

in man's most basic need: housing and a decent environment. This research and technology effort should be funded this year, and the Institute of Urban Development should be established as quickly as possible.

The President's message is a responsible response to our current problems. But we are a rapidly changing society, and it will take many years of commitment and action to achieve our long-range goal: a decent environment and full opportunity for all our citizens.

The President has pointed the way—he has begun the process. We in the Congress must follow through.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in legislative session, the message from the President of the United States on poverty be jointly referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

**ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT 11 O'CLOCK A.M.**

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order of March 9, 1967, that the Senate, in executive session, stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 15, 1967, at 11 o'clock a.m.

**NOMINATIONS**

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 14, 1967:

**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

Richard B. Smith, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term of 5 years expiring June 5, 1967, vice Byron D. Woodside.

Richard B. Smith, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 5, 1972.

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

*Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for you are the salt of the earth.—Matthew 5: 12, 13.*

O God and Father of mankind, who art above us yet within us, far off yet very near—nearer than breathing and closer than hands and feet—we bow in Thy presence with hearts filled with gratitude because Thou hast been so wonderfully good to us.

We are what we are and we have what we have not because we deserve them, but because Thy goodness hast blessed our days, and Thy spirit hast led us along the way.

We thank Thee for these men and women who are giving themselves in real and deep devotion to our country, who are seeking to put justice above injustice, good will above ill will, principle above prejudice and liberty above license. May they continue to have the courage of their convictions and in these crucial days fail not man nor Thee.

Bless our Nation with Thy favor and these leaders with Thy spirit. Together may we be channels for peace and for prosperity in our world. 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. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1177. An act to provide for the disposition of a judgment against the United States recovered by the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana;

S. 1191. An act to provide for the disposition of a judgment against the United States recovered by the Southern Ute Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation in Colorado; and

S.J. Res. 18. Joint resolution to provide for the administration and development of Pennsylvania Avenue as a national historic site.

**APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COUNSEL PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 376**

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that he has, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 376, appointed, as special counsel, Hon. Bruce Bromley, of New York.

The Chair might add, parenthetically, that this appointment meets with the unanimous approval of all Members who were named as defendants in the legal proceedings.

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING DEBATE TODAY**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Library of Congress of the Committee on House Administration be permitted to sit during debate today.

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

There was no objection.

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING DEBATE TODAY**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcom-

mittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit during debate today.

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

There was no objection.

**LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM**

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of making an announcement regarding the program.

Mr. Speaker, we announced last week that the Committee on Ways and Means would call up today sundry bills and resolutions which had been unanimously reported from that committee and had passed the House also, I believe, last year. I have been advised by the committee that the distinguished chairman of that committee must appear before the Committee on Rules at this time. He has two important bills pending which we hope to call up later in the week, the so-called interest equalization bill and the investment credit bill. As a result we may not be able to call up the unanimous-consent bills today. If not, they will be called up at a later date.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make the further announcement that I have information that perhaps the message on the Economic Opportunity Act may be up today. Since there is no legislation, we may be on special orders at the time, but if the message does come up, I should like to advise the Members, so they will know that even though special orders are commenced, we may read the message and have it properly referred at that time.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, this comes as quite a shock to some of us who did our homework last night. I have here 21 bills, which have been studied, annotated, and are ready. Does the gentleman mean to imply that the Committee on Rules is meeting now, while the House is in session?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that, of course, the House grants that committee the privilege to meet while the House is in session. They have numerous important measures before them, and I believe it is not uncommon that they should meet at this time. I believe it would expedite the business of the House to let the committee proceed with the consideration of very important bills by that committee, because these other bills are bills which can be brought up at a later date, and they will be brought up in the near future if postponed today.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentle-

man will yield further, the emphasis on "very important" bills is relative to one's point of view, of course. Does the gentleman, the majority leader of the House, expect to bring the investment tax credit bill on the floor tomorrow, to program it if, indeed, a rule is granted by the Committee on Rules?

