor of this State, for the members of the Assembly, and all other officers who are appointed to guard our political freedom and welfare. We ask the guidance of the Holy Spirit for the members of our Constitutional Convention, upon whose labors the future welfare of our State so vitally depends.

We pray especially for Thy servant Thomas, whom the people of this City have elected to preside over and to rule them as their Mayor. As he assumes the heavy burden of this office, may Thy divine guidance enable him to lead his people forward in the ways of justice and charity so that they and he may merit from Thee, Almighty Father, true and abiding peace and abounding prosperity. Amen.

CALIFORNIA'S VAST INVESTMENT IN WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star printed a fine editorial in its November 27 edition, entitled "The Atom on Bolsa Island," the text of which I wish to place in the RECORD. The reference is to a notable event which took place about a fortnight ago in Newport Beach, Calif., a contract signing ceremony that the urgency of congressional duties prevented me from attending.

The principals involved are the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Los Angeles Department of Water & Power, San Diego Gas & Electric Co., and Southern California Edison Co. These California public and private organizations are partners now with the two Federal agencies in the construction and operation of the world's first and largest nuclear desalination and powerplant. This dual-purpose facility, with an ultimate capacity of 150 million gallons of pure water, and 1.8 million kilowatts of electricity, will be situated on Bolsa Island, a manmade, 43-acre site off the coastline of Huntington Beach.

This prototype installation possesses, as the Star points out, "enormous promise for all mankind," but I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues the fact that this project represents just one facet of California's vast, continuing program of water resource development.

The investment of $126 million by MWD in the Bolsa Island plant is just the latest example of the willingness of Californians to put up important money of their own in the search for new water supplies. Many, many more millions have been expended or earmarked for water reclamation and water conservation projects.

In fact, in no comparable region of the world is more money spent on more projects to conserve water and salvage waste water than in the southern California counties that are dependent on the rapidly diminishing Colorado River for their water supplies.

A quick review of some of the projects in and around Orange County will give you an indication of the magnitude of the entire program. Studies are well along on a proposed treatment plant to be located in the northern part of Orange County which will be designed to reclaim 10 million gallons per day of domestic waste water for recharge of the Santa Ana River basin. By 1990, expansion to a capacity of 70 million gallons per day is contemplated. As this water salvage program develops, estimated cost of the rectified water is expected to drop from the starting figure of $30 per acre-foot to $18 in 1975 and to $12 in 1990.

Existing plants of smaller size already reclaim water to irrigate landscaping at a retirement community and at San Clemente, in addition to supplying lakes at Moulton Niguel, and to help crops grow at the Orange County Honor Farm. At El Toro, waste water is treated for reuse at the Marine Base there and at the Industrial Farm. At Perris and at Huntington Beach, also, waste water now is being processed for safe reuse.

Near Laguna, the Aerojet-General Co.'s testing of reverse osmosis processes to demineralize saline and brackish water are in progress.

All told, there are more than 60 reclamation plants in southern California and they are salvaging more than 350,000 acre-feet of waste water a year.

Although engineers recognize the importance of water reclamation, they also recognize that the amount of water which can be reclaimed in southern California can not possibly represent a quantity large enough to solve the Southwest problem of deficiency. As future development of the Colorado River occurs, California's allotment will be limited to 4,400,000 acre-feet annually instead of the 5,100,000 acre-feet yearly which now is used. This cutback will occur because other States are not yet able to divert their shares of Colorado River water. The quantity of water which might be reclaimed in southern California would not even replace the impending loss of 700,000 acre-feet. Much more water will be needed to keep the Southwest economy viable.

Because of engineering, economic, legal, and political problems, it is extremely difficult to predict at this time how much of the need could be supplied on a dependable basis. The same holds true for weather modification, which also is still in the experimental stage. Estimates of their true economic potential are not as yet known. Therefore, it is unfair to sell these programs as panaceas for all air-water problems. They are not, and to build up confidence that they will be that major factor in solving our problems until we have had the benefit of more study is only indulging in self-delusion.

California is pursuing every conceivable measure possible to achieve maximum use of her precious water supplies. However, our efforts must continue to concentrate on new sources of water if we want to meet the demands and needs

of the area. The Bolsa Island project is a major advance, but still only a step in a continuing search.

The Star article follows:

THE ATOM ON BOLSA ISLAND

There is enormous promise for all mankind in the contract the Atomic Energy Commission and the Interior Department executed the other day with the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

Under the contract, the Federal government will provide technical assistance and a contribution of $72 million to the building and operation of the world's first and largest nuclear-fueled desalting and electric power plant. California and the participating private utility companies will supply the balance of the nearly $500 million investment involved.

In an age of exploding population, when our own and every other country faces sharply rising demands for power and water, the significance of this enterprise can hardly be exaggerated. When it becomes fully operational on Bolsa Island—a man-made 43-acre site 40 miles south of Los Angeles—it will do two revolutionary things on an economically feasible basis: (1) It will desalt and make drinkable 150 million gallons of sea water every day—enough for a city the size of San Francisco; and (2) it will generate 1.8 million kilowatts of electricity—enough for the needs of a metropolitan area the size of Washington's.

This plant, moreover, will be only the prototype, the forerunner, the Model T version of comparable but much greater projects combining desalinization and electrical generation for the production of food and other goods vital to man and his society. AEC Chairman Seaborg, in a little-noticed address last month in Warsaw, Poland, had many arresting things to say about the prospective developments. One of the examples he cited is based on a still-unpublished study at Oak Ridge National Laboratory. It envisions the creation of nuclear-powered "agro-industrial complexes" in both advanced and underdeveloped nations. In Seaborg's words, the "near-term possibility" is that just one such complex—producing 1 million kilowatts and desalting 400 million gallons of water a day—could do the following:

"It could support the daily production of 2,000 tons of ammonia and 360 tons of phosphorus. The food factory in this plant would consist of 200,000 acres irrigated and fertilized by the nuclear plant. On the basis of growing a single high-yield crop . . . this complex could produce more than 1 billion pounds of grain annually—enough to feed about 2.5 million people at a level of 2,400 calories per day. In addition, it could export enough fertilizer to other agricultural areas . . . to cultivate 10 million more acres."

If not one but many plants of this sort become a reality in the decades ahead, the world will have a weapon to combat the Malthusian nightmare that some experts fear is even now in the making. Bolsa Island serves as a bright reminder of the atom's marvelously beneficent potentials for peoples everywhere.

THE COPPER STRIKE

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the vast bulk of copper production and some of our zinc and lead mines have been shut down since July 15. It is a strike which is just a few days short of being 6 months old. Yet there is little knowledge of this strike across the country and by and large you would be scarcely able to find anyone who knows about it. But what is worse is that there has yet to be any real bargaining between the parties involved—and the Department of Labor advises me that there does not seem to be any immediate hope of bargaining.

The history of mining is turbulent, and the history of western mining is especially so. Any student of history knows that in the mines of western America there were hard and bitter and sometimes bloody battles over union organization. And even today the unions representing copper workers and management representing the great copper producers have bitter antagonisms. It is almost as if the industrial warfare of the 1930's is still continuing in this basic industry.

The issues at stake in this strike are many. The workers are demanding higher wages—which surely is a negotiable point. They are also demanding greater benefits—which surely is a point which can also be bargained over. Finally, the unions are demanding companywide bargaining; it is this which apparently management is unwilling to even talk about. Assuredly companywide bargaining has met with fierce resistance in the electrical industry and in every other industry where it has been sought. But still this would seem to be the crux of the crisis in the copper industry. Whether this is the source of the problem I do not know, but it seems to be the reason why management is not talking with the unions today.

While this strike goes on there is suffering and hardship among the striking workers. A good many mines are in out of the way places, and I do not know how families survive without work in such places. Yet despite the hardship imposed on them, these workers seem quite willing to undergo it in order to achieve their goals.

While collective bargaining has broken down in this strike—never in fact ever started—our supply of copper continues to dwindle. The situation for some companies which need copper will soon be critical, and may already be for a few. But despite this threat there seems to be no hope for progress in this dispute until and unless there is some drastic change on one side or the other.

The companies involved in this strike disclaim all responsibility for its length and bitterness. I doubt that this is true. The unions claim for their part that the companies are wholly at fault. This may or may not be true. But whoever is at fault and whatever the reason it is incomprehensible to me that this strike can continue much longer.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the parties in the copper dispute will bargain, and bargain honestly, at the earliest opportunity. The hardship and suffering has gone on long enough; I hope that management will abandon its intransigence and at least come to the bargaining table.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO URGES EARLY ENACTMENT OF LEGISLATION TO DEDICATE WESTON ATOM SMASHER FOR DR. ENRICO FERMI

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, 1967, I introduced H.R. 11726 to provide that the nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., be named the "Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator" in memory of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi.

I am happy to note that on December 2, 1967, the 25th anniversary of the first nuclear chain reaction, President Johnson announced in a closed circuit television speech beamed by satellite to scientists observing this anniversary, that he would like "to see the new Weston atom smasher dedicated for Enrico Fermi, the late scientist who guided the world into the atomic age 25 years ago."

It was Dr. Fermi, Italian Nobel Prize winner, who headed the two teams working around the clock to build the first nuclear pile. On December 2, 1942, at precisely 3:25 p.m. under the west stands of Stagg Field at the University of Chicago, Dr. Fermi and his team of scientists achieved for the first time a controlled nuclear fission chain reaction. This great event ushered in the atomic age.

I am delighted to learn that the President shares my feelings in this matter, and I shall appreciate the help and assistance of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to enact H.R. 11726 into law without further delay. Few men, if any, have played a greater role than Enrico Fermi in the harnessing of nuclear energy for both war and peace, and he is truly deserving of this recognition.

It is my pleasure to insert at this point in the RECORD an article which appeared in the December 3 edition of the Chicago Tribune covering President Johnson's closed circuit television address with reference to Dr. Enrico Fermi, and also an article which appeared in the December 1 edition of the Christian Science Monitor regarding the 25th anniversary of the first nuclear chain reaction. The articles follow:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Dec. 3, 1967]

ASKS AN OPEN DOOR ONSITE INSPECTION—SPEAKS BY TV TO SCIENTISTS

(By Ronald Kotulak)

President Lyndon B. Johnson said yesterday that the United States is willing to open up all of its nuclear facilities, except those used for military weapons, for international inspection in a major step to reduce the risk of a nuclear war.

In a closed circuit television speech beamed by satellite to scientists observing the 25th anniversary of the first nuclear reaction, on the University of Chicago campus, Johnson said that the United States is willing to take such a step if other countries would do the same.

A MEMORIAL TO FERMI

Johnson also announced that he would like to see the new Weston atom smasher dedicated for Enrico Fermi, the late scientist who guided the world into the atomic age 25 years ago.

Johnson said that the giant 200 billion electron volt proton accelerator, which is now called the National Accelerator Laboratory will keep America in the forefront of nuclear research. Construction on the accelerator is expected to start next summer.

HEAR ITALIAN PRESIDENT

The ceremonies at the university's Mandel hall marked the history-making experiment Dec. 2, 1942, when a group of scientists led by Fermi achieved the first controlled, self-sustaining nuclear chain reaction, under the west stands of Stagg field.

Johnson's address from Washington was televised to Chicago by way of the Comsat communications satellite.

The satellite also carried a live television speech from Giuseppi Saragat, president of Italy, who praised Johnson's offer of open inspection of nuclear facilities. Saragat spoke from Rome.

He said that if all men of "good will" respond in a like manner then the great peaceful uses of nuclear energy can be realized without the fear of an atomic holocaust.

Johnson said that the experiment harnessing the power of the atom gave man, for the first time, all of the potential energy he could possibly use.

MUST DISPEL WAR PALL

Altho the atom was first employed in the world's most destructive weapon, it is also the key to the golden age of mankind, Johnson told his audience, which included most of the members of the Fermi team.

But the pall of a nuclear war hangs over the world, and it is up to man to take every possible step to dispel this dark cloud, Johnson said.

"We can either remake life on earth or we can end it forever," he said.

The world now needs a treaty to ban the spread of nuclear weapons to nations that now do not possess them, he said.

Every day, the chance becomes greater that smaller nations will acquire material for atomic bombs because of the spread of nuclear reactors, Johnson said.

A small diversion of the nuclear fuel can be used for weapons, he explained.

SEEK OTHERS TO AGREE

"The American people have made their own desire crystal clear. When the Senate voted unanimously to support an effective nonproliferation [of atomic weapons] treaty.

"We are now engaged in a major effort to achieve such a treaty in a form that is acceptable to all nations," Johnson said.

America is trying hard to assure everyone that the benefits of the treaty would be shared by all nations, both large and small, he explained.

The safeguards of such a treaty would in no way interfere with the peaceful uses of atomic energy, he added.

NO SAFEGUARDS ASKED

"I want to make it clear to all the world that we in the United States are not asking any countries to accept safeguards that we are unwilling to accept for ourselves.

"I am today announcing that when such safeguards are applied over the field, the United States will permit the International Atomic Energy agency to apply its safeguards to all nuclear activities in the United States, excluding only those that have direct application to security protection.

Johnson said that the inspection would include private nuclear reactors as well as nonmilitary nuclear facilities operated by the government.

"We wish to conduct ourselves so that future generations will not look back on Dec. 2, 1942, to despair but as the beginning of the brightest and most inspiring chapter in the long history of man," Johnson said.

In his speech, Saragat said Italy wanted to pay homage to the United States for opening its doors to Fermi and others who fled persecution in Italy and Germany during World War II periods.

Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, chairman of the atomic energy commission, said that a nonproliferation treaty is necessary before nuclear reactor programs can be expanded to underdeveloped countries.

The treaty, Dr. Seaborg said, would assure small nations that their neighbors would not secretly acquire atomic bombs nor use reactors to make their own weapons.

Sigvard Eklund, director general of the International Atomic Energy agency, which is located in Vienna, said that if the nonproliferation treaty is not signed by the middle of next year there is little likelihood it would ever become effective.

"A failure to sign a treaty may bring the atom as a repellant to the fore and initiate an atomic armament race," Ecklund warned.

"Our world will not become a safe place to live in thru such an action, but may be brought much closer to that holocaust every one of us wants to avoid," he said.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 1, 1967]

DECEMBER 2, 1942: THE DAY TOMORROW BEGAN

(Twenty-five years ago, physicists at the University of Chicago achieved man's first nuclear chain reaction. Here is an account of the momentous day that opened the Atomic Age.)

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—"What's going on, Doctor? Something happen in there?"

Dec. 2, 1942, was a cold snowy day in Chicago, and it was particularly bleak and windy around 5 p.m. under the west stands of Stagg Field at the University of Chicago.

A group of heavily overcoated men filed out from the west stands led by Dr. Enrico Fermi, the Italian physicist, and including Canadian Walter Zinn, the Hungarians Leo Szilard and Eugene Wigner, the Americans Arthur Compton, Norman Hilberry, Herbert Anderson, and a dozen or more others.

They nodded to the guard then hurried on. Incidentally, the guard never did learn, until years later, just what had happened that day on that old squash-rackets court under Stagg Field's west stands. For until the war ended it was top secret.

What happened on that cold Wednesday in 1942 altered the course of civilization. For it was on that day, at precisely 3:25 p.m., that Fermi and his team of scientists for the first time achieved a controlled nuclear-fission chain reaction. That event ushered in the Atomic Age.

This energy was first employed for war. The first experimental bomb was exploded July 16, 1945, at Alamogordo, N.M. Three weeks later a sister bomb was dropped on Hiroshima and three days after that another on Nagasaki.

PEACEFUL USES

After the war more sophisticated reactors were built, thus channeling the enormous energy of the atom into peaceful pursuits—the generation of electricity, propulsion of ships and rockets, testing of materials, medical research.

The Atomic Energy Commission has aptly called Dec. 2, 1942, "the day tomorrow began." On Dec. 1 and 2 this year the University of Chicago is staging a 25th-anniversary observance of the first nuclear chain reaction.

Today the government has the personal recollections of a dozen or so of the 42 scientists who spent that historic day under the west stands at Stagg Field.

There is also the record on which was traced the neutron intensity within the first pile, showing when it went "critical."

And there are volumes of correspondence, including that famous letter Albert Einstein sent President Roosevelt. In it Einstein, speaking for the scientists working on nuclear fission, notified the President of what was in prospect, described the possible destructiveness of an atomic bomb, and warned him that Nazi Germany was working desperately to develop such a weapon.

As the experiment at Stagg Field became directly tied to the development of the atomic bomb, security and secrecy became an obsession.

There was in fact a time in the spring of 1942 when concern for security was so tight that Fermi and his colleagues didn't dare meet in their offices. They gathered quietly and informally under what came to be called "the council tree," out in front of Eckhart Hall on the university campus.

HIS WIFE DIDN'T KNOW

The emphasis on secrecy was so strong that all during the experiment Mrs. Laura Fermi, the wife of the chief of the project, had no idea what was going on. She writes in her memoirs of those days:

"Enrico walked to work every morning, not to the physics building but to the 'Met Lab,' the Metallurgical Laboratory. The only single secret about it he told me was that there were no metallurgists at the Metallurgical Laboratory—and I wasn't even to divulge that!"

On the evening of Dec. 2, 1942, Mrs. Fermi gave a party for the "metallurgists" working on her husband's project. As each came in, stamping his feet, shaking the snow from his shoulders, she writes: "They shook Enrico's hand and said the one word, 'Congratulations.' When I asked some of them why, they would only smile and say, 'Ask your husband,' or 'Your hubsand's a smart guy,' or, 'Don't worry you'll find out sometime. "

It was 2½ years later that Mrs. Fermi finally learned just what her husband had done under those west stands at Stagg Stadium.

"One evening," she writes, "shortly after the end of the war in Japan, Enrico brought home a mimeographed paperbound volume.

" 'It may interest you to see the Smyth Report,' he said. [That was the first official declassified information on atomic energy.] Halfway through I found the reason for the congratulations at that party: the first chain reaction achieved under Enrico's direction."

MANY NATIONALITIES INVOLVED

Few Americans are aware of how much the United States owes to Italy and Germany, as well as many other countries, for contributing to creation of the first atomic pile.

There was Dr. Fermi, Italian Nobel Prize winner, who after picking up his award in Sweden came to the United States, condemned by his Italian Fascist government for failing to give the Fascist salute in accepting his award. It was Dr. Fermi who headed the two teams of scientists, physicists, and engineers working around the clock to build the first nuclear pile. They constructed 30 different models before finding the design and size they wanted.

There was Lise Meitner, who had fled Nazi Germany and was working with Niels Bohr in Copenhagen, on the breaking up of the uranium atom.

There was, of course, Albert Einstein who in 1905 with his equation ($E=MC^2$—energy equals mass times the velocity of light [C] squared) opened the door to the concept of energy release, and finally found a haven at the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton, N.J.

There was the Canadian-born Walter Zinn and Lee Szilard, a Hungarian, with their work on the number of neutrons emitted by fissioning uranium.

It was the young Glenn Seaborg, future Nobel Prize winner and today chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, who at Berkeley, Calif., using a cyclotron, produced a submicroscopic speck of an entirely new element, plutonium.

MASSIVE TEAM FORMED

Thus the scientists joined statesmen and military leaders in a "chain-reaction" effort: the achievement of uranium fission to produce plutonium to make a bomb to end the war.

Much of the theoretical and experimental work on nuclear fission was being done at Columbia University and at Princeton. But when Dr. Arthur H. Compton of Chicago University was placed in charge of the uranium project in 1941, the work moved to Chicago and the "Metallurgical Laboratory," now called the Argonne National Laboratory.

Dr. Fermi, in his memoirs of that memorable day in 1942, defines a chain reaction thus:

"An atomic chain reaction may be compared to the burning of a rubbish pile from spontaneous combustion. In such a fire, minute parts of the pile start to burn and in turn ignite other tiny fragments. When sufficient numbers of these fractional parts are heated to the kindling point, the entire heap bursts into flame."

This was the process they were working to perform under the stands of Stagg Stadium.

The experimenters used uranium for their "rubbish pile," because of two properties possessed by this element in its natural state:

First, a uranium atom can be split—fissioned. Second, when it fissions, it releases more energy than was required to split it. Furthermore, there is also a release of particles (neutrons) from the atom's nucleus.