Mr. ALBERT. We hope that we can announce tomorrow that that bill will be ready for floor consideration; and with the cooperation which we will, of course, have, if he is ready, from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, we may have that bill up Thursday or later this week. We do hope to do that.

I say to the gentleman, all of these unanimous-consent bills are important bills, and I am sure that any preparation the gentleman has made with respect to them, since he is one of the most attentive Members in the House, will be just as available to the House later this week or next week.

Mr. HALL. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I assure the gentleman I will keep my powder dry.

Mr. ALBERT. I know the gentleman will.

Mr. HALL. In the meantime, it poses quite a dilemma. One hates to be tossed from horn to horn, as to whether to break up the meeting of the Rules Committee or allow it to progress on the one hand, or whether to have another one of these oft-messaged releases from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue come down and reserve the roilcall for then. Obviously we do not have a quorum present. This is, indeed, a dilemma.

Mr. ALBERT. I state to the gentleman that if the message gets here—I do not know whether it will or not—before we are ready to adjourn, we will read it. The gentleman certainly would be within his rights at that time to call for a quorum. That is why I am notifying the House.

**PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO SIT WHILE HOUSE IS IN SESSION TODAY**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit while the House is in session today, during debate.

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

There was no objection.

**PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

**PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO FILE REPORTS**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means desires to do so, I ask unanimous consent that for his committee he may have until midnight tomorrow night to file reports.

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

There was no objection.

**UNANIMOUS-CONSENT BILLS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS**

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I see that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the distinguished ranking member of that committee have come to the floor and they advise that they are ready to present these bills now notwithstanding my earlier remarks. I also see the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] here.

**UNANIMOUS-CONSENT BILLS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS**

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to advise the Members of the House that all of the bills that will be called up today are bills that were reported from the Committee on Ways and Means during the last Congress by unanimous consent, as well as in this Congress.

In addition thereto, Mr. Speaker, all of these bills which we propose to call up for consideration today, with the exception of some minor changes, changes which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] and I will discuss and explain, were passed by the House of Representatives by unanimous consent during the last Congress, and that applies to all of them.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished chairman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Arkansas has previously stated, there has been no change in the substance of any of the bills from the substance and the manner in which they passed the House last year.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, I agree with the gentleman's statement.

**GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON BEHALF OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, THE RANKING MINORITY MEMBER, THE AUTHORS OF CERTAIN BILLS**

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] and I, plus the author of each bill, be permitted to extend remarks in connection with the passage of each of the bills considered today.

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

There was no objection.

**DUTY-FREE TREATMENT OF DICYANDIAMIDE**

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 286) to permit duty-free treatment of dicyandiamide pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 286

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for purposes of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, sections 201(b)(1) (relating to limit on decrease in duty) and 253 (relating to staging requirements) of such Act shall not apply with respect to dicyandiamide provided for in item 425.40 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States.*

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 286 is to authorize the President to eliminate the duty on imports of dicyandiamide pursuant to his trade agreement authority. The bill, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable HALE BOGGS, is identical to H.R. 16077 of the 89th Congress as passed by the House on October 21, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means is advised that dicyandiamide is used mostly to make melamine, which in turn is reacted with formaldehyde to make plastics used principally in the manufacture of moldings—mainly tableware—laminates, and coatings. Dicyandiamide is not produced in the United States, but is obtained principally from a Canadian plant which is the only producer of this product in North America. Most of our imports of this product come from Canada, Japan, and Norway.

There is presently imposed on imports of dicyandiamide a rate of duty of 10½ percent ad valorem, and the maximum that the rate of duty on dicyandiamide could be reduced by the President pursuant to his trade agreement authority

under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 would be 5 percent ad valorem in gradual stages over a period of 4 years.

The bill provides that section 201(b) (1)—relating to limit on decrease in duty—and section 253—relating to staging requirements—of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 shall be inapplicable with respect to dicyandiamide provided for in item 425.40 of the tariff schedules of the United States. In essence, this authorizes the elimination of the duty—or reduction to a rate under 50 percent of the July 1, 1962, rate—without staging. However, no such agreement could be made before the requirements of chapter 3—relating to requirements concerning negotiations—title II of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, have been met.