Free neutrons from outer space are continually bombarding the earth. If one of these strikes the nucleus of a uranium atom at the proper velocity, it will split that nucleus—releasing energy and more neutrons. If some of these can be induced to strike the nuclei of other uranium atoms, more energy and more neutrons will be released. And so on. Hence, the term "chain reaction."

But in 1942, this was still unproved theory. It had to be proved. The Chicago experimenters calculated that if they could assemble enough uranium in one place, they could keep a chain reaction of atomic fission going.

One problem was how to slow the velocity of the flying neutrons to the point where they could collide effectively with surrounding atomic nuclei.

GRAPHITE BRICKS USED

It was Dr. Fermi and Mr. Szilard who came up with a "neutron brake": Graphite, they found, would effectively slow the particles.

In essence they took a four-inch-square bar of dirty, slippery carbon (graphite); cut the bar into bricks; drilled holes in them; filled the holes with uranium; and then built the bricks into a pile. The result: a "graphite cake" filled with "uranium raisins."

But there was another problem: The researchers couldn't be certain—without actually trying it—that when the total number of "uranium raisins" got large enough (reached "critical mass"), then the number of escaping neutrons might not also be large enough to trigger an uncontrollable, runaway chain reaction of fission. In short they could have an atomic explosion on their hands.

To prevent this, a set of control rods was inserted into the "cake." These rods were made of materials (including cadmium) which would not merely slow down the neutrons but completely absorb them. With the rods in, no neutron interaction could occur. As they were slowly withdrawn, more and more fission would be permitted to take place.

Geiger counters (which register radioactive emissions) would measure the number of escaping neutrons and thus indicate when a chain reaction was taking place.

Two other control rods were installed as safety devices. One was linked to the Geiger counters. If, as the main rod was being withdrawn, the Geiger count reached a certain point, the safety rod would be automatically shoved into the pile to halt neutron interaction.

The second safety rod could be slammed home manually.

On the other hand, efficiency was also a consideration. The hydrogen and oxygen atoms of the air within the pile might absorb so many neutrons that there wouldn't be enough left to produce the desired chain reaction in the uranium.

Accordingly it was decided to encase the pile in a square-shaped cloth balloon, from which the neutron-capturing air could be pumped out.

At first the people at Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company thought the order for a square balloon was a joke. It wasn't until years later that they found out what the balloon they built was for.

It was hung around the pile with one side left open, to be closed if needed. But the scientists' concern proved groundless, and it never had to be used.

BUILT UP BY LAYERS

The pile was constructed brick by brick: first a layer of "uranium raisin" bricks, then a layer of solid graphite bricks. As the pile grew, the men became increasingly concerned over safety. They began to worry that the pile might be nearing "critical mass," or size—too many "raisins."

Following are parts of Fermi's account of the momentous event on Dec. 2, 1942, when the 57th layer of bricks was added:

"Finally the day came. We gathered on a balcony about 10 feet above the floor. Below us was George Weil, whose duty it was to handle the last control rod that was holding the reaction in check.

"Every precaution had been taken against an accident. There were three sets of control rods in the pile. One set was automatic. Another consisted of a heavily weighted emergency safety held by a rope. Walter Zinn was holding the rope ready to release it at the least sign of trouble. The last rod left in the pile, which acted as starter, accelerator, and brake for the reaction, was the one handled by Weil.

"Since the experiment had never been tried before a 'liquid control squad' stood ready to flood the pile with cadmium salt solution in case the control rods failed."

The drama and tension of the scene mounted perceptibly.

"Finally," the Fermi account continues, "it was time to start withdrawing the main control rod. The [Geiger] counters clicked rapidly. Then a loud clap. The [automatic] control rod slammed home. The safety point had been set too low."

At this point Fermi called time out for lunch. They reassembled at 2 p.m. and reset the safety point a little higher. At 2:30 they again began gradually pulling out the main control rod.

At 2:50 it came out another foot.

At 3:20 it was moved another six inches.

Then at 3:25 Fermi said, "Pull it out another foot. This will be it." The click of the counters speeded up to a steady brrrr!

Fermi's face broke into a smile and he said suddenly: "The reaction is self-sustaining!"

For 28 minutes these 42 scientists watched enthralled as the world's first nuclear reactor operated.

"O.K., zip in," called Fermi.

At 3:53 p.m. it was all over.

It was while these scientists were filing out of the stands at Stagg Stadium that Compton got on the long-distance telephone to Dr. James B. Conant of Harvard, who was anxiously awaiting word:

Said Compton cryptically: "The Italian navigator has landed in the new world."

"How were the natives?" asked Dr. Conant.

"Very friendly," was the reply.

And thus dawned the atomic age which Chicago University and the Atomic Energy Commission are celebrating Dec. 1–2 with speeches and the unveiling of a piece of sculpture by Henry Moore for the occasion.

Ultimately, when the atomic bomb was built, its fuel was not uranium but plutonium, a byproduct of the uranium-fission process and a much more "explosive" (fissionable) element.

In fact, there was no danger of an atomic explosion on that December afternoon in 1942. Had the danger point been exceeded, the pile would have disintegrated before it could have sustained a runaway chain reaction. But at that time atomic physics was a strange new field filled with unknowns.

Actually it can be said that the atomic age had been dawning for some time, with a long series of discoveries and experiments. But this actual production and control of nuclear power, Dec. 2, 1942, is probably as good as any date on which to date the atomic age—or what the AEC calls "the day tomorrow began."

MILESTONES

1942—First controlled nuclear fission chain reaction.

1945—First nuclear detonation, Trinity, at Alamogordo, N.M. First atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

1952—First thermonuclear (fusion) experimental device detonated.

1954—Nautilus, first nuclear-powered submarine, commissioned.

1955—Electricity from experimental reactor at National Reactor Testing Station in Idaho, lighted town of Arco for about an hour.

1956—World's first full-scale atomic power plant at Calder Hall, England, switched into national electricity grid.

1962—Project Sedan, first nuclear cratering experiment at Nevada test site, a 100-kiloton explosion forming a crater 1,280 feet in diameter and 320 feet deep.

1966—Congress authorized dual-purpose nuclear desalting and power plant off coast of California, eventually costing $500 million.

1967—AEC announced nuclear power expansion—by 1980, 34 percent of all American generating capacity to be nuclear.

IN PRAISE OF HEADSTART

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Montana Standard recently published excellent stories about two of the major programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Headstart and the Job Corps. Writing with tremendous compassion and style, Frank Quinn and Bill Parks have captured the essence of the great good produced by these antipoverty programs. Their stories are most informative, and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, the Headstart program at the Sacred Heart School on East Park is, as Frank Quinn says, "an answer to a community call to help children who are

innocent victims of less advantageous environments." And he gives us a poignant example:

Meet Becky! When she first attended Head Start in September, instructors felt she might be mentally retarded because she seldom spoke, even to answer questions, tests proved otherwise. Last week, playing "Farmer in the Dell" Becky's voice rang out loud and clear above all the others. She had found herself.

This example has been repeated in tens of thousands of instances around the country, wherever Headstart is at work. This marvelous program must be continued with the strong support of the Congress.

Bill Parks' story on the Job Corps is equally encouraging. Bill and his wife invited two Anaconda Center Job Corps enrollees, Carl Triplett and Harrison Washington, to join them for Thanksgiving dinner. His report of their hopes and feelings about the Job Corps reveals that the Anaconda Center is living up to its mission. Corpsman Washington reports:

The center has just about everything a man needs. It sure has been a big help to me.

As Bill Parks recounts, these young men are determined to prepare themselves for meaningful employment after graduation from the Job Corps:

They gave the impression that the Job Corps is not just another chance for high school dropouts and the underprivileged—it is possibly their only chance.

Mr. Speaker, the two programs described in the articles which follow are a vital part of this Nation's objective to prepare our disadvantaged youthful population for an eventual full and independent life. The best way to win the war on poverty is certainly to reach youth, and to the extent that the anti-poverty program provides youngsters with the good health, motivation, education, and skills to succeed in a world which would otherwise be denied them, it has my unqualified support.

The above-mentioned articles follow:

[From the Montana Standard, Nov. 26, 1967]

HEADSTART—A HAND UP, NOT A HANDOUT

(By Frank Quinn)

The Sacred Heart School on East Park, which for more than half a century gave many of Butte's business, professional, clerical, industrial and labor leaders their start, was abandoned this fall as an elementary school.

But the building is now the center of another educational program, a government financed project, in which preschool boys and girls are getting a head start.

There are 100 children in this Head Start project. The eight-month program will end in May. The current project, the third in Head Start circles here, was funded for $103,855 by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Two prior programs here were eight weeks duration each. The local in-kind funding for the present project is $16,503 for a $120,503 total.

Coming from low-income families, the children forming the school enrollment are sponsored by the Butte-Silver Bow Anti-Poverty Council, receiving benefits of a children development program. The program is a vital component of broad efforts to attack the roots and sources of problems of such children.

These children, all of whom will enter school next fall, will have been given the chance they need, the chance of keeping pace with more fortunate first graders. In some instances, the chances of such children adjusting to the new and challenging environment of school has been dangerously thin.

Meet Becky! When she first attended Head Start in September, instructors felt she might be mentally retarded because she seldom spoke, even to answer questions. Tests proved otherwise. Last week, playing "Farmer in the Dell" Becky's voice rang out loud and clear above all others. She had found herself.

A conference with Becky's parents also helped. It appeared that if she spoke at home, no one listened; if she was spoken to, it was a brief command, sometimes a rebuke. The adults she knew were too preoccupied with the daily grind of existence to offer much cheer or encouragement.

Then there is Eddie, almost 6, who knew nothing about things other children take for granted—a visit to Columbia Gardens, the pictures in a fairy tale and the comforting smile of a concerned adult. Eddie is the proud boy who constructed the Halloween mask pictured on this page.

The response to Head Start has captured the imagination and enthusiasm of the community. This is one OEO program that has met with almost universal approval. Head Start has been described as a hand up, not a handout, to boys and girls who need a lift. It is an answer to a community call to help children who are innocent victims of less advantageous environments.

Also important from a community standpoint is the fact there are numerous volunteers, men and women and high school boys and girls serving without pay. Most are parents of child enrollees. At least 95 per cent of the children enrolled are eligible under family income standards.

The OEO guidelines for participation range from $1,600 to $7,800 a year for a family of 13. Many of the children in the Butte program come from families ranging from 4 to 10.

Understanding is what many of the children in the Head Start program require. The director is Sister Mary Ann Lanahan, BVM, and one of the most understanding persons you'll ever meet.

Sister Mary Ann is a native of Chicago and after her novitate in Dubuque, Ia., took her BA degree in education in Mundelein College, Chicago. She has been with the program for three years. Other personnel in the school include five teachers, five teachers' aides, a nurse and the volunteer workers.

Sister Mary Ann, telling of the reaction of the children to the program said: "Hesitant looks and full-fledged tears have been replaced by happy faces and cheery 'good morning, Sister,' greetings. These children are learning a new independence and joy in a feeling of belonging, of riding the school bus, of joining in art and play activities and of learning to listen and to share. With such progress over the eight-month period, these boys and girls will be both eager and ready to begin school next fall."

The program is not all classroom activities and field trips. It has cooperation of doctors, dentists, psychologists, nurses and social workers.

Medical and dental examinations are available. Immunization is given if needed. Some of the children had not received immunization against measles, polio or other diseases.

Working with the parents, the staff provides instruction in economics and in learning how to purchase food wisely and how to improve the care of their children.

Classes are from 10 to 1:30. There are periods for socializing, snacks, art crafts, rhythm activities, teachers' reading, outdoor play, acting out fairy tales and field trips. Visits are made to the fire department headquarters, to the Gardens—when the weather permitted—and to other interest spots.

What do the boys and girls look forward to most? That's easy. They wait for snack time and lunch. Snacks include milk or cocoa, orange juice and cookies. For lunch, a typical meal provides a hot meat plate, buttered cabbage, bread, butter, pudding and milk. Weight gains are notable.

For the health and physical abilities portion of the project, school and county nurses lend aid in checking the children and, if needed, the children are referred to physicians, dentists or optometrist.

[From the Montana Standard, Nov. 26, 1967]

THANKSGIVING AWAY FROM HOME—TWO JOB CORPSMEN CAME FOR DINNER

Thanksgiving Day, this reporter and his wife had as dinner guests two Job Corpsmen, and I think we all came out of it with more than a stomach full of turkey.

In the Nov. 20 issue of The Montana Standard, under the heading, "Like to share Thanksgiving?" were two phone numbers to call to invite Job Corpsmen from the Anaconda center into your home for the traditional feast. Corpsmen are often thousands of miles from their families on Thanksgiving and Christmas.

Icy roads from an overnight snow lengthened travel time from Butte to Anaconda. This reporter was over an hour late when he picked up Corpsmen Harrison Washington, 20, and Carl Triplett, 16. Both were stylishly dressed with "spitshined" black shoes that winked the sun's reflection as they tip-toed through the new snow.

"This is the gym here," Washington said as I turned around in a driveway. "We play basketball and volleyball and box there, whenever we're not going to school or working."

Over 200 Job Corpsmen are housed in four new-looking dormitories at the Anaconda center. Corpsmen study math and reading one week while receiving work training on alternate weeks.

"Here's the school," Washington said, as we passed a red building that could pass for a scaled-down model of any modern high school in the country. "There's the dispensary. That's where I work. I'm learning to be a hospital attendant."

The car drifted slightly as we wormed our way out of the scenic hills around the Job Corps camp and headed toward Butte.

Washington, tall and slender, is the more talkative of the two. Triplett, shy and unassuming, had been at the Anaconda center less than two weeks. Washington had been at Anaconda almost two months, and is assistant leader in D Wing, Dorm 2.

"Way I see it, a man's got to have some papers—diploma of some kind, when he goes to get a job in this world," Washington said.

Talk during the ride to Butte centered around Triplett's and Washington's enthusiasm for the Job Corps. They gave the impression that the Job Corps is not just another chance for high school dropouts and the underprivileged—it is possibly their only chance.

"I'm going to learn me several trades," Washington said. "As soon as I get a certificate in one field, I'm going to try for another. The more things you know, the better chance you have of getting a job."

The corpsmen talked of going on to the Urban Center program after the Job Corps. Washington plans to take up bricklaying after his study of hospital work. Triplett is taking up carpentry.

There are 12 Urban Centers in U.S. cities. A Corpsman has to attain a certain level of classroom proficiency to move on to an Urban Center.

We were greeted at this reporter's home by the aroma of the traditional Thanksgiving dinner cooking—turkey (16 pounds), mincemeat pie, yams, rolls, etc.

"I'm counting on you fellows to eat lots of turkey," I said. "You've got to save me from all those turkey sandwiches."

"Don't worry," was the response.

Triplett asked to play my weathered guitar which was standing in the living room corner. He tuned it in some obscure way and began playing a funky brand of blues. His beat was flawless and he seemed to know a hundred blues melodies. He'd play one and say, "Heard that one?" I'd shake my head.

Finally he thumped out:

Dum - dum - dum - dum - DUM - dum-dum-dum-Bat Maaaaannn . . . .

That one I knew.

Triplett is self-taught on the guitar and says he has been playing for about three years.

"I just got a guitar and started thumping it," he said.

Washington is from Charleston, N.C., while Triplett says he lived three years in Chicago, but is from Mississippi.

Both are from large families—Washington has seven brothers and three sisters, while Triplett has six sisters and four brothers.

Washington says he quit school in the ninth grade to support his mother and three younger children. Two of the three have graduated from high school, and the third, a niece, is in her junior year.

"They got more than I got," Washington said. "Now I'm going to try and get something for myself."

After he quit school, Washington says he worked in a hospital, as a mason, and at various odd jobs.

Triplett says he picked oranges in Florida before joining the Job Corps. "I dropped out once before, but this time I'm going to stick it out," he says.

Thanksgiving dinner was eaten to recorded blues guitar music and punctuated by laughter at this reporter's fumbling with an unfamiliar camera self-timer.

After-dinner talk concerned football on TV ("There goes Hayes again") politics and the Vietnam war.

Washington, who will be old enough to vote in the next presidential election, says he would vote for Martin Luther King if he runs, or maybe LBJ. He says he feels the war is taking a lot of money that could be used for things like the Job Corps.

"Just a bunch of people killing each other—that's all it amounts to," he said. "But I guess someone's got to do it. I've got a brother who's leaving for Vietnam on Dec. 26. If we don't stop them Viet Cong over there, we'll be fighting them over here. But then, I guess everyone has a different way of thinking."

After more talk, football and a session with this reporter's "slot-car" set, it was time for the corpsmen to return to Anaconda.

We toured Butte briefly before heading for the Smelter City.

"We came up here to play "flag football once," Washington said. "I got a medal for playing football and two certificates so far—one for attendance and one for achievement. After I got appointed assistant leader I got a $5 raise—I'll be making about $20 every two weeks."

The corpsmen are paid about $15 every two weeks to start. Another $25 is put in the bank for them every month, and $25 is sent home. If the corpsman is the major supporter of his family, $50 is sent home. Most corpsmen are between 16 and 18. Top age limit is 21. Courses in mechanics, welding, carpentry, brick laying, cement work and cooking are offered at the Anaconda center.

"The center has just about everything a man needs," Washington said. "It sure has been a big help to me."

About 50 corpsmen spent Thanksgiving with families in Butte, Anaconda, Great Falls and Helena. The rest had dinner at the center and went into Anaconda for recreation.

SECOND-CLASS ADVERTISING INSERTS

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate members of the conference committee on the postal rate and pay bill recently insisted that the provision to charge first-, third-, or fourth-class rates for advertising inserts in second-class publications be removed from the bill.

I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that in one recent edition of the Reader's Digest the lack of this provision cost the Post Office Department $408,000 in lost postage on an eight-page advertising supplement for the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

Reader's Digest actually paid approximately $14,700 in postage at the low second-class rate for this supplement. If Reader's Digest had been obliged to pay the very minimum bulk third-class rate for this advertising supplement it would have cost the Digest and their client $423,000.

Please remember the Reader's Digest has a supplement almost every issue and is issued 12 times annually. Some of these supplements are much bigger than that of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, running as many as 36 pages. The tremendous loss in postage may not be so bad on the surface, but I also wish to call your specific attention to the fact that Reader's Digest was recently told by the general counsel of the Post Office Department that it violated U.S. postal rules in its handling of this supplemental advertisement which was "inconsistent with the spirit and intent of postal laws and regulations."

In order that you will better understand the background on this, I include an article from the Washington Post, dated December 6, 1967, in the RECORD, as follows:

READER'S DIGEST TOLD IT VIOLATED U.S. POSTAL RULES

(By Morton Mintz)

The Post Office Department has told the Reader's Digest that its handling of an advertisement "was inconsistent with the spirit and intent" of postal laws and regulations.

The ad, which appeared in the November issue, was bought by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. It was an 8-page pull-out section consisting of four unsigned articles in Digest editorial format supporting the PMA position on brand-name prescribing and drug prices.

The Department's criticism of the Digest was made by general counsel Timothy J. May in a letter on Monday to Hobart Lewis, president and executive editor of the Digest.

The letter noted that the PMA section was labeled "Special Advertising Section" only on its cover page. But there "is no indication on the remaining seven pages that it was paid advertising material," May said.

Postal laws and regulations impose special requirements on publications that enjoy low-rate, second-class mailing privileges, May said.

He pointed to one such requirement—that paid editoral or reading matter "shall be plainly marked 'advertisement' by the publisher." The maximum penalty for non-compliance is a $500 fine.

May told the Digest that Department attorneys have "consistently ruled that in the case of multiple pages of paid editorial or reading matter each page should be marked with the word 'advertisement' and that just showing 'all advertisement' or 'advertising section' or words of like import on the first page is not deemed sufficient . . ."

Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.), chairman of a Senate subcommittee that has been investigating drug prices, has called the PMA pull-out a "calculated deception." He complained to the Department and was told by May yesterday that the PMA ad "is believed to be a violation . . ."

A Department spokesman said, however, that the Digest would not be prosecuted, because the failure of existing regulations to require an "advertisement" label on every page of a multi-page ad put the Department in a weak legal position.

At a subcommittee hearing on Nov. 16, Nelson also protested the deletion of the single "Special Advertising Section" label from 1 million reprints the PMA ordered for distribution. At the Senator's request this is being investigated by the Federal Trade Commission as a possible deceptive practice.

The FTC said in a statement last week that ads in any print media that "have the appearance of news or feature" articles should not be undertaken. The statement was in the works before the Digest episode.

CITY HALL AND SCHOOL BOARD: THE NEED FOR DIALOG

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith an address I delivered at a model cities workshop sponsored by the National League of Cities and the U.S. Office of Education at the University of Maryland on December 1, 1967:

CITY HALL AND SCHOOL BOARD: THE NEED FOR DIALOG

(An address by Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, at a model cities workshop sponsored by the National League of Cities and the U.S. Office of Education, University of Maryland, December 1, 1967)

The introduction to a book published in this country over 75 years ago read: ". . . What shall we do with our great cities? What will our great cities do with us? These are the problems that concern every thoughtful American.

"For the question involved in these two questions does not concern the city alone. The whole country is affected, if indeed its character and history are not determined by the condition of its great cities . . ."

If it is true that the character and history of the whole country are determined by the condition of our cities—as I believe it is—then the outlook for America may not be altogether bright.

For we have been rediscovering the American city in the last few years and for many of us, the experience has not been a happy one.

For many Americans, the city is the symbol of light and learning, of art and music, of ticker tape parades and foreign restaurants, of complexity and fascination.

But for many other Americans, the city is a jungle—of racial strife, slum housing, third-rate schools, of hopelessness and despair.

Our task, I believe—yours as mayors, municipal officials, school board members and school administrators—and mine as a Congressman concerned with these matters, is to work to revitalize our cities and thereby our country, to make them the centers and generators of the best, not the worst, in American life.

And in my view, the role of education—your schools and universities—in that process of revitalization is crucial.

So I am glad to be with you today and to have the opportunity to discuss with you the crisis in our urban schools from the perspective of a member of the Committee of the House of Representatives—the Education and Labor Committee—with chief responsibility for writing education legislation.

I want here to salute both the U.S. Office of Education and the National League of Cities on having organized this Model Cities Workshop. In doing so, you have recognized the importance of bringing together both city and school officials.

For city halls and school boards must get better acquainted with each other, or a major purpose of the Model Cities program will be completely frustrated and the task of radically improving city schools severely hampered.

I shall not here trace the pathogenesis of city problems. You better than I know the painful need for more money, better trained personnel, additional facilities.

I want rather to talk to you about the problems of education in our cities as viewed by one Member of Congress, to touch on some of the issues in the relationship between the schools and the cities, and to comment on the role of Congress in respect of this relationship.

CONGRESS AND THE CITIES

It has been only within the past several years that Congress has shown signs of recognizing the seriousness of the urban crisis. Since 1964 Congress has authorized a number of programs aimed at providing at least some measure of relief for our beleaguered cities. They include, for instance, such landmark legislation as the Model Cities Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Teacher Corps, rent supplements, Title I of the High Education Act, several key civil rights acts, amendments to the Housing Act, the Economic Opportunity Act and, more recently, legislation to help meet the problems of air, water and solid waste pollution.

I would not for a moment suggest that the appropriations for any of these programs has been adequate to meet the need. On the contrary, in some cases—for example, rent supplements and the Teacher Corps—Congressional appropriations have been so low as to be almost shameful. No matter how promising the legislation, its impact, if starved for appropriations, will be greatly lessened.

This afternoon I want to discuss several broad problem areas that bear directly on the future of urban education, more precisely, on elementary and secondary education in the inner cities of America.

My list is certainly not intended to be all-inclusive. Another caveat: most of these public policy questions are interrelated and to some degree overlapping. Nevertheless, for present purposes they can be viewed as distinguishable problems.

RACIAL IMBALANCE AND QUALITY EDUCATION

1. The first policy area affecting urban education is the perplexing and highly charged issue of the relationship between racial imbalance and quality of education. The question is: does school integration or do compensatory education programs constitute the most effective approach to achieving equal opportunity in education?

You have had the opportunity this morning to listen to no less an authority than Dr. James S. Coleman, so I shall not venture deeply into this question.

As you know, there are educators and civil rights leaders on both sides of this issue, and the end of the controversy is not in sight. At the U.S. Civil Rights Commission conference on "Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities" two weeks ago, integration versus compensation became the major topic of debate, and both points of view were effectively presented. Indeed, the contending positions on each side are backed by formidable statistics and impressive expertise. I would suggest, however, that spokesman for the two sides may be withdrawing into hardened positions and closing out middle ground alternatives.

Bayard Rustin, in his address at that conference, made a plea for reason when he said, "We have got to stop the debate over whether you're for integration or quality. You're for quality first, and for that degree of integration which is consistent with it. We want children who can read, write, and do arithmetic."

I don't think it is yet proved with any certainty what degree of integration is in fact required to achieve quality education, nor do we know, in the absence of integration, how much quality can be achieved by means of compensatory programs such as Title I of ESEA. We simply do not have the hard data to show one way or another, with irrefutable evidence, the extent to which substantial compensatory programs can make real differences on a nation-wide scale in the quality of schooling for disadvantaged children.

Whatever proves to be the best approach to assure quality education, we must recognize that *de facto* segregation is not going to disappear of its own accord. Across the country, almost 80 percent of white first-graders attend schools that are from 90 to 100 percent white. The sad corollary is that more than 65 percent of our Negro first grade pupils are isolated in schools which are at least 90 percent Negro.

SCHOOL SEGREGATION ON THE RISE

Moreover, in many of our largest cities including a number which you represent today, the degree of classroom segregation is actually on the rise.

Or consider another facet of the problem, the cumulative effects of deprivation. The report prepared by Dr. Coleman for the Office of Education showed that Negroes in the sixth grade of metropolitan cities of the Northeast lag 1.6 years in academic achievement behind whites from the same areas. By grade 9, the gap widens to 2.4 years, and at grade 12, the Negro student is fully 3.3 years behind his white counterpart. None of us, I think, would be tempted to call that equal education.

I am sure that Dr. Coleman would be the first to agree that his study has been used by many people to prove many different cases. However, I consider one of his findings extremely significant: ". . . if a minority pupil from a home without much educational strength is put with schoolmates with strong educational backgrounds, his achievement is likely to increase."

In light of this evidence, will Congress act to help overcome persisting racial imbalance? Frankly, there is little sympathy in Congress—at least this present Congress—to venture into this thorniest of political thickets.

We need only look at one often-proposed approach to the problem, busing. As evidenced by the express prohibition found in Title IV of the Civil Rights Act, there is a strong feeling in Congress against busing children for the specific purpose of overcoming racial imbalance. Furthermore, the sanctity of the neighborhood school is still such that even transportation of students incidental to an educational program is suspect to many of my colleagues.

So right now major attempts to overcome the debilitating effects of racial imbalance based on neighborhood residential patterns will have to be undertaken by local officials without much Federal assistance. Only indirectly, perhaps through legislation authorizing Federal funds for educational parks or other metropolitan educational centers, is Congress likely to assume much responsibility for eliminating *de facto* segregation. Having laid aside the stick, whether Congress will choose to dangle the carrot remains to be seen.

MONEY FOR EDUCATION

2. The next problem is as simple to state as it is difficult to find: money.

During the current school year, an estimated $32 billion will be spent on public elementary and secondary education. Although the Federal contribution is enormous compared to Federal help merely five years ago, still only 8.1 percent of the support for elementary and secondary education comes from Federal sources. The lion's share, 54.1 percent of the total, comes from local funds, and 37.8 percent from State funds.

Meanwhile, urban school buildings decay, city teachers are grossly underpaid and per pupil expenditures in inner city schools, while on the rise, are at present woefully inadequate.

Despite the urgent need for more school funds, revamping local tax and other revenue sources is obviously not a job for Congress.

Congress could, of course, embark on a policy of general aid to education. Indeed, some important conditions are more amenable to such legislation now than they were during, say, the Kennedy Presidency. For example, both school authorities and the public are less fearful that federal dollars mean federal control. For another, State departments of education, partly through resources provided by Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, appear to be making some progress. Perhaps when Congress feels that state education departments become responsive to big city school needs, Congress will be more likely to adopt a block grant or general aid approach.

Meanwhile, I see no groundswell of support for a general aid effort, either among members of the Education and Labor Committee or among my colleagues not serving on the Committee.

On a balance, then, it is not likely that Federal funds will be available for elementary and secondary schools in greatly increased amounts in the near future, especially as long as Viet Nam persists.

Congress can, however, ease the burden on local school districts through providing Federal assistance, on a categorical basis, for identified educational problem areas. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, through the operation of its formula based on grants to school districts with concentrations of children from low-income families, attempts to do just that. Title III, authorizing innovative and supplementary centers, offers another means for local educators to utilize Federal funds in solving some of their knottiest problems.

Yet Federal assistance will remain supplementary to State and local efforts and therefore much of your success in the cities will depend on a reshaping of antiquated and insufficient State and local sources of revenue for public education.

TEACHERS FOR INNER CITY SCHOOLS

3. Let us now consider a third perplexing problem, providing teachers for inner city schools.

Our urban areas need more teachers, better trained teachers, and teachers specially

equipped to deal with the problems of the ghetto. More than 5 percent of the teaching force in our schools—approximately 90,500 full-time teachers—do not meet the certification standards of their states. On opening day last year, New York City had to mobilize a 500-man substitute teacher force for full-time duty.

America's urban ghettos suffer the worst teacher shortages; the teachers there are often the most poorly-trained in the school system. Part of the blame must fall on seniority arrangements which permit veteran teachers to choose the schools in which they will serve. This local policy almost invariably has the effect of transferring the most experienced teachers away from those schools and those students that most desperately need them.

And a survey conducted early this year for *Grade Teacher* magazine underscores this shameful weakness in our schools of not winning enough good teachers to the slums. Only 13% of today's graduating teachers said they would definitely accept a position in a slum school.

In the main, teacher-training curricula are based on the assumption that graduates will teach in white, middle-class suburban schools. Teacher education in America does not give nearly enough attention to the special requirements of the center-city child, the child whose readiness for education is impaired by family background. Just as the university curriculum fails adequately to equip the prospective ghetto teacher, so will that teacher in turn fail the children he hopes to teach.

THE TEACHER CORPS

Congress is attempting to help here some. We have recognized that a dialogue between urban schools and teacher-training institutions is essential if our teachers are to be adequately prepared for the challenges of urban education. Two years ago, Congress established the Teacher Corps in an attempt to stimulate such a dialogue. The Teacher Corps legislation recognizes that teaching in low-income areas requires special training, special skills, and special dedication.

The Teacher Corps has had a stormy life in Congress, and it is no credit to us that Congress allowed it only $13.5 million for the current year, a savage slash from the Administration's original request of $36 Million. As President Johnson said, "The Teacher Corps has been put on a starvation diet."

Ironically, I have heard almost no criticism emanating from the schools to which Corpsmen were bringing new ideas and new enthusiasm. On the contrary, teachers and administrators of these schools, including two junior high schools in my own home town of South Bend, Indiana have been highly vocal in their support for the program.

I should here note that Congress last summer passed the Education Professions Development Act, which draws together programs with great potential importance in the field of teacher training. The new law extends and modifies the experienced and prospective teacher fellowship programs originally contained in the Higher Education Act, and adds new programs for the training of other educational personnel at all levels. In addition, the Act establishes a new program of grants to States to enable them to support local efforts to attract qualified teachers into shortage areas.

Another way in which Congress could act here is to provide significant sums of money to supplement teachers' salaries either directly, that is, by means of a salary bill or less directly, through general aid. Neither approach, however, is likely to be forthcoming in the near future.

"NEW CAREERS" FOR GHETTOS SIGNIFICANT

Let me here mention one other measure.

In 1966 Congress amended the Economic Opportunity Act to authorize programs aimed at training ghetto residents for what have been termed "subprofessional" jobs in fields such as education, health services and law enforcement. These amendments, sponsored by my very able colleague, Congressman JAMES SCHEUER of New York, embody the "New Careers" concept that for several years has been advocated by various social scientists. The aim is to create new job opportunities for the poor by separating out those aspects of professional jobs which are routine and can be performed with a minimum of training by inexperienced men and women in need of employment.

Although little money has yet been allocated to implement this innovative program, it is now being administered by the Department of Labor on a small scale. So far the program has demonstrated a great potential not only for providing the poor with jobs, but also for helping our schools in a number of ways: by involving parents in the operation of the schools and by relieving the professional teachers in the schools of their non-professional tasks, thereby permitting more individual attention for the children.

MORE RESEARCH ON EDUCATION

4. A fourth acute need confronting urban education, and, indeed, all education, is our need for more learning about learning.

Despite innumerable studies of the nature of the learning process, in the final analysis we know far too little about it—about motivation, cognition, the skills necessary for conceptualization—all highly elusive subjects. We still don't know, for instance, the answer to the superficially simple question of the best way to teach first graders how to read.

Research and dissemination activities, although the prime responsibility of universities and other institutions, have been a Congressional concern since the passage of the Cooperative Research Act in 1954. More recently, Congress has launched other promising programs, including clearinghouses in a variety of fields across the country by ERIC, the Educational Research Information Center of the Office of Education. Also supported by Federal funds are regional laboratories, such as the Center for Urban Education in New York City, which concentrate on the educational problems of a region, covering several counties or even including several States.

Yet despite this new intensity of Congressional interest in educational research, we invest far too little in basic or developmental research in education. Although our nation as a whole invests about 3 percent of its gross national product in research and development, we set aside no more than two-fifths of 1 percent of our national expenditures in education for R and D. This phenomenon can be stated another way: this country spends, proportionately, twenty times as much on health research and sixty times as much on defense research as we do on research in education.

What will Congress likely contribute here in the months ahead?

I believe that more learning about the learning process will flow from several activities. First, we will probably see more Congressional insistence on closer evaluation in order to determine the effectiveness of Federal urban-oriented programs such as Headstart and Title I of ESEA.

Second, I believe that Congress will soon recognize that our support of research in education is inadequate both in absolute terms and as compared to federally-subsidized research in other areas.

The main burden, though, in uncovering the secrets of learning will continue to rest with our universities.

REVITALIZATION OF THE ENTIRE CITY

5. I pass now to a fifth point, that of revitalization of the urban environment. As this Model Cities Workshop demonstrates, the problems of urban education go far beyond teacher training or school facilities or racial composition. If our cities are to remain viable places to live and if the urban child is genuinely to be educated, large scale remaking of our entire cities is essential. And this remaking on a comprehensive scale is, of course, what the Model Cities program is all about. This notion is far broader than the traditional concept of urban renewal which has acquired the unattractive reputation of ignoring human values.

The Coleman Report is very instructive at this point. It offers impressive evidence that student achievement is more closely linked to the child's home background than to such school characteristics as teachers' salaries, laboratories, libraries and classroom size. The fundamentally important variable thus emerging is the spectrum of educational and economic resources available to the student at home.

The implications here are plain. If we seriously intend to "do something" about urban education, we will have to provide the wherewithal to revitalize entirely the dismal ghettoes of urban America.

Only through a concerted, and expensive, across-the-board attack—on the problems of housing, health and employment as well as education—can we begin to provide an environment in which the city child has a chance to escape from the grim fate which otherwise awaits him.

In recent years, Congress has showed that it is aware of the multi-faceted nature of the urban crisis, and we have passed exciting and hopeful legislation, including the Model Cities Act and the Economic Opportunity Act. Yet, as I have already said, the amount of money Congress has appropriated for a racial, not to say, revolutionary, change in the urban development has been tragically little.

What lies ahead?

If we take the present Congress as a benchmark, the outlook is gloomy for innovation legislation to help the cities in the next few years. Much obviously depends upon the cause of the Viet Nam war, upon next year's Presidential and Congressional elections, and on the extent to which the American people prove willing to support programs that will make possible a genuine renaissance of the American city. The question is open, and if you invite me back a year from now to your next conference, I can give you a more authoritative answer.

MORE DIALOG AND COOPERATION BETWEEN SCHOOL AND CITY OFFICIALS

6. Finally, I come to what is perhaps the most vital issue of all for a conference like yours so far as urban education is concerned.

I speak of the critical importance of establishing workable linkages between the people who run our cities and the people who run our schools.

It seems to me clear that our city school systems should not seek shelter from the political leadership of the community but support. The distinguished President of Teachers College, Columbia University, John H. Fischer, made the same point here in Washington only last month in an address that should be required reading for all of us, "Urban Schools for an Open Society".

Said Dr. Fischer: "The tradition of separation that has so long dominated public school policy and administration has become anachronistic. The mechanisms initially designed to protect the schools from partisan or corrupt political influence, however necessary they once were, now tend to isolate the schools from other agencies and to insulate them from normal political processes."

Let me quote President Fischer still further, for what he says is, I think you will

agree, directly relevant to the concept of the Model Cities program:

"In the city, as in the nation, every important undertaking today has its educational aspect. Many projects have no future at all unless they can count on effective schools. An intricate network of relationships ties the families of every community to its economic, cultural, political and social institutions. With virtually all of these agencies and many of the families, the school is connected in mutual dependence. Yet among school boards, administrators and university people, there are many who still think that these connections call for no more than routine courtesies, prudent "public relations," and a vigilant watch against any sign of encroachment on the school's traditional prerogatives."

Their words are echoed in a similar plea which Commissioner of Education Harold Howe made to schoolmen last summer:

"Educators must start paying attention to some matters we have neglected in the past: to tax policy, to site selection, to the multiple use of land and buildings. We should, now and then, forget about computer-assisted instruction and team-teaching and nongraded classes and dream a little bit, not about what kind of city *school* we want, but about what kind of *city* we want."

But if these sermons to educators are in order, you mayors and city councilmen require admonition, too. I must cite John Fischer, for more eloquently than any figure except Commissioner Howe, he has put his finger on the urgent requirement of dialogue and cooperation between the office of the mayor and the office of the school superintendent:

"Urban planning that does not now include educational planning is not unrealistic it is irresponsible. Such planning must moreover go far beyond a perfunctory review by the planning body of the size and location of new school sites. It must confront questions of curriculum, attendance patterns, teacher supply, financial support; in brief, the whole complex interrelationship between the development of schools and the total development of the city. The need for such planning is crucial and so is the manner in which it is done. Not only the central planning agency, but the school authorities, other public and private agencies, and the municipal and state governments must accept jointly the responsibility for projecting goals and setting timetables, and they must also share the responsibility for seeing that commitments are met."

CITY AND SCHOOL OFFICIALS TOO OFTEN ISOLATED FROM EACH OTHER

For isolation of city officials from school officials is far too often the pattern of urban education in America. Yet urban schools cannot possibly make the dramatic improvement they must have unless their progress is linked directly to the betterment of the cities.

A major approach of the Model Cities program of course is to involve all of the institutions of the city—public and private—government, business, education, labor and the social agencies—in planning and carrying out programs aimed at progress on every front—jobs, housing, health and education.

But without increasing dialogue and cooperation between mayors and school superintendents, between city councilmen and school principals, the battle to educate the urban child will never be won.

For example, the toughest dilemma facing our schools today is providing equal opportunity for minority children, and the schools are not likely to find the answer to this problem without the help of skillful and intelligent political leadership in the cities.

At the same time, urban schools are feeling increasing pressures, not only from racial minorities, but also from better organized teachers and better organized parent groups. I should think that, given these pressures, schoolmen would not flee but would embrace the help of elected political leaders and their appointees.

I here recall what another distinguished leader in American education, Commissioner Howe's predecessor, Francis Keppel, once said:

"Education is too important to be left to the educators."

Mr. Keppel is right and that is why I urge more conversation and cooperation between school leaders and political leaders.

And that, too, is why I would paraphrase Mr. Keppel to say that our cities are too important to be left to city hall.

We require, if we are effectively to attack the many problems of the cities, the involvement of every sector of community life with every other sector.

And this, to reiterate, is what the Model Cities program is all about.

THE MODEL FOR THE MODEL CITIES PROGRAM

Let me conclude.

I started with the premise that the depth of our national crisis in urban education makes it absolutely imperative that we reassess, reorganize and radically expand our efforts to educate the children of urban America.

The only alternative to revolutionary improvement of our city schools is the continuing disaster of still another generation of children bred in the slums and ill-prepared to lead productive lives in our not-so-open society.

I have touched upon six policy areas which directly affect our capacity to achieve this desperately needed improvement in urban education—and I have given you an assessment of the extent to which Congress is likely to contribute to that regeneration. My predictions have not been especially hopeful, but I have tried to indicate some encouraging signs.

In the final analysis, of course, whether Congress acts to meet these needs will depend upon the mood of the country. And you, as leaders of cities and of school systems can help shape that mood—in two ways.

First, you can help persuade the citizens of your respective cities of the urgency of the urban school dilemma—and the importance of their supporting effective action in Congress to meet it.

Second, you can dramatize your own awareness of the depth of the crisis of our city schools by acting swiftly and actively to demonstrate that the political leaders of your cities and the leaders of your schools are working closely together.

You can, in short, show yourselves to be the model for the Model Cities Program.

LOC NINH EMERGING AS SIGNIFCANT FIGHT

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is not unnatural that our U.S. news media devote the greatest part of their coverage of the struggle in Vietnam to the activities of our U.S. forces there. Of course, we all want to know what our boys are doing.

It seems, though, perhaps because of this emphasis, that we forget that the war in Vietnam is very much the South Vietnamese' own war against Communist aggression. It is their war, and they are fighting it well. But, it seems to me all too little is written about them. I would, therefore, like to call the attention of the Members of this House, and of all Americans, to an excellent article on the recent battle of Loc Ninh which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of November 21. Orr Kelly, its author, who has obviously carefully studied the reports from Loc Ninh, points out:

What is now clear from reports reaching the Pentagon is that a division of the much-maligned Army of the Republic of Viet-Nam (ARVN) fought superbly while their Viet Cong and North Vietnamese Army opponents fought bravely but were handicapped by almost incredibly bad leadership.

At the end of his detailed, day-by-day account of the battle, Mr. Kelly points out that, whatever the enemy's purposes were at Loc Ninh, they failed at them.

The one thing that they did help demonstrate—

The article concludes—

is that a run-of-the-mill ARVN division, not one of the best nor one of the very worst, was able to do almost everything right and win a major battle.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the Washington Star article in the RECORD at this point:

STAND-UP BATTLE: LOC NINH EMERGING AS SIGNIFICANT FIGHT

(By Orr Kelly)

The battle of Loc Ninh, fought during 10 bloody days at the end of October and the beginning of November, is beginning to emerge as one of the two most significant engagements of the Vietnam war.

It may be months before the full importance of the battle becomes known. It may not all become clear until long after the war when military historians have a chance to interview participants on both sides.

What is now clear from reports reaching the Pentagon is that a division of the much-maligned Army of the Republic of Vietnam (ARVN) fought superbly while their Viet Cong and North Vietnamese Army opponents fought bravely but were handicapped by almost incredibly bad leadership.

In the past, in battles involving the ARVN, the VC and the NVA, the opposite has been almost invariably true.

What is not yet clear about the the battle of Loc Ninh is how it may fit into a broad new enemy strategy.

Since the battle of the Ia Drang Valley—the most significant battle of the war—in October and November of 1966, when the VC and NVA tried to slug it out with the American 1st Air Cavalry Division in the Central Highlands, the enemy strategy has been to hit and run, trying to inflict damage and then get away before overwhelming American firepower can be brought into play.

But at Loc Ninh, the NVA fought a stand-up battle. When their first assaults were repulsed, they kept throwing in more men, even though it must have become apparent the ARVN and the United States were rapidly putting superior forces into the battle zone.

This is precisely what American military leaders have been wishing for years that the enemy would do: come out and fight rather than hiding far back in the jungles.

In this sense, Loc Ninh may have been a fluke.

ORDERS FROM HANOI

A number of American military leaders have concluded that the commander on the other side received orders from Hanoi to take Loc Ninh to detract from the inauguration of the new government in Saigon and that he persisted in trying to carry out his orders, blindly and stupidly, even after he should have realized he could not win.

But it was only a few days after relative quiet had come to Loc Ninh that a new battle erupted at Dak To, far to the north in the Central Highlands. There, again, the enemy forces stood and fought—and they are still fighting as this is written.

Are Loc Ninh and Dak To part of a new strategy evolved by Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, the victor at Dien Bien Phu? If so, what can it possibly hope to achieve?

These are the questions American military leaders are now trying to answer and one of the most important areas where they are looking for answers is at Loc Ninh.

The town of Loc Ninh lies about 75 miles due north of Saigon on the east side of Highway 13, the main road north from Saigon into Cambodia.

DOTTED WITH PLANTATIONS

The land is gently rolling at an elevation of 500 to 600 feet. From the air, the area can be seen to be covered for mile after mile with the dense green of rubber trees, dotted here and there by the tile roofs, the swimming pools and the gardens of the French plantation owners. Some of the homes are well maintained, others have fallen into disrepair because of the war.

Loc Ninh lies in the lower quarter of a rectangle formed by a rubber plantation. The rectangle is 8 miles from north to south and 5 miles across.

The Cambodian border forms a rough arc at that point so that the border is about 9 miles from Loc Ninh to both the north and west. The eastern corner of War Zone C, long a VC stronghold, is about 15 miles to the southwest.

The first sign of trouble came shortly after midnight on the morning of October 27, when the 88th NVA regiment hit the command post of the 3d Battalion, 9th Regiment of the 5th ARVN Division. The attackers, some 800 to 1,000 men, outnumbered the defenders by about 4-to-1. But after three assaults, their attack was broken and they were driven off by the ARVN.

This battle took place just to the south of Song Be, 27 miles east of Loc Ninh. Because of the distance, it may not have been directly related to the subsequent attack at Loc Ninh, but it also may have been a diversionary assault because it was the 5th ARVN Division that bore the brunt of the early fighting at Loc Ninh.

BATTLE OF LOC NINH

The battle of Loc Ninh itself began at 1:15 a.m. Oct. 29.

In the district command post in the town, there were two regional force companies and a regional force platoon and two American advisers. Just to the south of the town, across Highway 13 from the airstrip, was a Special Forces camp containing three companies of Civilian Irregular Defense Group (CIDG) soldiers and six U.S. Special Forces advisers. The defenders totalled about 600 men—only eight of them Americans.

The main strength of the first attack by the 273rd Main Force VC Regiment was thrown against the district command post in the town after a heavy attack with mortar and rocket fire.

By 2:20 a.m., the attackers had penetrated the northern half of the command post, forcing the defenders to pull back into the southern half of the compound. Capt. Tran Minh Cong, the district chief, called in all strikes and called for artillery fire on his own position keeping the enemy at bay until daylight.

Gen. Pham Quoc Thuan, commander of the ARVN 5th Division, requested helicopters (a U.S. division commander would have ordered up his own helicopters) and moved two companies into the fight. He arrived at the scene of the battle himself shortly after daylight.

REINFORCEMENTS ARRIVE

By 9 a.m., the two companies originally in the compound had been reinforced by four additional companies—two from the Special Forces camp and two brought in by helicopter. By 1:05 p.m., they had cleared the area of enemy elements.

By day's end, two U.S. infantry companies of the 1st Division and two U.S. artillery batteries had set up a fire support base at the airstrip, a U.S. infantry battalion had taken up a blocking position between Loc Ninh and the border to the west and an ARVN infantry battalion had moved in around the district command post.

The first day ended with a clear victory for the ARVN. And by that time, the enemy commander should have realized that his failure to commit more troops to the initial attack—and his failure to take the airstrip first—had probably cost him whatever chance he may have had to overrun Loc Ninh.

Oct. 30 was relatively quiet, with a few brushes with the enemy and a few rounds of enemy mortar fire. The buildup in ARVN and U.S. forces is indicated by the fact that there were 611 rounds of artillery fired on Oct. 29 while the number rose to 2,326 the next day.

The following day, Tuesday, was only 50 minutes old when heavy mortar and small arms fire began hitting both the command post in the town and the Special Forces compound near the airstrip.

The enemy commander had upped the ante throwing in both the 272nd and 273rd VC Regiments—both of them filled out with large numbers of NVA soldiers from the north.

TWO DAYS TOO LATE

The first assault was directed at the airstrip. It was 2 days too late.

U.S. artillerymen at the south end of the strip lowered their barrels and fired high explosive ammunition along the runway into the attacking forces and kept it up for more than 2 hours.

At 4:50 a.m., the attackers hit the compound at the north end of the airstrip with fire from 75-mm. recoilless rifles and .50-caliber machine guns.

At 5:05 a.m., they hit the command post in the town from the west, north and south, with the main attack coming, as it had 2 days before, from the north. Within 25 minutes, they made five separate ground attacks, but each was repulsed.

By 7 a.m., the enemy had been cleared from the areas around both the command post and the Special Forces camp near the airstrip.

Nov. 1 was relatively quiet. During the day, 525 tons of supplies and fortification material was brought in by air—emphasizing once again the failure of the enemy to take the airstrip—and the defenders worked at rebuilding their bunkers.

On Nov. 2 the enemy came back, scattering his forces with attacks on all of the ARVN and U.S. bases. They were beaten off by 6 a.m. and during the day two battalions of the U.S. 1st Infantry Division made helicopter assaults to the northeast and northwest of Loc Ninh, trying to prevent the enemy from retreating back across the Cambodian border.

CASUALTIES TELL STORY

In terms of resources expended and enemy casualties, this was the most significant day of the battle. There were 107 tactical air sorties, one B–52 strike and 3,964 rounds of artillery fired. The casualties for the day were officially reported as 7 of the friendly forces killed and 36 wounded, compared with 296 enemy dead.

On Nov. 3, United States units swept through the areas surrounding Loc Ninh while additional ARVN reinforcements were moved in. By this time, the U.S. and ARVN intelligence officers had been able to identify the 273d VC Regiment, at least one battalion of the 272d VC Regiment and elements of the 141st and 165th NVA Regiments.

This would indicate that the enemy commander had available in the area, at the time he opened the battle, from 5,000 to 6,000 men—outnumbering the defenders 10-to-1. But he never concentrated his forces sufficiently to make their full weight felt.

The battle then tapered off, with U.S. and ARVN units conducting search-and-destroy operations around Loc Ninh, with only one significant contact with an unknown size enemy force on Nov. 7.

Later that day, the reinforcements began to pull out of the area and the battle of Loc Ninh was considered over at 6 a.m. Nov. 8.

During the 10-day battle, 452 close air support sorties and eight B52 strikes were flown, 30,125 rounds of artillery were fired and 852 enemy were known killed, compared with 50 of the friendly forces killed and 234 wounded.

If the enemy commanders had hoped to achieve a propaganda victory, they failed. If they had hoped to inflict crippling losses on the ARVN and U.S. forces, they failed. If they were trying out a new strategy, that, too, appears to have failed.

The one thing they did help demonstrate, ironically, is that a run-of-the-mill ARVN division, not one of the very best nor one of the very worst, was able to do almost everything right and win a major battle.

FAVORABLE TAX ACTION WILL RESTORE CONFIDENCE AND ORDER IN MARKETS

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Joseph R. Slevin, a journalist with many years experience covering economic affairs, has written a timely and informative column on the need for tax action by Congress to help restore calm and confidence in the Nation's financial markets.

In a syndicated column published in the November 28 issue of the Minneapolis Star, Mr. Slevin wrote that inflationary sentiment has broken loose in the wake of the Ways and Means Committee's September decision to lay aside the President's surcharge request.

A belated endorsement of the tax increase now would quiet things down again.

Mr. Slevin said.

Psychology is a powerful force in the economic affairs of the Nation. Decisions to buy, sell, or to change a price are importantly influenced by expectations about the future.

Ways and Means Committee approval of the President's proposals would be a clear signal that the long, costly tax bill deadlock is nearing an end and that the Government will use its powerful fiscal weapons to help curb the inflationary boom.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Mr. Slevin's views may be of interest to our colleagues and with unanimous consent I am inserting his column into the RECORD at this point:

[From the Minneapolis Star, Nov. 28, 1967]

INSIDE THE ECONOMY

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Favorable action by the House Ways and Means Committee on President Johnson's multi-billion-dollar tax and spending package will help calm the nation's market places.

Inflationary sentiment broke loose in the wake of the committee's September decision to pigeonhole the President's surtax request. A belated indorsement of the tax increase now would quiet things down again.

"I don't care whether the final congressional vote comes in December or January or even February," an astute government economist declared. "If ways and means finally decides to act responsibly, there will be a less inflationary mood from that moment on."

Psychology is a powerful force in the economic affairs of the nation. Decisions to buy, to sell or to change a price are importantly influenced by expectations about the future.

Ways and means committee approval of the President's proposals would be a clear signal that the long, costly tax bill deadlock is nearing an end and that the government will use its powerful fiscal weapons to help curb the inflationary boom.

The change will be evident in the markets for raw materials and in the markets for manufactured goods, too.

Businessmen will be less quick to post higher prices. Many prices will go up, but they will rise less than they would if a full-blown inflationary mood still dominated.

Company officials make pricing decisions with one eye on their customers, and they will be less confident that their customers will be willing to pay sharply higher prices.

Labor-management attitudes will change for the better, too.

Unions will be less insistent on outsize wage hikes. Management negotiators will put up greater resistance to union demands if their companies are less certain that they will be able to pass along increased wage costs in higher prices.

Business inventory policies will be affected along with business decisions to order new capital goods. Company officers will buy more cautiously if they do not feel they have to protect their firms against a threat of accelerating price increases.

Even the stock market is likely to be helped by a favorable ways and means vote. Market participants grumble about the impact of a stiffer corporate profits tax, but all the recent evidence is that they have even less affection for the alternative prospect of tight money and steadily climbing interest rates.

Both the stock and bond markets gave unexpectedly strong performance during the first few days after Britain devalued the pound. It is plain that both got a lift from ways and means committee Chairman Wilbur D. Mills' announcement that the group would meet this week to take another look at the surtax.

Corporations had been piling into the bond market to borrow money while the borrowing was good. Their huge, anticipatory offerings had helped push interest rates to the new peaks that they reached this fall.

But the tax-spending package could chop some 10 billion from the government's big deficit-financing requirements and would give corporate treasurers and other borrowers important assurances that loan funds will be available to meet 1968 needs.

Ways and means acceptance of the Johnson proposals thus would change the bond-market psychology, just as it would alter price, wage and stock-market expectations.

PROJECT HEADSTART

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, project Headstart is perhaps the most popularly recognized success of the economic opportunity program. In large part, that success is due to the active involvement of concerned citizens, parents, and students in its imaginative and effective operation.

This past month, the Junior League of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, undertook an examination of the Linn County Headstart program, to learn more about it and the role which the league might play.

Serving as a basis for that discussion were articles which appeared in the November issue of the organization's monthly publication, Leaguely Speaking, by Mrs. Thomas Hyde, a member of the Headstart advisory board, and her 14-year-old daughter Denise, who was a classroom volunteer last summer.

Mr. Speaker, these excellent articles provide most interesting and useful insights into one local program of demonstrated success, I commend them to my colleagues and, under unanimous consent, I am inserting them at this point in the RECORD:

HAPPINESS IS: THE HOPE OF HEADSTART

(By Mrs. Thomas Hyde)

Poverty can be heard and seen almost any day on any TV news broadcast. It isn't quite so easy to look at in reality. The aroma is everywhere—and it is a compound of fear and hate, hope and despair, dirt streets and lack of garbage cans.

There is one significant factor that differentiates modern man from primitive man and that is collective concern . . . the ability that one human being or group of human beings has to care about each other. Headstart is the delineation of collective concern.

This is the third summer there has been a Headstart program in Linn County, and each year the program has grown within itself. This growth is mainly attributed to local citizens having collective concern and involving themselves either as volunteer workers or advisors.

This year 287 children from families within the guidelines of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) were in the Headstart program. The standards of family income determined who was eligible to participate. For a family of four the standards call for income no higher than $3,000 a year. For a family of five income must not exceed $3,500, and so on.

Identifying the poverty family children was no easy task. Neighborhood opportunity centers, the county social welfare department and the school system all helped in this process. This year, however, a new and effective means was also used. The United Church Women, including the Jewish, Catholic and Orthodox women, supplied volunteers who canvassed the county one Sunday in May. The combination of all these methods meant that nearly every eligible child was offered the opportunity to attend one of the 19 Headstart centers in Linn County.

The objectives of Headstart are to prepare the children both mentally and physically for their school experience. The program is really much more. Total family involvement is the real goal. A unique method of reaching for this goal while helping to coordinate the program, was the use of Family Coordinators. This program was the outgrowth of a volunteer Homemaker service initiated in 1965. Each Headstart center was supplied with a family coordinator. These were usually college students in the field of psychology or social work, or graduate social workers. Their goals were establishing communication with the families of Headstart youngsters, encouraging them to keep their children in class (this meant sometimes sending a volunteer to pick them up), and organizing parent education programs to involve the adults in Headstart. Attendance at weekly parent meetings doubled this last summer. The majority of their work was done within the individual homes on a person to person basis.

Another innovation this year was in the field of nutrition. In other years children were sent each day by bus to cafeteria-style lunch centers. This year all the food was prepared in a central kitchen at Tyler School and distributed by truck to all the centers. All food was served family-style at tables seating one adult and five children. This enabled the children to achieve a social experience unavailable to the majority of them. At the same time some ate their only decent meal of the day. One little girl in Marion cried every morning around 10 for no apparent reason until it was discovered she was hungry. From then on she ate two complete meals every noon. Some of the children would take home any leftovers in order to feed brothers or sisters who were hungry. Many children didn't know how to use forks, spoons and plates. One child put all his food in a glass and tried to drink it as that was the only way he had ever had food. Some children never had sat down to eat—they didn't know you could or should. For several children it was the only food they could ever remember not having prepared for themselves. This is poverty of the spirit as well as the pocketbook.

Educationally, everything the children do is a learning experience and socialization plays a large part. The classroom is not designed to be educational in the strictest sense of the word, but in the broad concept that every hour of every day should be enriching. Development of language skills and muscular coordination are always objectives. The development that is a result of environmental and social factors must be drastically upgraded in order that kindergarten may be an educational experience, not a frustration and depressant.

This poverty of the spirit, which is part and parcel of most economic poverty, is battled in a most natural and spontaneous manner by an amazing corps of youthful volunteers. This year there were close to 200 volunteer workers in various areas of the program. Each classroom had a staff consisting of a teacher, a teacher's aide and three to six volunteers. As there were no more than 15 children in each classroom, this made the ratio one staff to three children or less. The great majority of these volunteers were committed teenagers. These are the people who really know what Headstart is all about. They loved the unloved, washed the unclean, fed the hungry and taught the deprived, but mainly these young people, in their enthusiasm and innocence, battled the poverty of the spirit. It is hard to recruit adults as classroom volunteers in Headstart. Today's young people seem to have the openness of spirit to meet head on the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse—poverty, pestilence, war and death. They know how important it is to hold a Headstart child in their arms with love. This is true collective concern.

These teachers' aides (one to each classroom) were hired from families who were within the OEO guidelines for poverty. The majority were mothers of children in the Headstart program. Not only did this supplement their income, it also taught them about children, their own and others, and goals to seek.

The health program also was geared to be a learning situation. Clinics were set up on four Wednesday afternoons at Mercy Hospital. Each child received a complete physical examination, hearing and eye tests and immunizations. In addition they were given a tour of the pediatric ward of the hospital, and they were entertained in between sections of the examination. All the children were given follow-up care for any medical

problems that were discovered. Dental examinations were given each child and here, also, the funds were available for follow-up care.

(By Denise Hyde)

Jesse often came to school without any shoes. The shoes he did wear were his brother's. Victoria was given a bottle of pop, but instead of drinking it, she took it home for her family to see. Joseph liked to bring his sisters to school so they would be able to eat a good meal, and maybe even be able to ride on an elevator. Mary didn't have enough to eat, so we sent some food home with her. A little boy named Alan loved to fight. His vocabulary included words that make me blush. He never smiled; I don't think he knew how. He must be taught. Doors must open for him and others. They must be given an equal opportunity.

Who opened the doors? A wonderful program called Project Headstart.

This summer I worked at Tyler School as a classroom volunteer. I tried to help the children develop language skills and muscular coordination. I encouraged their socialization with others. To put it plainly, my goal was to make them happy and to give them a little love.

My tools were the "Three A's": attention, affection and achievement. My medicine was accepting the child for what he was, not what he could be.

Our class made many field trips. We visited the airport, Ce-Mar Acres, a hatchery, a farm (did you know animals were bigger than they looked in our story books?) and different kinds of stores. We went swimming, fishing, and on a bus trip, among others. These enriched and improved the child's basic concepts.

Headstart in Linn County is administered by the County Board of Education which hires a project director. The project director is directly responsible for the daily operation of the program. An advisory committee is set up consisting of professional educators and welfare people, concerned citizens and participating poor.

One board member, Keith Moreland, principal of Tyler school, said he can walk into any kindergarten room in his school and pick out each child who has attended Headstart. The difference is dramatic!

The mere receipt of money from the Federal Government into the community does not mean an effective program. There is but one way to assure maximum use of the money. The community must show collective concern. It must become committed and involved. Each community must tailor each government program to fit its individual needs. The government requires community involvement, but *required* involvement is not good enough. Only personal commitment and involvement can create meaningful programs. It is the responsibility of individuals in each community to see that these programs don't just function in the community, but that they achieve their highest goals.

Every day we had family style lunches. This taught manners and responsibility. The children set the tables and helped themselves to the food. Afterwards, they washed hands and brushed teeth.

Stories and finger plays helped coordination and taught various things, besides being fun.

It was very easy to teach many things, for they loved to imitate. Whatever their teachers did, they would try to repeat. This is why many parents should also be taught. The children take their traits and pattern many habits after them.

All in all Project Headstart is wonderful. It gave me a chance to do something I love—helping others not as privileged as myself. Next year I hope to be one of the first to volunteer.

Happiness is helping a child get a head start.

WHY ARE WE IN VIETNAM?

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, there have been many opinions expressed in the past few weeks as to just why we, as a nation, are in Vietnam. Mr. Robert Christopher, a senior editor of Newsweek magazine has produced a penetrating, balanced, and immensely readable article in the issue dated November 27, 1967. I commend to the attention of this House and the American people this view of "Why Are We in Vietnam?"

WHY ARE WE IN VIETNAM?

(By Robert Christopher)

Over the past few weeks, it has been my misfortune to spend virtually all my waking hours talking or thinking about Vietnam. I have discussed the war with some of the most eminent and articulate of the critics of the U.S. involvement. I have discussed it, too, with many of the men responsible for shaping U.S. policy in Vietnam over the past seven years. The purpose of this exercise was to try to determine what, if any, vital U.S. interests are at stake in Vietnam. To that end, I concentrated on three questions: (1) why did the U.S. become involved in Vietnam in the first place; (2) do those reasons still hold good; (3) if not, why are we still there?

Of all the members of the Administration with whom I talked, no two gave precisely the same explanation for our original involvement in Vietnam nor for the escalation of the war. But without exception, they all agreed that, even if every one of the decisions which led to the present state of affairs in Vietnam were wrong, there remains one compelling reason why the U.S. cannot now afford to accept defeat there.

That reason, as they see it, is this: the U.S. Government has made so great a commitment in South Vietnam, both in words and in military effort, that failure to achieve our stated objectives there would gravely damage the U.S. position all around the world. It would, more precisely, cast doubt upon the believability of U.S. guarantees and the constancy of U.S. purpose in the eyes of both our allies and our enemies. And this, in turn, would make the world a far less secure place for Americans to live in.

This argument is given particularly lucid expression by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. Says McNamara: "If we failed to fulfill our treaty commitments in Vietnam, there would, I am convinced, be profound repercussions internationally. I do not mean that all the 40-odd security treaties which we have with other nations would become worthless scraps of paper overnight. But over a period of years there would, I believe, be a series of adverse shifts in our relationships with other nations, including some with which we have no formal treaty ties. These shifts would in part reflect a shifting of world power balances, but in part they would also reflect uncertainty about U.S. reactions."

This, of course, is not a proposition that greatly impresses critics of U.S. policy in Vietnam. In the eyes of many doves, the "credibility thesis" is merely the latest in a series of shifting—and sometimes mutually contradictory—rationalizations of Administration policy in Vietnam. "Listening to Dean Rusk," Minnesota's Sen. Eugene McCarthy told me, "is like listening to an accordion concert; you start out with the melody and gradually you get all the chords and variations . . . The Administration has consistently escalated its objectives in Vietnam to match the escalation of the war."

In a sense, however, it would be unhealthy if the Administration's explanations of our presence in Vietnam had *not* changed in emphasis. It does not seem unreasonable to assume that when a war vastly increases in magnitude, the stakes involved also change. When critics complain that the Administration cannot have it both ways—that it cannot first escalate the war and then proclaim that its significance far transcends the fate of Vietnam—their sense of grievance is understandable. But their logic is not necessarily sound.

THE BASIC QUESTION

Yet that, in essence, is the position taken by most of those who oppose our present course in Vietnam. Their answer to the credibility argument is simply to deny that it is true. But a simple denial will not do. Surely, the possibility that defeat or quasi-defeat in Vietnam could seriously weaken the entire U.S. international position is critical enough to the nation's future to warrant careful examination of such evidence as is available.

By questioning the widest possible range of experts on foreign affairs, I have tried to make such an examination here in the United States. And while I was doing this, NEWSWEEK correspondents in 32 other countries were making similar investigations on the spot. Wherever possible, they confined their questioning to politicians and diplomats—the men likely to shape the policies of their countries in the years ahead. In every case, the basic question was posed in the same terms: how do you think your country would react if the U.S. were to seek a settlement in Vietnam on terms that would permit a Communist take-over in Saigon or the absorption of South Vietnam by North Vietnam?

In general, Newsweek's correspondents found that while there was relatively little foreign support for the U.S. involvement in Vietnam, there was even less meaningful support for a U.S. retreat. In all their interviews, in fact, they failed to come up with a single instance of any concrete benefit to U.S. interests that would result from a withdrawal from Vietnam. Their specific findings:

Africa: In Morocco, Tunisia and the Republic of South Africa, a retreat from Vietnam would seriously affect confidence in the U.S., but in Black Africa it would make little difference. "U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam without a saving grace would be almost as hard on my government as on the White House," said one North African diplomat. And a South African official predicted that "if America did withdraw, my country would tend to drift toward neutralism, fearing an increased Communist presence in the Indian Ocean." The prevailing attitude of the Black African governments, on the other hand, was reflected by a senior Kenyan official who frankly declared: "Whether or not America withdraws from Vietnam is not our concern. Our future relations with the U.S. will be governed by other factors."

Latin America: The effects here could be serious, but probably would not be fully apparent for some years. The extent to which Latin American governments would lose confidence in the U.S. is suggested by the fact that most of them flatly refuse to believe that Washington will ever accept an unfavorable settlement in Vietnam. "The U.S.," says an official of the Argentine Foreign Ministry, "is in the same position as any boss. He can't afford to be weak because he will lose the respect of his underlings." What concerns students of Latin America most, however, is the likelihood that a U.S. setback in Vietnam would revive the flagging morale of the hemisphere's Castroite revolutionaries and so increase their strength that a Latin American "War of national libera-

tion" would become a real possibility within a decade. Such a war might well lead to a nuclear confrontation since the Russians, who are currently soft-pedaling revolution in Latin America, would be under great pressure to change their tune if the Vietnamese were to demonstrate that the U.S. can be humbled by guerrillas.

Western Europe: Disengagement from Vietnam would almost surely lead to some further erosion of U.S. influence in Europe, but just how much is hard to measure. The majority of Continental politicians insist that they would still have faith in U.S. guarantees to their countries. But in many cases, their assurances ring hollow. "The very people now crying for an American withdrawal," predicted a spokesman for the West German Foreign Office, "would complain afterward at the unreliability of U.S. commitments."

That seems virtually inevitable—and was, in fact, tacitly admitted by a senior French official. "America is too strong," he said, echoing a favorite thesis of General de Gaulle. "It would be a good thing for her to suffer a setback." In a different way, Berlin's Mayor Klaus Schutz was equally candid. Said he: "It would take a lot of explaining to make clear to people the difference between U.S. commitments in Vietnam and in West Berlin."

The Middle East: In the Middle East, the consequences of a U.S. reverse in Vietnam would be felt hard—and fast. Israel and such pro-Western states as Jordan and Saudi Arabia would be weakened, while Iran and Turkey would be driven to reconsider their dependence on the U.S.

Israel, whose own survival ultimately depends on U.S. support, is all for negotiated peace in Vietnam—but not a sellout of the South Vietnamese. "If the U.S. simply reneged on its commitments in Vietnam," says a confidant of Prime Minister Eshkol, "this would cause a great deal of anxiety and rethinking in connection with our defense posture." What that means, in the eyes of many Mideast experts, is that Israel would give consideration to starting its own nuclear weapons program. And such a move would not be totally unjustified in view of the probable Arab reaction. "If you pulled out of Vietnam," said one Arab ambassador, "there would be an automatic tendency on our part to expect a disengagement from Israel, and the Arab line would harden."

The first of the non-Arab Moslem states of the Middle East to be affected would probably be Turkey. U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam, said an aide to Turkish Premier Suleyman Demirel, would be taken as a sign of a return to isolationism and "could weaken Turkish ties with the U.S. and NATO." And such a reaction in Turkey, coupled with the probable reaction in Pakistan and India, would in time affect Iran's posture. One possible result: a replacement of Iran's present U.S. military mission by Russian officers.

India and Pakistan: Though they will not say so openly, their deep fear of China leads most Indian officials to favor U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam only after the survival of an independent, non-Communist South Vietnam has been assured. "Anything else," one influential Indian says, "would cause an irreparable loss of credibility to the U.S." It might also ultimately cause India to reconsider its "firm" decision not to manufacture nuclear weapons. As for Pakistan, many diplomatic observers believe that in the event of a U.S. defeat in Vietnam, the Pakistani Government might well oust the U.S. Air Force from its Peshawar base—a prime source of intelligence about the U.S.S.R.

Asia: Throughout Southeast Asia, a Communist take-over of South Vietnam would immediately shift the balance of power in favor of China. In Japan and South Korea, the immediate effects would be less drastic, but the long-range consequences might be even more ominous. And in Australia and New Zealand, fears of a wholesale U.S. withdrawal from the Pacific would be aroused.

Part of what disengagement from Vietnam would mean to U.S. allies in Southeast Asia was spelled out for NEWSWEEK by President Marcos of the Philippines. "We would no longer look to America for the kind of mutual defense alliance on which small countries like the Philippines depend for security and survival," he said. "We should perhaps be faced with no other alternative than . . . a strict policy of neutrality and accommodation to Communist intentions."

With the exception of Cambodia's Prince Norodom Sihanouk, virtually every other national leader in non-Communist Asia shares Marcos's fears in some degree. The specter of Chinese dominance of Southeast Asia has led Japan's Prime Minister Sato, Singapore's Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew and Malaysia's Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman to risk their domestic political fortunes by publicly expressing support for the U.S. position in Vietnam. Even in Indonesia, which is primarily preoccupied with its own economic problems, an army newspaper recently expressed the belief that if the U.S. were to follow Walter Lippmann's prescription and withdraw its Pacific power to Australia "the greatest part of Southeast Asia would probably fall into Communist clutches."

Quite clearly, the average citizen in many Asian countries would applaud almost any settlement in Vietnam. But that applause would likely be short-lived if the settlement produced a Communist South Vietnam. Former Ambassador to Japan Edwin Reischauer believes that a U.S. retreat from Vietnam would at first please most Japanese but later "would strongly increase Japanese worries about the nuclear umbrella we hold over them. . . . This would tend to push them toward neutralism—which would further weaken their faith in U.S. nuclear protection and, in the long run, might lead them to decide that they needed their own nuclear weapons."

To me, both my own investigations and those of Newsweek's correspondents abroad amply bear out the Administration's contention that U.S. credibility is at stake in Vietnam. But it must be added that, whatever they say in public, the members of the Administration to whom I have talked emphasize in private that they do not believe a U.S. defeat in Vietnam would be an apocalyptic disaster. Most of them do not believe that there would be great immediate risk of overt Chinese military conquests in Southeast Asia—a view shared by such academic experts on China as Columbia's A. Doak Barnett and Harvard's John Fairbank. Rather, they feel that China would be in a position to overawe her Asian neighbors diplomatically and that Chinese-supported subversion in Burma, Thailand, the Philippines and Malaysia would sharply increase. This, in time, would almost surely overturn some Asian governments. (Singapore's Lee Kuan Yew has reportedly said that if the U.S. leaves Vietnam, he will either have to leave his country or die fighting the Communists.) And it would certainly destroy one of the great U.S. achievements of recent years: the creation of a climate of stability in Asia which has permitted the emergence of prosperous and relatively acceptable societies in such countries as Korea, Malaysia, Thailand and even Taiwan.

Similarly, most Administration officials do not believe a U.S. failure in Vietnam would inspire the Russians to quick, new probes—say, in Berlin. But they do share the view of a European diplomat in Moscow who says: "The next time it came to the crunch, the Soviets would remember that you lack staying power and would act more boldly." Expanding on this theme, Zbigniew Brzezinski, one of the leading American students of Soviet affairs, predicts: "What would seem attractive to the Russians—and what they would seek—would be opportunities to maintain a sustained but limited level of violence elsewhere in the world. And that, of course, is the definition of a 'war of national liberation'."

What the precise consequences of the new Soviet and Chinese boldness would be, no one in the Administration is prepared to say flatly. Presumably, not all the disasters conceivable would happen nor would the situation necessarily be completely irreversible. But how, Administration spokesmen ask, do you justify taking such a gamble with the U.S. position in the world?

CHANGING TUNES

To this, critics of the Administration, insofar as they concede that there would be any consequences at all, offer several answers. Some of them, including Edmund Stillman of Hudson Institute, argue that the costs of disengagement could be minimized if the U.S. now changed tunes and began to proclaim that nothing is really at stake in South Vietnam but the fate of a single, rather unpromising society. Hans Morgenthau of the University of Chicago offers a variation on this: he believes that if President Johnson were to say that all the United States was ever fighting for was South Vietnam's right of self-determination and that this was fully achieved in the recent South Vietnamese elections, the Administration could then disengage to the applause of the American electorate and of the whole world. But I have yet to talk with a single practical politician who believes that it is that easy to pull the wool over the eyes of the American people—and I see no reason to assume that the statesmen of the world would be any easier to deceive than American voters.

Some doves, of course, argue that the consequences of disengagement from Vietnam would, on balance, actually be good. To prove their case, they most often cite the French withdrawal from Algeria engineered by General de Gaulle and the consequent upsurge in French prestige. But to this, American officials make an effective if cold-eyed rejoinder: France could afford to accept defeat in Algeria because she is no longer a major power and the survival of numerous other nations is not dependent upon the credibility of her pledges and her military might.

Perhaps the strongest argument made by opponents of our present policy in Vietnam is that, whatever the price of failure there, it cannot equal the price we are now paying in blood, treasure, domestic discord and international obloquy. But it seems to me blindly optimistic to assume that an unfavorable settlement in Vietnam would restore domestic tranquility. What form the U.S. reaction to defeat would take is impossible to predict. It might be a witch-hunt reminiscent of the McCarthy era; it might, as many foreigners fear, be a resurgence of isolationism under new guises; it might ultimately even express itself in a fit of aggressiveness designed to show the world that, despite Vietnam, we were still a power to be reckoned with. In any case, I do not think it would be pretty—and neither do most of the eminent Americans with whom I have talked in the past weeks.

BALANCE OF POWER

As for the notion that the U.S. could regain its international image as a benevolent power by magnanimously conceding that it had made a mistake in Vietnam, that is doubtless partly true. But many foreign critics of the U.S. openly admit that they would simply go on belaboring this country on other grounds. And public applause overseas, however gratifying, scarcely seems worth the risk inherent in accepting defeat—which is, in essence, a diminution of U.S. capacity to influence the course of world affairs.

The prospect of a decline in U.S. influence obviously does not worry the increasing number of Americans who appear to be opposed to all war and who regard balance of power as an evil concept. But as Richard

Rovere conceded in The New Yorker recently, balance of power is what foreign policy is about. Peace is not the natural state of man and does not keep itself; it has to be enforced—and currently it is being enforced by the U.S. and the Soviet Union. If the U.S. opts out, it will leave the task of determining the world order to those who have no cause to love us. I do not suggest that this would mean the immediate downfall of the Republic. What I do think it would mean has been vividly expressed by Zbigniew Brzezinski. "If the U.S. withdraws from Vietnam," he says, "it will find itself in the years ahead in the position of a millionaire living in a small town that seethes with potential riots and whose inhabitants are united only by their dislike for the millionaire."

Of the thousands of statements on Vietnam to which I have been exposed, none has impressed me more than one made by John Fairbank. "When you make a mistake before history," he told me last week, "you have to pay for it." Somewhat uncertainly, I have come to share his assumption that the U.S. made a mistake by becoming so deeply involved in Vietnam. I say somewhat uncertainly because the chain of causality runs so far back and involves so many decisions which seemed perfectly sensible at the time that I am not convinced that things could have happened any differently. Still, it is hard not to agree with the general who recently told a visitor to the Pentagon: "If anybody could have foreseen the present situation four years ago, I do not for a moment think we would be in Vietnam in force now."

But we *are* there. And, mistaken or not, this war, like all wars, must be paid for. The question is not how we can finish the war off without great cost; it is how can we finish it off at the least cost. And, as of now, it seems to me that the cost of fighting the war is far smaller than the long-range costs we would incur by a retreat.

HAS REPRESENTATIVE BRINKLEY CHANGED TO CONGRESS CONSERVATIVE?

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STUCKEY] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I noticed an article by Art Pine in the Atlanta Constitution which carried the headline, "Has Representative BRINKLEY Changed to Congress Conservative?" Proving the consistency of my fellow freshman Democratic colleague, this story about JACK BRINKLEY is just as current today. He lives up to his campaign slogan which is reproduced on a plaque in his office, "I promise to remember who I am, where I'm from and who sent me."

I first became impressed with Representative BRINKLEY's integrity and personal responsibility when we were classmates at the University of Georgia. Because of adjoining congressional districts, we have mutual interests in issues affecting our constituents and I would like for the article to which I refer to become a part of this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HAS REPRESENTATIVE BRINKLEY CHANGED TO CONGRESS CONSERVATIVE?

WASHINGTON.—Back when he was still a state legislator from Muscogee County, sandy-haired Jack Brinkley was usually linked with a small group of moderates in the Georgia House.

But somewhere along the road to the U.S. Capitol, the new Third District congressman seems to have made a sharp turn to the right.

His voting record so far in the 90th Congress makes the 37-year-old Columbus attorney one of the most conservative members of the 10-man Georgia delegation.

"I don't think I've changed a bit," Brinkley says. "It just looks that way because Congress is a lot more liberal than the Georgia General Assembly."

That may be, but in the past six months the west Georgia congressman has voted against the food stamp, teacher corps, rent supplemental, model cities and debt-ceiling bills.

In fact, on all but one major issue so far, his votes have been identical to those of his GOP predecessor, Howard (Bo) Callaway. (Brinkley supported the school aid bill.)

The apparent irony doesn't seem to bother him, however.

"I think Bo tried to reflect the views of the district," Brinkley says, "the same ones the Democrats have held for years."

It is these views—or rather his dogged adherence to them—that already have marked Brinkley as a strong-minded independent more likely to go for principle than for compromise.

Despite two months of congressional armtwisting the Columbus conservative twice voted against the debt-ceiling measure—one of only two Georgia Democrats to do so.

House leaders claimed the measure was needed to enable the U.S. to meet its obligations, but Brinkley insisted he wouldn't budge until the President promised to cut spending.

"I'm convinced he would have if we defeated it again," Brinkley said after the measure finally passed. But a senior Georgian described his vote as "irresponsible."

STRONG WORDS

Another time, when the House brushed aside heavy administration pressure to defeat the rent supplement bill, the Third District freshman took the floor to warn:

"Mr. Speaker, the vote shows that many of us will not be 'driven' anywhere by the majority leadership or the minority leadership." They were strong words for a house newcomer.

Underneath all his fierce-sounding ideals, however, Jack Brinkley probably is the most soft-spoken member of the Georgia delegation.

"He's a country-boy at heart," says one observer who knows him well, "and that affects almost everything Jack does."

SLOW DECISIONS

In day-to-day contacts, Brinkley remains as shy and boyishly polite as he was in the Georgia General Assembly, is so modest he uses "we" rather than say "I" to describe his doings.

Conditioned to the early-bird habits he acquired in the Air Force, the lanky Georgian is at his office by 6 a.m.—at least four hours before most congressmen—and stays until 7 p.m.

Never one to rush a decision, Brinkley dwells painstakingly and ponderously on his officework, has been known to "study" over a simple postal appointment for several weeks.

On the House Science and Astronautics Committee, where he is third from the bottom on a 31-member panel, the Georgian is considered a quiet, studious type who takes his job seriously.

Brinkley's committee attendance has been near-perfect, but he rarely asks questions or engages in debate, partly because the subject-matter is so complex it takes months to learn it.

On the space science and applications subcommittee, the congressman just couldn't resist the chance to okay a $5 billion U.S. space budget—his only vote for "big" federal spending.

In the House chamber, where he has made some nine or 10 floor speeches, Brinkley has kept his remarks brief and to the point.

Few have been more than one minute long. "It's best to get up, speak up and shut up," he says. "That's what we always try to do."

In the past six months, the Columbus congressman has urged "total war" in Vietnam, castigated flag-burners, criticized foreign-aid policies and called for more cuts in spending.

He's introduced seven bills and resolutions, all—as is typical of freshmen—modifications or token endorsements of measures offered by senior colleagues.

They include bills to readjust wage-board salaries, reclassify some post office jobs. Entice industry to stay in small cities, restrict dairy imports, set up a committee to keep tabs on federal spending, maintain U.S. rights in Panama, and bring someone else's anti-riot bill to a vote.

Traveling back home to the district an average of once every two weeks, Brinkley maintains a moderate pace of speech-making and public appearances.

Besides the Third's historical district office in Columbus, he has set up part-time offices in Americus and Warner-Robins—to show the rural areas they're not left out.

Mindful that the Third elected the state's first modern-day Republican 2½ years ago, Brinkley has kept in close contact with local officials.

Ironically, it could lead to some change in his voting record:

After Brinkley voted against the liberal-tagged food stamp program last spring, local officials in poverty-ridden Pulaski and Houston counties wrote him, "I don't think you understand it."

Though still opposed to the concept, Brinkley promised to look into the program more fully, and vote for it next time "if the people want me to."

At this early stage, the statement may not sound like much. But it could be the only political compromise Jack Brinkley makes in the 90th Congress.

SALUTE TO HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to salute my friend of many years, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] who celebrated his 81st birthday on December 2.

Mr. Speaker, MIKE KIRWAN has been an inspiration to us all during the 30 years he has served in Congress. He has proved to all of us, indeed he has proved to all America, that a man does not have to have material wealth to become great in his own time. He has also proved that a man dedicated to doing right can overcome his critics and go on to make magnificent contributions to building a greater America.

Yet, through all his years and achievements, MIKE KIRWAN has remained his same humble self, dedicated to public service and improving the face of the

country he loves. The late Speaker Sam Rayburn, often said that "service" is the most beautiful word in the English language and MIKE KIRWAN is certainly the embodiment of that saying.

Just the other day in a meeting with MIKE, he mentioned to us that he had to leave to be with his wife at their home in Ohio. He mentioned offhandedly that they still lived in the same house that they had lived in when he came to Congress. This is indicative of his unpretentiousness.

Millions of Americans have benefited from the wisdom of MIKE KIRWAN and his dedication to building America, conserving its resources and developing its water potentials. Generations to come will be better off because of his vision as chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

I only hope they will appreciate what MIKE KIRWAN has done for them. I do.

AMENDMENT OF LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation that could add a new dimension to the collective-bargaining process. It proposes an amendment of section 302 of the Labor Management Relations Act to permit employer contributions to jointly administered trust funds established to provide educational scholarships for employees and their dependents, or to provide day-care centers for children of employees. I am pleased that 13 of my colleagues, both Democratic and Republican, will cosponsor the bill.

Unfortunately, too many Americans get their only impression of labor-management relations from the publicity given strikes. Obviously, it would be impossible for newspapers and television to cover the thousands of instances in which management and labor representatives quietly negotiate contracts which benefit employer and employee alike. It is these success stories—not the occasional strike—by which the collective-bargaining process should be judged.

It is estimated that there are more than 130,000 labor agreements in force now governing the working conditions of more than 20 million employees. Moreover, since 1964 the percentage of man-hours lost to strikes has averaged less than one-half of 1 percent. In short, the collective-bargaining process is a potent force in the orderly settlement of management-labor problems.

In recent years collective bargaining has moved beyond the basic contractual subjects of wages, hours, and working conditions. Many industries have introduced into their negotiations subjects ranging from subsidized employee lunches to employee stock purchase plans. Legislation permitting establishment of trust funds for scholarships for employee children and establishment of child care centers follows in this tradition of creativity.

Higher education in our society is no longer a luxury. Many working parents believe a college education is essential to insure meaningful lives for their children. But the cost of attending college is constantly increasing. Therefore, sending children to colleges inevitably imposes a harsh burden upon middle- and low-income parents. Educational trust funds established and sustained by employer and employee contributions would do much to ease this burden, and could make college educations financially possible for many young people.

Mothers who must work to help meet family obligations will certainly benefit from jointly sponsored day-care centers to which they can safely entrust their children. There are a number of industries, notably textiles and electronics, which depend heavily upon women employees for their labor force. Many industries may find it in their interest to contribute to day-care centers.

I hope this legislation will commend itself to the great majority of my colleagues. It will bring the wealth and energy of the private sector of our economy to bear upon two major areas of need. In addition to helping with these two problems, it is possible that joint sponsorship by management and labor of educational trust funds and day-care centers will stimulate exploration of other areas in which similar cooperation could yield significant rewards.

AMENDMENT OF LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the distinguished Representative from New Jersey for introducing this legislation today and I am pleased to be a cosponsor. This legislation recognizes two important facts and problems of our society.

The first is the increasing need and cost of higher education. Congress has responded to this problem by passing, in recent years, a series of education legislation. In our society, however, any successful attack on a national problem must have the support and cooperation of business. Business is too large and too important to be ignored. Labor and management will be able to commit some of the resources of business to help solve this national educational problem.

The second fact of our society that this bill recognizes is that the working mother is not the exception but the rule. While for a particular mother, working may be temporary, collectively it is permanent. I believe that Congress has been very slow to respond to this fundamental change in the working habits of American mothers. We must provide new institutions between the home and the job. We must recognize that part-time and temporary employment is for the country a permanent fact. Therefore, I am happy to support this bill as a step in the right direction.

THE IMPROVED PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WELFARE

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in the more than 400 pages of the social security amendments that have passed both the House and the Senate is a substantial accomplishment that has passed virtually unnoticed by the public and perhaps even by many concerned academics.

This accomplishment is contained in section 401 of the social security amendments, which authorizes $5 million in each of the next 5 years for grants to develop, improve, and expand undergraduate and graduate programs of professional social welfare training.

This program is a small portion of a very large and significant piece of legislation, but this small portion is vastly significant to the success of all of the social welfare programs which exist today and which may come to exist in the future. This significance stems from the simple truth that we are facing a critical shortage of professional social workers. This small program is designed to get us on the road to meeting the manpower demands of the social welfare needs of the 1970's. This program is not the solution all by itself, nor is it yet large enough—but still it is a major contribution.

The field of social welfare and the profession of social work have been faced with a critical shortage of qualified manpower for a very long time, certainly since World War II. Rapid population growth, the influx of educationally and culturally disadvantaged people into the cities, the growing complexity of life in large urban centers, the persistence of pockets of poverty in bypassed rural areas—all have contributed to the growing demand for social services and the growing demand for personnel to administer them.

Legislation creating or expanding programs of social welfare and community renewal has been enacted by Congress in every session during the past decade, as well as by most State legislatures. Private endeavors in the field of social welfare have multiplied. The gap between needed and available manpower for these new and expanding social services had widened so dangerously that it now has become a matter for action at the Federal level. Modern social legislation, to achieve its purpose, needs programs manned by competent and dedicated personnel, including social workers. They are the links between the person, the

group, the community in need of services, and the legislation that establishes the service and the specific conditions that regulate its application.

In the manpower report that President Johnson submitted to Congress in April 1967,[1] employment requirements in professional and technical occupations were predicted to reach nearly 13 million by 1975.

Manpower needs are expected to rise in practically every profession, though much faster in some fields than in others; social welfare is one of four identified in the report as critical.

Recent projections prepared in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicate that for all social welfare programs, public and private, 537,000 persons will be needed by 1973 for the provision of social services. The total includes 167,000 social workers with a master's degree from a graduate professional school of social work; 142,000 social workers with a bachelor's degree who have had undergraduate education in social work; and 227,000 social work assistants and technicians with community college associate degrees or vocational high school education.

According to the same projections, services in public welfare departments to families and children will absorb 185,000 of the total and all other public and private programs will require the remaining 351,000. At present the United States has approximately 46,000 social workers with graduate professional education. If enrollment in the graduate schools continues at the present rate, it is estimated that by 1973 the number will rise to 69,000 leaving a gap of more than 98,000 that it will be imperative to fill.

Despite the magnitude of the problem represented by these figures, it is not beyond our capacity to meet the established goals within the next 10 years if we put our minds, our wills and our dollars to the task. The manpower report to the President, referred to earlier, predicts that the supply of college-educated personnel will probably be in balance with the demand in professional and related occupations over the next decade as a whole. It is estimated that by 1975 the number of earned degrees at the bachelors' level will have risen to 902,000 annually. If approximately 5 percent of these young people were recruited to and educated for technical and professional competence in the provision of social services the need would be met, and we would be out of the woods in terms of the manpower problem in social welfare.

What it will take is action along two fronts.

First, it will require of social work educators and social welfare administrators a tremendous investment in energy and competence to recruit and train the necessary numbers of people. Administrators must adjust to the professional manpower available their methods of delivering services and find new ways of using technical and supporting personnel to extend the professional's range of effectiveness.

Action in this area is already being taken. Public welfare departments are separating their income payment functions from the social service functions so that the valuable time of social work personnel is not occupied with verifying needs and actually providing the financial assistance, just as community health centers are making good use of supporting personnel of very modest education in the development of their service programs.

The schools of social work are committed to expansion and development in order to triple their enrollment as soon as resources are available to support the expansion. Undergraduate colleges are interested in developing a major in social work to prepare students either for direct entry into practice or for graduate social work education. Here again, additional faculty and investment in curriculum development by 1973 are necessary. It would be possible to have an undergraduate major in social work in every major institution in the country and in smaller colleges as well, particularly in areas where social workers are in very short supply.

What is needed to accomplish these purposes is support, which leads to the second front for action—massive Federal support for the development and expansion of social work education in all its aspects, including building, faculty, curriculum, and student stipends, particularly at the graduate level.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates the cost of producing the social workers and supporting personnel required to reach the total of 537,000 by 1973 at $35,550,000, of which 50 percent would be directed to workers with a bachelor's degree and 50 percent to those with graduate degrees. The total does not include construction costs for the development of new schools of social work or the expansion of existing schools. It is anticipated that those costs will average about $5,000 for each student to be accommodated in the institution. The cost of constructing a school of social work to accommodate 200 students on this basis would be approximately $1,000,000.

The Nation must weight the costs of major investment in manpower development for social welfare against the costs of the manpower shortage.

The national social goals of American society that are emerging in the second half of the 20th century encompass an aspiration to extend the benefits of democracy, technology, and culture to every man; a hope to eliminate poverty and ignorance wherever they are found; and an effort to make needed health services, educational opportunities, and social services available to all throughout the Nation.

The absolute prerequisite if we are to attain those goals to which the Nation and the Congress have committed us is the manpower that will connect the person to the service, through which the service flows, and only through which it can become effective.

Mr. Speaker, in the Social Security Amendments of 1967 we have shown that we recognize this need and that we will do what is necessary to meet it.

[1] *Manpower Report of the President* (House Document No. 116, 90th Congress, first session), Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

SECRETARY McNAMARA'S 7 YEARS OF DEDICATED SERVICE

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Secretary of Defense McNamara on his appointment to the presidency of the World Bank and to commend him for the dedicated fashion in which he carried out his enormous duties over the last 7 years.

Few Presidents have had a Cabinet officer whose brilliance, loyalty, and dedication to duty have contributed so much to their country.

Although he has served as Secretary of Defense for longer than any of his famous predecessors, we will remember his productivity, not his longevity, in office.

As chief of history's most powerful and awesome military machine, he has revolutionized our Nation's defenses.

He has shifted our Armed Forces from an outdated concept of massive retaliation to a flexible posture of armed might. He has armed our forces with maximum power at minimum cost. And he has inspired the closest intraservice coordination in our Nation's history.

But most of all, Americans will remember Robert S. McNamara as the man whose loyalty to President and Nation, courage in the face of challenge, and brilliance in service to country, have helped keep America the bastion of freedom and citadel of liberty.

A grateful Nation salutes his service and wishes him well in his new position.

WELFARE'S SECOND GENERATION

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there has been in the past considerable debate over what I call the "myth of perpetuation" in regards to welfare programs. This myth holds that once a person begins taking welfare, he will be content to live in a state of "secure poverty" the rest of his life, jobless, forever on the dole.

However, recent studies indicate that the stereotype of a typical welfare recipient as a healthy, potential wage earner who refuses to work because he prefers a monthly unemployment check, is a false one.

The fact is that employable males are only a small percentage of those receiv-

ing welfare. The typical welfare recipient is very young or very old, a mother with children, or a man or woman who is physically handicapped and unable to work. Of those who are physically capable of working, the evidence indicates that many—educationally handicapped, without salable skills—want jobs, if somebody would only hire them. I have twice cited in the RECORD the experience of business and industry in Detroit, where firms made jobs readily available for hard-core unemployed. The recruiters were mobbed with applicants.

There is an extension of the myth of perpetuation. Its exponents say that granting welfare to a family will result in a generation of "welfare children" who will grow into adulthood living on welfare, and know no other life. Thus they will be content to continue the family tradition of dependence on the dole. This sounds logical, but is it correct?

There has come to my attention facts to indicate that just the opposite may be true.

The Macomb Daily in my home county in Michigan recently published an editorial, "In Our Opinion 'Welfare Kids' Cast off Bonds."

The editorial asks:

What's happening to the second generation of welfare recipients? Are "welfare children" growing up to be "welfare adults"?

The editorial cites a survey in Mecklenburg County, N.C.

Of 456 children in 100 families receiving aid to families with dependent children, only 1.9 percent were on public relief as second generation welfare recipients.

Forty-four percent have graduated from high school, 17 percent have gone *on to college.*

By all indicators, the "welfare children" in Mecklenburg County do not fit the pattern embodied in this theory of perpetuation.

It is true that experience elsewhere may be different. But it is heartening to see, as the Macomb Daily observes:

In one county, at least, it has paid to treat human beings as human beings.

And that:

Welfare children will grow up to prefer independence and responsibility.

I remind my colleagues of President Kennedy's cogent observation that:

The great enemy of the truth is very often not the lie—deliberate, contrived, and dishonest, but the myth—persistent, persuasive and unrealistic. Too often we hold fast to the cliches of our forebears. We subject all fact to a prefabricated set of interpretations. We enjoy the comfort of opinion without the discomfort of thought.

I place the editorial, "'Welfare Kids' Cast Off Bonds," from the Macomb Daily, in the RECORD at this point:

"WELFARE KIDS" CAST OFF BONDS

What's happening to the "second generation of welfare recipients"?

Are "welfare children" growing up to be "welfare adults?"

Not in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina.

(Mecklenburg's county seat is Charlotte, the state's biggest city with its population of more than 200,000. The area is heavily industrialized.)

The Mecklenburg County Welfare Department has completed a study of 100 families receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) in January, 1955.

What has happened to the 456 children in those families?

Only 1.9 per cent of those children who are now adults are on public relief as "second generation" welfare dependents.

44 per cent have graduated from high school, and 17 per cent of these have gone on to college.

Half of those who have reached maturity are married and living with their spouses.

71 per cent are now able-bodied adults in the labor market, and only 10 per cent are unemployed.

7 per cent are professional workers (mostly teachers or nurses).

9.7 per cent are clerical workers.

1.9 per cent are officials, managers or proprietors of businesses.

This record is all the more encouraging in view of the family backgrounds of the children.

33 of the families were on welfare because the father had deserted the family.

25 families involved unwed mothers.

19 had disabled fathers.

16 had deceased fathers.

7 had fathers in jail.

Perhaps Mecklenburg County isn't a typical case and doesn't accurately reflect the national welfare picture.

But it does indicate that in one county, at least, it has paid to treat human beings as human beings and to have had faith that welfare children will grow up to prefer independence and responsibility to living on the dole.

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, my very good friend, Bill Hart, of Morgantown, W. Va., and most points north, south, east and west, has been in the newspaper business for a good many years, I refuse to say how many. A few months ago he voluntarily classified himself as "retired," or at least "semiretired," a condition which the datelines on the column he still contributes to various newspapers seems to deny. An astute observer of the current scene, and a sound and just appraiser of day-to-day developments, his column invariably touches the public imagination. It is my pleasure to share one of those columns with you, especially since it notes with approval the attitude of a neighboring State which West Virginia, and indeed most of the Nation, is proud to accept:

GI's: JACKSON WOULD BE PROUD OF YOU

(By Bill Hart)

CHANCELLORSVILLE, VA.—We have come here where a famed West Virginian "Stonewall" Jackson, immortalized with his life "A Cause" in which he believed . . . we are here for several reasons . . . Third Flight and Pocahontas have a slight equity in some ground in this famed country west and slightly south of Washington, and to see some country that is little changed from those historic days of more than a century ago when we were indeed testing whether our nation under God was to survive—just as it seems to some of us such a crisis exists today . . . if our long trek around the country has counted for anything save a good lesson in geography it surely must be: Americans everywhere realize law and order is facing their most serious challenge and the man who convinces them he can and will preserve law and order is their boy.

Talking with natives and "temporary natives" in this area you get a mixture of land promotion and solutions of all problems by merely "sweeping them under the rug of rustic Virginia" . . . in Culpeper, a few miles away, or in most any of the towns nearby, there are visible signs of the great wealth made in Pittsburgh, Cleveland, New York and Washington . . . for this is in some respects even more desirable as a place to relax than Warrenton or Leesburg, miles to the north, where Arthur Godfrey hangs out between shows and over which hundreds of Morgantown people have flown in recent months.

Perhaps, the Virginians overdo it, but you can hardly turn around without running into something involving Jackson or Lee or the Wilderness Campaign . . . we shall have to ask Dr. Chitwood or Dr. Summers who won that campaign because, surely, we Yankees did a little better than the markers tell tourists . . . but here, as we talked with people, we said the "Wah Between the States" and not once did we make the error of talking about the Civil War . . . and, after you stop kidding about it, maybe they have something here all could use—pride in our heritage . . . maybe the reason we have hoodlums is that they have no pride in anything or haven't been taught to have pride?

Another reflection: We have been asking ourselves from coast to coast why we have yet to find a place where highways are worse than West Virginia's? . . . it is true, of course, we have seen highways only from the air or like riding 60 miles from Austin to Ft. Hood and about 60 miles from Washington here, but there is a standing joke among travellers we do not like . . . it goes something like this: the pilot loses his way . . . he wakes a passenger and asks his help to find out where he is . . . the passenger looks out the window of the plane and says: "We're over West Virginia" . . . the pilot asks how he knows . . . the passenger says, "It's the only place I know where there are no roads." There is, unfortunately, more truth than poetry in that crack.

It was raining, it seems to rain or snow wherever we go—like the other day in Northern New Mexico—six inches of snow—and then sleet as we broke out of the Rockies and saw no sun until the Gulf was reached near Houston—but the clouds here kept most of their sorrow to themselves for a short time—and, if you are like us, you wish to get a second grab at history—real history because at such places as Chancellorsville you are reminded of people who had character and purpose and were ready to give up soft living in defense of what they really believed.

And in Stonewall Jackson's day, as in this day, most of us like to "play it cozy," to "not stick out our neck," "let the other fellow be the hero" . . . but, as we walk from the marker where Jackson was mortally wounded, we think that he and others—Blue and Gray who fell here—would be proud of the heroism of so many of our young people in Vietnam . . . to them, like the kids from Boston or Charleston, S.C., who did what they should have done more than a century ago, we are sure the spirit of Stonewall Jackson salutes them . . . and, for those in Viet-

nam who may read this, we'd like to report we know Stonewall Jackson would have been proud to have you in his command!

SENIOR CITIZENS TO PICKET READER'S DIGEST

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of my colleagues to an event scheduled to take place next Monday, December 11, in 10 cities across this Nation.

At 11 o'clock in the morning thousands of senior citizens plan to picket the offices of the Reader's Digest, coast to coast. The phenomenon of America's senior generation organizing a protest against a magazine which enjoys the largest circulation in America is significant; even more impressive is the reason for their protest.

The October 1967 issue of the Digest contained an article to the effect that the social security system of the United States is in trouble, and implied that not all present and future beneficiaries will be able to collect the benefits due them under the law.

This article was labeled by Under Secretary Wilbur J. Cohen of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as "a great disservice to millions of social security beneficiaries and to millions who are counting on social security benefits in the future." Under Secretary Cohen went on to give a detailed, point-by-point refutation of the article.

The social security laws of America are sound legislation, based on long-established and sound fiscal policy and firm understanding of the human condition. Congressman MILLS and Congressman BYRNES of Wisconsin have both repudiated suggestions in the article that they question the soundness of the social security program.

Part of the philosophy underlying the social security laws is that it is the responsibility of the American people to provide support for her older citizens—citizens who in their younger and more vigorous days have done so much to shape and strengthen America—and who have prepared themselves for retirement through the payment of insurance under the Social Security Act.

Recognizing this responsibility, Congress acted responsibly and passed the legislation.

Congressmen MILLS and BYRNES of Wisconsin, distinguished Members of this Chamber, have acted responsibly and repudiated the article.

Secretary Cohen has acted responsibly and refuted the article.

The senior citizens who became concerned by the article are acting responsibly in organizing a peaceful protest to the article.

It seems that the only irresponsible issue at hand is the article itself, in print, and duplicated 15 million times over.

The responsible thing for a responsible publication to do would be to print a clarification, retraction, or erratum on its article as a gesture toward healing the wounds it has caused among our senior citizens.

COMMISSION TO SEEK COPPER STRIKE SOLUTION

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include charts and tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I joined with my good friends and colleagues from Montana, Senators MIKE MANSFIELD and LEE METCALF, in urging President Johnson to appoint a Special Board of Inquiry to look into the 21-week-long copper strike which is causing a severe hardship to many of the residents of my district, the First District of Montana.

Efforts have been made to bring the strike to an end. The National Labor Mediation Board and the Department of Labor have worked hard, and all of us who hope for a settlement appreciate their efforts. I have spent several days during the last few months in Montana and in Washington attempting to find solutions to the areas of disagreement. Senators MANSFIELD and METCALF, as well, have done everything they could to bring a settlement.

Yet today the strike is not ended, and officials on both sides are now resigned to the possibility of the strike lasting several more months. The economy of our State has already suffered heavily as a result of the dispute and I believe we must continue our efforts to bring labor and management together for fruitful negotiations around the bargaining table.

For this reason, I have written to the President urging the appointment of the special board of inquiry. I include my letter to the President and a summary of the statistics which I sent to the President in the RECORD at this time. These statistics support my belief that there is no justification for invoking the Taft-Hartley law at this time:

DECEMBER 1, 1967.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you know, the copper strike which is having a devastating effect on much of my District is now in its 21st week. Those of us who have had a hand in attempts to find a solution are convinced that serious negotiations are not occurring. Both sides are talking of the possibility of a strike which could last several more months.

I agree with my colleagues, Senators Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf, that we cannot impose the Taft-Hartley Act at this time, and I am enclosing a compilation of statistics which will support this view. I have also sent this material to Senators Mansfield and Metcalf.

In the first place, the dispute is not having an effect upon the total economy or security of this country.

Secondly, you will note that copper stockpiles and cooper product stockpiles have not diminished to the level of December, 1965. Further, I have been advised by the Department of Defense that it is now making purchases of copper at a rate of 6,000 short tons per month and there is an availability of 35,000 short tons per month.

I submit there is not a sufficient impact upon the economy or upon our security or defense to warrant invoking of the Taft-Hartley provisions.

Yet I believe we have not exhausted the options the government has to enhance the possibility of achieving a solution. I realize the National Labor Mediation Board and the Department of Labor have worked wth dedication to encourage mediation and those of us who have remained close to the situation are certainly grateful.

However, because these efforts have been fruitless, I want to join with Senators Mansfield and Metcalf in urging that you appoint a Special Board of Inquiry to look into this dispute. I believe such a board could be helpful in bringing the two sides together for serious negotiations. And, if such an effort does not result in an agreement, I would hope it would result in additional recommendations to you which could lead to a settlement.

I join with my colleagues from Montana in requesting your serious consideration of this request.

With great appreciation, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

ARNOLD OLSEN.

The tables sent to the President indicated:

I

Inventories of refined copper at refiners, brass mills and copper wire rod mills rose from approximately 150,000 short tons in December 1965, to almost 300,000 tons in June 1967. This is almost a doubling of the copper inventories.

II

The statistics on the U.S. imports of copper indicate an increase of over 50 percent of imports during the year 1966 with a leveling off during the first half of 1967.

III

The statistics on inventories at the brass and copper wire mills likewise show an increase from about 550,000 short tons to over 800,000 short tons in the period from January 1, 1966, to June 30, 1967, an approximate 40-percent increase. There was a dropoff in the third quarter of this year of some hundred thousand tons but this still leaves a very substantial quantity on hand.

IV

The statistics of the copper producing and fabricating industries, as issued by the United States Copper Association, show a very steady climb in stocks from less than 500,000 short tons on December 31, 1964 to over 700,000 short tons on June 30, 1967. During the third quarter of this year which, of course, coincided with the period of the strike the stocks did drop approximately 150,000 short tons but this still left them considerably above the December 31, 1964, level. The statistics show that the great bulk—at least 80 percent—of these stocks is in the hands of the fabricators.

The tables referred to follow:

TABLE I.—CONSUMPTION, STOCKS, SALES, AND SALES POSITION OF THE COPPER PRODUCING AND FABRICATING INDUSTRIES AS REPORTED BY THE UNITED STATES COPPER ASSOCIATION

[Copper content in tons of 2,000 lb.]

[Col. 1—copper content of fabricators' shipments to consumers of finished or semifabricated materials produced from purchased refinery shapes but excluding refinery shapes resulting from toll treatment of purchased scrap; col. 2—stocks of refined shapes and cathodes, the sale of which is controlled by Copper Institute members; col. 3—stocks held by nonconsumers and at commodity exchange warehouses, etc.; col. 4—fabricators stocks consist of refined shapes; material in process, in finished form, and in scrap; col. 6—sales of refinery products booked by copper-producing industry during reported period; col. 7—sales booked by fabricators during reported period stated in terms of additional copper required; col. 8—same as col. 4; col. 9—fabricators unfilled purchase contracts are equivalent to unfilled sales contracts reported by the Copper Institute; col. 11—working stocks represent estimated tonnage of copper that is required for normal operations; col. 12—fabricators unfilled sales contracts stated in terms of additional copper required.]

	Net consumption by fabricators	Refined stocks, end of period				Sales		Fabricators sales position					
		Copper industry	Nonconsumers	Fabricators	Total	Copper industry	Fabricators	Stocks	Unfilled purchase contracts	Total supplies	Less working stocks	Less unfilled sales contracts	Available for sale or deficit
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1953	1,375,869	86,413	1,232	380,881	468,526	1,381,688	1,271,178	380,881	25,022	405,903	309,664	170,917	−74,679
Jan. 1, 1954	----------	84,932	1,232	380,881	467,045	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1954	1,231,840	40,307	2,523	360,526	403,356	1,223,971	1,197,504	360,526	58,125	418,651	304,619	136,581	−22,549
1955	1,418,241	53,407	2,534	389,974	445,915	1,491,573	1,574,924	389,974	139,094	529,068	314,145	293,264	−78,341
1956	1,416,378	115,774	1,666	437,187	554,627	1,435,924	1,306,948	437,187	117,601	554,788	336,217	183,834	34,737
1957	1,282,329	177,171	3,281	430,171	610,623	1,229,732	1,237,126	430,171	75,627	505,798	347,465	138,631	19,702
1958	1,166,129	57,657	19,593	446,358	523,608	1,200,089	1,205,367	446,358	90,401	536,759	326,438	177,869	32,452
Jan. 1, 1959	----------	57,657	19,593	452,102	529,352	----------	----------	452,102	90,401	542,503	338,938	168,113	35,452
1959	1,347,526	40,236	23,588	414,757	478,581	1,279,015	1,379,527	414,757	130,324	545,081	340,349	202,775	1,957
1960	1,237,469	131,741	7,531	456,094	595,366	1,190,121	1,160,954	456,094	75,222	531,316	370,055	126,260	35,001
1961	1,420,377	63,542	16,213	461,252	541,007	1,423,682	1,438,461	461,252	89,745	550,997	361,286	144,344	45,367
1962	1,518,963	104,836	11,114	465,592	581,542	1,481,708	1,512,708	465,592	81,297	546,889	385,239	138,089	23,561
1963	1,569,078	70,640	5,978	474,875	551,493	1,582,215	1,594,547	474,875	100,357	575,232	382,692	163,558	28,982
Dec. 31, 1964	1,727,263	42,376	3,213	429,989	475,578	1,676,407	1,789,071	429,989	107,244	537,233	381,677	225,366	−69,810
Dec. 31, 1965	[1] 1,822,520	49,854	10,957	462,519	523,330	1,742,850	1,885,835	462,519	129,349	591,868	395,396	288,681	−92,209
Jan. 1, 1966	----------	49,854	10,957	453,090	513,901	----------	----------	453,090	129,349	582,439	395,396	279,252	−92,209
January 1966	[1] 211,551	53,119	10,708	448,535	512,362	138,404	214,957	448,535	126,984	575,519	407,040	282,658	−114,179
February	[1] 179,838	63,715	8,205	465,848	537,768	143,137	240,197	465,848	128,681	594,529	400,688	343,017	−149,176
March	[1] 206,684	66,567	6,658	458,245	531,470	156,540	217,558	458,245	128,204	586,449	401,950	353,891	−169,392
April	[1] 192,377	54,508	4,964	448,322	507,794	146,190	194,144	448,322	128,112	576,434	399,906	355,658	−179,130
May	[1] 168,966	53,016	4,266	446,235	503,517	156,463	168,699	446,235	131,839	578,074	405,559	355,391	−182,876
June	[1] 223,539	56,811	1,935	460,848	519,594	148,259	235,859	460,848	130,762	591,610	400,295	367,711	−176,396
July	[1] 128,094	52,200	4,459	507,689	564,348	142,038	125,489	507,689	134,127	641,816	418,826	365,106	−142,116
August	[1] 175,847	44,850	5,806	531,224	581,880	162,236	208,984	531,224	143,706	674,930	421,106	398,243	−144,419
September	[1] 166,226	52,504	6,850	525,908	585,262	138,255	157,212	525,908	137,988	663,896	414,031	389,229	−139,364
October	[1] 181,971	40,997	6,708	526,200	573,905	157,532	172,987	526,200	132,196	658,396	411,647	380,245	−133,496
November	[1] 160,177	52,876	6,254	533,227	592,357	147,016	142,201	533,227	124,966	658,193	404,085	362,269	−108,161
December	[1] 139,058	56,079	9,628	558,599	624,306	167,889	138,348	558,599	134,732	693,331	407,345	361,559	−75,573
Dec. 31, 1966, total	[1] 2,134,328	56,079	9,628	558,599	624,306	1,803,959	2,216,635	558,599	134,732	693,331	407,345	361,559	−75,573
Jan. 30, 1967	----------	57,617	8,333	641,082	707,033	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Sept. 30, 1967	----------	48,368	17,248	540,711	606,327	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Oct. 31, 1967	----------	47,238	17,724	502,685	567,647	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

[1] Includes production resulting from the release of GSA stocks, for commercial use and for account of Bureau of the Mint. Actual delivery of tonnage included may be delayed beyond period in which it has been recorded. Starting May 1966, deliveries of GSA tonnages to fabricators are included during each month as reported by producers.

TABLE II.—P. 7 OF "COPPER," QUARTERLY REPORT OF BDSA, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—BRASS MILL AND COPPER WIRE MILL PRODUCTS: INVENTORIES AND RELATED DATA, 1965-67

[In millions of pounds]

Item	2d quarter, 1967			Inventories, July 31, 1967	1st quarter, 1967			Inventories, Dec. 31, 1966	Inventories, Sept. 30, 1967
	Receipts	Consumption or sales [1]	Inventories, end of quarter		Receipts	Consumption or sales [1]	Inventories, end of quarter		
Total	----------	----------	[2]	[2]	----------	----------	[2]	[2]	----------
Selected industrial sectors, total	[3]	[3]	1,618.0	[3]	[3]	[3]	1,578.1	1,404.4	[4] 1,438.0
Brass mill shapes			875.3				897.3	775.3	----------
Wire mill shapes			742.7				680.8	629.1	----------
Consumers:									
Manufacturers, total (brass and wire mill products)	717.9	747.4	539.5	511.1	783.5	746.4	568.9	531.8	[4] 490.9
By major industry group:									
Machinery, except electrical (SIC major group 35)	95.2	103.6	81.9	77.9	112.1	100.2	90.2	78.3	----------
Electrical machinery (SIC major group 36)	256.7	267.6	198.0	190.0	279.3	273.8	208.9	203.4	----------
Transportation equipment (SIC major group 37)	66.2	69.9	66.0	62.7	83.3	70.0	69.7	56.4	----------
All other copper mill shape consuming industries (SIC major groups 34, 38, 39, and 19)	299.8	306.3	193.6	180.5	308.8	302.4	200.1	193.7	----------
By shape:									
Brass mill shapes, total	524.2	540.1	401.2	378.0	561.8	532.9	417.0	388.1	----------
Sheet, strip, and plate	242.1	246.7	192.3	180.6	250.2	233.3	196.9	180.0	----------
Rod and nonelectrical wire	185.0	195.0	115.6	109.1	199.4	198.4	125.5	124.5	----------
Pipe and tube	97.1	98.4	98.3	88.3	112.2	101.2	94.6	83.6	----------
Wire for electrical conduction [5]	193.7	207.3	138.3	133.1	221.7	213.5	151.9	143.7	----------
Electric power utilities, investor owned [6]	32.9	30.2	81.7	[3]	30.6	24.5	79.0	72.9	74
Wholesale distributors, total	434.8	430.6	443.1		486.2	413.5	438.9	366.2	[6] 400
Brass mill shapes, total	198.8	213.5	244.2		235.1	186.5	258.9	210.3	
Sheet, strip, and plate	32.0	34.6	46.6	[3]	38.1	27.8	49.2	38.9	
Rod and nonelectrical wire	39.4	42.8	63.2		57.1	41.4	66.6	50.9	
Pipe and tube	127.4	136.1	134.4		139.9	117.3	143.1	120.5	
Wire for electrical conduction [5]	236.0	217.1	198.9		251.1	227.0	180.0	155.9	
	Shipments [7]		Inventories, [8] end of quarter		Shipments [7]		Inventories, [8] end of quarter		
Brass and wire mills of primary producers, total	1,325.9		553.7	474.9	1,422.9		491.3	[6] 433.5	[4] 473.2
Brass mills (SIC 3351 pt.)	637.8		229.9	199.0	768.6		221.4	[6] 176.9	----------
Wire mills (SIC 3357 pt. [5]	652.1		323.8	275.9	654.3		269.9	[6] 256.6	----------

[1] Represents consumption of mill shapes by consumers and sales of mill shapes by wholesale distributors.
[2] Because of the lack of data for certain copper consuming industries such as construction, communication, and utilities, the total inventories held by U.S. industries are not available.
[3] Not applicable.
[4] Estimate.
[5] Data represent copper content of both bare wire and insulated wire and cable.
[6] Estimate as of Nov. 27.
[7] These data are not strictly comparable to those in tables S-1 and S-2.
[8] Excludes work in process.

Source: Current industrial reports series M-33K, U.S. Department of Commerce.

TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, if there is one precept that stands before all others in our democracy, it is that this Government exists to serve and protect the welfare and legitimate interests of the greatest number of citizens possible. As Thomas Bentham once phrased it and I quote:

Legislation should provide the greatest good to the greatest number.

If there is any area of legislation before this body today which meets this criterion of service to the greatest number of citizens, it is truth in lending and consumer credit protection.

We have become a nation of consumers buying on credit. It would be next to impossible to find a significant number of adults who do not purchase consumer goods on credit. Since 1945, consumer credit purchases have grown at a rate 4½ times that of the gross national product. Yet, I would venture to state that no normal and common transaction is less understood by the individual consumer than the cost of credit he uses when he makes a purchase. He is faced with confusing, complicated and even deceptive practices when he buys on the installation plan.

I am most anxious to see a truth-in-lending measure pass this Congress. The Senate has passed S. 5. It has been said of this bill by the most influential newspaper in my district that while it is "weaker than its predecessors, enough remains to insure millions of American consumers a clearer picture of the financial obligation to which they are committing themselves when they buy on credit or contract for a loan." I submit that it is not enough that millions of Americans have just a clearer picture. We must attempt to insure that all American consumers have the clearest picture and understanding possible. S. 5 and H.R. 11601 do not give us this picture because they exempt revolving credit from disclosure.

In my examination of this problem, I have discovered some alarming facts. Total consumer or personal debt stands at almost $320 billion—just a few billion less than the national debt—but interest payments on personal debts are at least double the interest in the national debt. A recent study showed that interest rates available in one community ranged from 5.5 to 192.5 percent. If consumers understood credit charges, the pressures of honest competition would prohibit such a range.

Another study using 800 families as a sample, showed that on the average, these people thought they were paying 8.3-percent interest on their debts. However, they were actually paying 23.2 percent. Not only were these families paying interest far in excess of their realization, they also were paying more income tax than was required of them. They could have made legitimate income tax deductions based upon interest charges of 23.2 percent rather than the erroneous 8.3-percent interest estimate.

I am pleased that H.R. 11601 includes among its provisions interest disclosures of first mortgage on homes, the advertising of credit and a National Commission on Consumer Finance.

My chief disagreement with H.R. 11601 is its exemption of the so-called revolving credit account from disclosure of an annual percentage rate. A very large amount of consumer credit purchasing is carried on through the medium of the revolving credit account, and this area is, perhaps, less free from deception in the selling of credit than most other forms of lending.

A majority of revolving accounts carry a true interest rate of about 12 to 18 percent per year. Buyers, however, are led to believe that they pay about 18-percent interest. What buyers do not know and what lenders do not tell them is that the consumers pay 18 times the number of months the credit account is opened.

In testimony before the committee during hearings on truth in lending, merchants complained that it is difficult to compute and state a true interest rate for revolving credit because of variable balances and time periods. This task may be difficult but it is not impossible, and in justice to the American consumer, a formula to ascertain the true interest on revolving credit must be devised.

The exemptions from revolving credit disclosures favor the large chains such as Sears, Montgomery Ward, J. C. Penney, and the like. These firms already enjoy a favored position because of their great size and tremendous ability to buy in large quantities. We should keep in mind that the very purpose of the revolving credit account method is to keep the consumers account considerably active—to keep him buying on credit. If merchants find this method of operation so profitable—as it obviously is—they can afford the trouble of disclosing the true interest charges.

I feel that any truth-in-lending legislation issued from this Congress must protect and inform consumers who use revolving credit. Such legislation will enable the consumer not only to shop intelligently for credit, it will also allow him to ascertain the true tax deductions for interest paid to which he is entitled.

The Senate bill constitutes an unwarranted and unjust concession to lenders. The time for the House to come to the defense of the beleaguered American consumer is now. We must rectify these serious and inequitable omissions in order that we will be able to call this a meaningful truth-in-lending measure.

PRAYER FOR CHILDREN

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the following prayer, composed by Cardinal Spellman in 1944, speaks quietly and clearly of his best human and religious qualities. The world, the country, and New York made him because we needed him. We will now feel our loss.

PRAYER FOR CHILDREN

(By Francis Joseph Cardinal Spellman, 1889–67)

Somewhere—the place it matters not—somewhere
I saw a child, hungry and thin of face—
Eyes in whose pools life's joys no longer stirred,
Lips that were dead to laughter's eager kiss,
Yet parted fiercely to a crust of bread.

FRANCE, ALSO, COULD HAVE AN OUTFLOW OF GOLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was not so many years ago that I, upon the invasion of North Africa by the Allied Forces, heard President Roosevelt's voice, in a speech to the French, saying, "mes amis." I wonder what he would be calling the French today, in the light of what France has done in the last few days.

Starting with the First World War, this country has gone out of its way to help France. In 1917, it sent the AEF and many pieces of equipment to help stop the forces of the Kaiser. It assisted financially in the amount of $4,089,689,588.

In World War II, France quickly capitulated to Nazi Germany, leaving the field of honor and the defense of free Europe to Great Britain. The English Lion was then a formidible adversary. Songs of the day, such as "The Last Time I Saw Paris," were the rallying cry for the invasion to liberate France and the other subjugated lands.

This country and Great Britain, principally, combined for the successful invasion of Normandy on May 1, 1944, and did, in fact, liberate Paris on August 26, 1944. The cost in men and supplies to this country was great.

In terms of dollar value, the supplies and services furnished by the United States to the French Army, Air Force, and Navy have been estimated at about $1,527,000,000, $457,000,000, and $310,000,000 respectively, for a grant total of $2,294,000,000.

In addition to this, the United States furnished the French civilian economy up until V–J Day, supplies representing another $548,000,000. For the period from November 11, 1941, to September 2, 1945—V–J Day—the total French military and civilian lend-lease account amounted to $2,842,000,000. For all this assistance, it was agreed, on May 28, 1946, to settle France's debt to the United States as to World War II for the sum of $420,000,000. France agreed to pay this

amount with interest at 2 percent beginning July 1, 1951.

Following World War II, on June 5, 1947, Gen. George C. Marshall suggested that the European countries, their economies wrecked by the war, draw up a program "to place Europe on its feet economically," and promised American support. In response to this suggestion, Great Britain and France arranged for a meeting of their ministers in Paris to discuss ways in which Europe could take the initiative in formulating such a program. Toward the end of 1947, Congress passed a $522 million program of interim aid to France, Italy, and Austria. In April of the following year, President Truman signed the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 which laid the foundation for a 4-year European recovery program. Before the Marshall plan program was 2 years old, this country had poured out $10 billion in grants. This assistance was credited with having increased industrial production in the stricken countries by 20 percent above the prewar level, restored agriculture to approximately its prewar level, brought inflation under control, provided better than a sustaining diet for the people, raised wages, improved living conditions, preserved democratic institutions, strengthened individual freedom, and stemmed the rising tide of communism.

France was conspicuously included in the participating countries and was helped back to her present position. And so, when one views the mean position and the insulting insolence of De Gaulle in the framework of this kind of friendship to France over the years, there is a striking similarity to the parable of the unmerciful servant—Matthew 18: 23–35. It will be recalled in that passage, a servant owed the master a large sum of money which he could not repay. The master could have had him thrown into jail, but instead, forgave him. When the shoe was on the other foot, this same servant not only would not forgive a fellow servant from a debt owed to him, but he had the man given over to the torturers until he should pay. When the master heard of this, he did justice by also handing the unmerciful servant over to the torturers until he also should pay.

When Britain, in 1963, desired entrance into the Common Market, it was De Gaulle who singlehandedly kept her out. On the eve of the pound's devaluation, it was De Gaulle who refused to participate in an International Monetary Fund loan to Britain. It was De Gaulle who pulled out of the international gold pool, the function of which was to protect the integrity of the dollar. France's participation in this was to be 9 percent, an added burden the United States was forced to pick up. It is now De Gaulle who gleefully talks of the devaluation of the dollar and the return to the gold standard of the 1930's.

De Gaulle, in a press conference of November 27, 1967, called for an end to the American takeover by the exporting of its inflated dollars. He also, unbelievably, sits in judgment on the deficits in the balance of payments of both Britain and the United States.

I feel that the time has come when France, our old friend of yesteryear, and its illustrious spokesman, De Gaulle, have convalesced to such a degree that they now have a surplus in gold of over $5 billion. Since, like the unmerciful servant, they have shown themselves unworthy of any further mercy, I think that country capable of paying the bill she has owed for so long.

To tally up that score, from World War I there is a principal outstanding of $3,863,650,000 plus overdue interest in the sum of $2,986,942,551, for a total World War I bill of $6,850,592,551.

For World War II, the principal outstanding is $298,540,933. The total bill comes to $7,149,133,484 which, as I understand it, is only a little more than France's gold surplus.

I would further suggest that we have ways in which to enforce collection, if we would, and our thirst for French wine is not so great nor our desire for French automobiles so desperate that we cannot do without them.

Therefore, let France and De Gaulle know that if they will wage an economic war on France's old friend and ally, the United States, they had better get ready for an outflow of gold from the shores of France's overly long subsidized land.

WINNING A WAR BY CEASE-FIRE IN ASIA—COMMUNIST TRUCE TACTICS NOW IN OPEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is important that we recognize Communist tactics and strategy in winning a war by cease-fire. Communist strategy was clearly demonstrated in China and Korea. We must be alert that their strategy does not repeat itself in Vietnam.

On the last occasion of a cease-fire or truce in Vietnam we agreed to a temporary cease-fire on humanitarian grounds to enable the Vietnamese people to enjoy a respite or a relief from the fighting during their New Year's holidays.

Needless to say, our decision to agree to the truce was also based on a desire to demonstrate to the Communists of Hanoi our willingness to ultimately seek an end of the fighting in Vietnam, providing an honorable peace could be assured the Vietnamese people.

Apparently our good intentions were not rewarded, for under the cloak of this cease-fire, the enemy moved more troops to the forward areas, and generally improved its military position as a result of the truce.

This view was confirmed by the President's remarks of February 13, when he stated publicly that—

> It had been our hope that the truce periods connected with Christmas, New Year and Tet (the Vietnamese Lunar New Year) might lead to some abatement of hostilities and to moves toward peace.
>
> Unfortunately, the only response we have had from the Hanoi government was to use the periods for major resupply efforts of their troops in South Vietnam.

Before we leap headlong into peace negotiations with the enemy in Vietnam, probably it will best be for us to take a hard look at the enemy's intentions in violating cease-fire agreements. Because, their practice of violating a formal cease-fire agreement might well weaken our position at the conference table while discussing peace.

To better understand their intentions in Vietnam it might be helpful to first review their record of cease-fire violations in China and Korea. In those countries the evidence shows that whenever a truce was called: First, it was at the instigation of the Communists; and, second, their violations of the truce or cease-fire led to miltary advantages which contributed to their ultimate victory.

In China in 1946, there was a 10-month truce between the Chinese Communists and the National Government. The purpose was to stop all fighting between the two, and halt all further troop movements; with one exception, that the National Government troops could move into Manchuria for the purpose of restoring sovereignty over the area after the Japanese occupation. In addition, American truce inspection teams were organized to see that the truce would be obeyed. During the 10 months when the truce was in effect, the Communists committed 91 major violations. Through these violations they were able to, first, occupy and control Manchuria, the heartland of East Asia; and, second, cut the main north-south rail routes enabling them to establish a corridor from west to east in North China. The destruction of these transportation routes split the Nationalist forces into isolated commands and rendered them powerless to launch coordinated offensive action.

It may seem strange that the Communists were able to violate their pledged word 91 times during this period of 10 months without effective hindrance from the American truce inspections teams. The Communists showed open contempt for their efforts. One American truce inspection team in Manchuria was met with Communist gunfire. Another, sent to stop a Communist attack in North China, was tricked into leaving the area, while the Communists resumed their attack, and captured their objective. Thus, the prestige of the truce inspection teams dwindled steadily. One American official was quoted as saying:

> There have been so many violations I could not count them.

In looking back at the China story, it is easy to realize why peace talks were never concluded. They broke down because the Communists, through their preconceived cease-fire violations, had won the strategic military decisions necessary to assure them final victory.

Specifically, 43 of the 91 major violations enabled the Communists to deploy units through mountain passes into Manchuria; cut communication or transportation routes there; establish areas of occupation; receive the new arms and equipment from the Japanese who surrendered them at the conclusion of World War II; and, effectively prevent the Nationalists from entering Manchuria to maintain their sovereignty there. Similarly, the balance of the 48 major violations in North China resulted in the disruption of the main north-south rail

routes; enabled the Communists to establish a west-to-east corridor or base of operations. This effectively prevented further Nationalist efforts to consolidate themselves in North China and reduced them to separated or isolated commands, which thereafter were unable to render assistance to each other for any possible offensive operations. The critical military issues of the war were resolved in favor of the Communists when they were able to neutralize and control Manchuria and North China, after that, it was just a question of time before they became the dominant force in China.

Next, in Korea the truce talks, for one thing, covered an alltime record of 2 years, during which time the enemy violations caused fighting to break out with great violence. Our casualties, which numbered approximately 90,000 before the truce talks, rose to about 140,000 by the time the armistice was signed.

From the beginning of the truce talks in Korea it became clear that the Communists were determined to exploit the truce talks for maximum propaganda advantage and to wear down the U.S. negotiators by ceaseless minor issues, as well as by military actions far from the truce tent. The net result was that by the time the armistice was signed, the Communists had deployed additional air force units into North Korea, and large stocks of military supplies to create a greater military capability. Up to this day there has been no actual peace agreement in Korea. Forces continue to remain in Korea to maintain the status quo of the armistice.

Now we come to the present situation in Vietnam. The background to our position there commenced in April 1954 when nine Western and Asian countries signed what was known as the Geneva accords to end the 8-year-old colonial war that France had been fighting in the area. Primarily, the Geneva Convention established the 17th parallel, dividing Communist North Vietnam from South Vietnam, and since that time we have been trying to protect the territorial integrity of the Republic of Vietnam, south of the 17th parallel. Since 1954, fighting has erupted from time to time, whereby at present we have military forces numbering about 500,000 men engaged in a military conflict against enemy forces controlled by Hanoi. Here the enemy seeks ultimate control over all of South Vietnam, utilizing forces from North Vietnam as well as guerrilla-type forces already established south of the 17th parallel.

To summarize, the enemy truce violation intentions: In China, it was to disrupt lines of communication or transportation and deny them to the Nationalists. In Korea, the distinguishing feature was to create as many casualties as possible among us over as long a period as possible; and at the same time create a buildup of their forces. In Vietnam it is the enemy's method of using a cease-fire to create a buildup and resupply of their forces in Vietnam.

The fluid battle situation in Vietnam, which involves the Communist buildup in Haiphong, the usage of the Ho Chi Minh trail, the Cambodian sanctuary, and guerrilla warfare in South Vietnam, otherwise known as search-and-destroy pattern of warfare, and the experiences in China and Korea lead inescapably to the conclusion that a secure truce in Vietnam could be based only on the most stringent terms and controls. In other words, until the aggressor can give assurances of wanting peace, without breaking their pledge of violating a cease-fire or a truce, every caution should be used to avoid historical precedents which have served their purpose of ultimate victory.

At present the enemy states that the price for a constructive truce, to discuss the end of hostilities in Vietnam would include: First, our stopping the bombing of North Vietnam; second, withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam; and, third, recognition of the Communist Vietcong in a new government in South Vietnam.

Obviously, our Government cannot accept these conditions without complete abandonment of our policy, which is to stop aggression that affects all of Southeast Asia. Therefore, our Government sees no alternative but to continue military actions until the enemy abandons some of these conditions and demonstrates a more realistic and sincere desire to end the hostilities.

In this connection, it is suggested that we: First, develop actions through the United Nations to prevent Laos and Cambodia from allowing their territory being used by Hanoi as routes of passage for their troops into Vietnam, south of the 17th parallel; second, constantly reiterate or repeat through our international information media that Hanoi's three conditions are untenable if the United States is to remain as an effective force in Southeast Asia in defense of freedom; and, third, impose a time limit or deadline on every subject discussed during a cease-fire to avoid needless exploitation of a truce by the enemy, such as in Korea.

With all the problems both at home and abroad weighing heavily on the shoulders of our President, he is to be highly commended and extolled for his patient and persistent efforts to arrive at an honorable solution to the conflict in Vietnam. He is faced with an implacable foe. I strongly urge that we give him our full support. Let us not forget those who have paid the supreme sacrifice, and salute our great legions which are acquitting themselves with unprecedented valor.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, December 6, on account of official business.

Mr. SNYDER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for December 11 through December 13, 1967, on account of official business in the Fourth Kentucky Congressional District.

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.

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. REUSS, for 40 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCLORY, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. SAYLOR, for 1 hour, tomorrow, Thursday, December 7; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GALIFIANAKIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHMORE, for 60 minutes, December 11.

Mr. RIVERS, for 60 minutes, December 13.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (at the request of Mr. HUNT), for 30 minutes, on December 7; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. HUNT), for 5 minutes, December 7; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUNT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. SPRINGER.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GALIFIANAKIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. NIX.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. FRIEDEL.

Mr. KEE.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in two instances.

Mr. IRWIN.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 809. An act for the relief of Dr. Youssef (Joseph) Selim Hasbani;

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

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. 480. An act to amend the act of October 4, 1961, relating to the acquisition of wetlands for conservation of migratory

waterfowl, to extend for an additional 8 years the period during which funds may be appropriated under that act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10805. An act to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission; and

H.R. 12638. An act to authorize the exchange of certain vessels for conversion and operation in unsubsidized service between the west coast of the United States and the territory of Guam.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2154. An act to provide long-term leasing for the Gila River Indian Reservation;

H.R. 2275. An act for the relief of Dr. Ricardo Vallejo Samala and to provide for congressional redistricting;

H.R. 2730. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to Temple Junior College, Temple, Tex.;

H.R. 2828. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Iowa Tribes of Kansas and Nebraska and of Oklahoma in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 138 and 79, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4920. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the San Carlos Apache Reservation in Arizona; and

H.R. 4983. An act to disclaim any right, title, or interest by the United States in certain lands in the State of Arizona.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock p.m.), the House adjourned *until tomorrow*, December 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:

1262. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting a copy of the report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held in Washington, D.C., September 21 and 22, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 331, title 28, United States Code (H. Doc. No. 194); to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

1263. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting the Rules of Appellate Procedure and the attached amendments to the Rules of Civil Procedure for the U.S. district courts and to the Rules of Criminal Procedure for the U.S. district courts, adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C., 2072 and 2075 and 18 U.S.C. 3771 and 3772 (H. Doc. No. 195); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1264. 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 to September 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1265. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report pertaining to premium payments for overtime, pursuant to the provisions of section 603 of the 1966 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1266. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for improvement in the system for managing nonexpendable equipment, Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1267. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examination of financial statements of Government Printing Office, fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1268. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of determinations on deferments of 1968 construction payments due the United States from the Cameron County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1; and the La Feria Water Control and Improvement District, Cameron County No. 3, parts of the lower Rio Grande Valley rehabilitation project in Texas, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 86-308; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1269. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of September 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 82-554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 8696. A bill to amend section 408 of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of savings and loan holding companies and subsidiary companies; with amendment (Rept. No. 997). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee of conference. H.R. 12144. An act to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 998). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 14293. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 14294. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 14295. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron ore, iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON (by request):

H.R. 14296. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Chickasaw Nation or Tribe of Oklahoma and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 14297. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 to extend the duties of the Civil Rights Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 14298. A bill to permit the State of Washington to use certain donated land for the promotion of public health, education, and recreation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 14299. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prescribe penalties for the possession of LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs by unauthorized persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 14300. A bill to provide criminal penalties for the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into interstate commerce of master keys for motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 14301. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 60 to 50 the age at which a woman otherwise qualified may become entitled to widow's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KUPFERMAN, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey):

H.R. 14302. A bill to facilitate the transaction of certain business incident to the representation of a congressional district in the House of Representatives when vacancies occur in such representation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 14303. A bill to require applicants for permits to parade in the District of Columbia or on property of the United States to post a bond to cover certain costs of such parade; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TALCOTT (for himself and Mr. RAILSBACK):

H.R. 14304. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 14305. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 14306. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit an employer corporation to establish a plan under which its employees may purchase and hold stock in such corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 14307. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize the provisions relating to payment of pension, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 14308. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal research facilities; to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the

United States; to encourage the study and improvement of the care, handling, and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of laboratory animals used in biomedical activities; and to otherwise assure humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 14309. A bill to establish the Federal Reinsurance Corporation to assure the availability of casualty insurance in areas which may present unusual risks of riots or civil disturbances; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOWNING (by request):

H.R. 14310. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to prohibit the baiting of waterfowl, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 14311. A bill to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1966, with respect to termination of widow's and widower's annuities upon remarriage, to certain widows and widowers of persons retired or otherwise separated prior to July 18, 1966; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 14312. A bill to establish a commission to study the organization and management of the executive branch of the Government, and to recommend changes necessary or desirable in the interest of governmental efficiency and economy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 14313. A bill to establish the Government Program Evaluation Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, Mr. CAREY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. DELLENBACK, and Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin):

H.R. 14314. A bill to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to permit employer contributions to trust funds to provide employees, their families, and dependents with scholarships for study at educational institutions or the establishment of child care centers for preschool and school-age dependents of employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.J. Res. 951. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.J. Res. 952. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. NIX:

H. Con. Res. 593. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should take appropriate action to insure the security and safety of the country and people of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 14315. A bill for the relief of Mary Roberts McFeely; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14316. A bill for the relief of Casimiro Marchese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 14317. A bill for the relief of Amalia Morales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 14318. A bill for the relief of Miss Keiko Nakamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 14319. A bill for the relief of Salpy Tchalekian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 14320. A bill for the relief of Belur S. Bhagavan, his wife, Leelavathi, and his child, Minni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 14321. A bill for the relief of Hui Wai Kay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 14322. A bill for the relief of Miriam Mischel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 14323. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elise C. Gill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 14324. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pedro Baudilio Napoles (Fernandez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14325. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Reese, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 14326. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Alfonso Cediel and their minor child, Liliana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 14327. A bill for the relief of Arie Aviv (also known as Arie Abrimovich); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 14328. A bill for the relief of Pamela Heavey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

214. Mr. SNYDER presented a petition of Richard L. Walker of St. Matthews, Ky., chairman of the Friends of Rhodesian Independence, relative to reconsidering our policy toward the independence of the Republic of Rhodesia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1967

The Senate met at 12 meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of grace and God of glory, trusting only in Thy mercy would we seek Thy face. We are but frail children of dust. As for every one of us swift to its close ebbs out life's little day, so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.

In a confused day, keep our minds clear and clean and uncluttered by prejudice. In a darkened day, when so many lights have gone out, give us the sight and the insight of the pure in heart that we may see God and the godlike everywhere. In a clamorous day, filled with angry accents of hatred and suspicion, give us ears to hear the voices that speak of justice and freedom and world understanding. In a mad day, grant us sanity of mind in our outlook and a glad and buoyant hope that sends a shining ray far down the future's broadening way.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, December 5, 1967, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A Message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 294) for the relief of Elroy C. Navarro, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

H.R. 4961. An act for the relief of Donald E. Crichton;

H.R. 6659. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro Augusto Ruiz y Cue;

H.R. 7909. An act for the relief of Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., of New York, N.Y.;

H.R. 8096. An act for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Air Force at Kelly Air Force Base, Tex.;

H.R. 8391. An act for the relief of Adel Lessert Bellmard, Clement Lessert, Josephine Gonvil Pappan, Julie Gonvil Pappan, Pelagie Gonvil Franceour de Aubri, Victore Gonvil Pappan, Marie Gonvil, Lafleche Gonvil, Louis Lavanture, Elizabeth Carbonau, Vertifelle Pierre Carbonau, Louis Joncas, Basin Joncas, James Joncas, Elizabeth Datcherute, Joseph Butler, William Roger, Joseph Cote, four children of Cicili Compare and Joseph James, or the heirs of any who may be deceased;

H.R. 10003. An act for the relief of John M. Stevens;

H.R. 10199. An act for the relief of Lloyd W. Corbisier;

H.R. 11166. An act for the relief of Earl S. Haldeman, Jr.;

H.R. 11276. An act to authorize appropriations to carry out the Adult Education Act of 1966 for 2 additional years, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11959. An act for the relief of Robert E. Nesbitt.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 809. An act for the relief of Dr. Youssef (Joseph) Selim Hasbani;

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

H.R. 480. An act to amend the act of October 4, 1961, relating to the acquisition of wetlands for conservation of migratory waterfowl, to extend for an additional 8 years the period during which funds may be appropriated under that act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10805. An act to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission; and

H.R. 12638. An act to authorize the exchange of certain vessels for conversion and