Favorable reports on H.R. 286 were received by the committee from the Departments of Treasury, State, Commerce, and Labor, as well as an informative report from the U.S. Tariff Commission, and the Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 286, a bill to permit duty free treatment of dicyandiamide pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Although I urge favorable action on this measure, I will not make any statement at this time. When similar legislation was before the House last fall, I made a statement which appears on pages 28566-28567 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 21, and this statement is equally applicable to H.R. 286.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**DUTY ON CERTAIN NONMALLEABLE IRON CASTINGS**

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 653) to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on certain nonmalleable iron castings, which was reported unanimously to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 653

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) schedule 6, part 4, subpart A of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by striking out item

662.20 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

662.18	Other: Cast iron (except malleable cast iron) parts, not alloyed and not advanced beyond cleaning or normalizing by heat treatment, and machined only for the removal of fins, gates, sprues, and risers, or for the determination of the porosity of the casting, or to permit location in finishing machinery, or painted only for protection from oxidation	3% ad val.	10% ad val.
662.20	Other	11.5% ad val.	35% ad val.

(b) Item 674.51 of such schedules is amended by inserting before the comma immediately after "cleaning" the words "or normalizing by heat treatment" and by striking out "or to permit location in finishing machinery" and inserting in lieu thereof, "or for the determination of the porosity of the casting, or to permit location in finishing machinery, or painted only for protection from oxidation".

Sec. 2. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Upon request therefor filed with the collector of customs concerned on or before the 120th day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entry or withdrawal of any article—

(1) which was made after August 30, 1963, and before the day after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) with respect to which the amount of duty would be smaller if the amendments made by the first section of this Act applied to such entry or withdrawal, shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry or withdrawal had been made on the day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That (a) schedule 6, part 4, subpart A of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. sec. 1202) is amended by striking out item 662.20 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

662.18	Other: Cast iron (except malleable cast iron) parts, not alloyed and not advanced beyond cleaning or normalizing by heat treatment, and machined only for the removal of fins, gates, sprues, and risers, or for the determination of the porosity of the casting, or to permit location in finishing machinery, or painted only for protection from oxidation	3% ad val.	10% ad val.
662.20	Other	11.5% ad val.	35% ad val.

(b) Item 674.51 of such schedules is amended by inserting before the comma immediately after "cleaning" the words "or normalizing by heat treatment" and by striking out "or to permit location in finishing machinery" and inserting in lieu thereof "or for the determination of the porosity of the casting, or to permit location in finishing machinery, or painted only for protection from oxidation".

Sec. 2. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Upon request therefor filed with the collector of customs concerned on or before the 120th day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entry or withdrawal of any article—

(1) which was made after August 30, 1963, and before the day after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) with respect to which the amount of duty would be smaller if the amendments made by the first section of this Act applied to such entry or withdrawal,

shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry or withdrawal had been made on the day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MILLS (during the reading of the committee amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the committee amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the pending bill is to restore to certain unfinished nonmalleable cast-iron machine parts the tariff rate which was applicable to such parts immediately prior to the effective date of the Tariff Schedules of the United States; that is, August 31, 1963. H.R. 653 as reported to the House is identical to H.R. 13116 of the 89th Congress as passed by the House on October 21, 1966.

Unfinished nonmalleable cast-iron parts were dutiable under a general provision of the Tariff Act of 1930 at the rate of 3 percent ad valorem. The general provision for cast iron castings was not continued in the tariff schedules of the United States because it was ambiguous in certain respects. In the tariff classification study preceding the adoption of the tariff schedules, the Tariff Commission made a survey to determine the major imports which were being afforded the 3-percent tariff treatment, and created special provisions for such cast-iron products in order to continue the substance of the past tariff treatment. No special provision was created to cover the aforementioned unfinished parts. Moreover, the special provision for unfinished nonmalleable parts for machine tools excludes such parts as are advanced by normalizing by heat treatment. Such unfinished cast-iron parts are dutiable under TSUS item 674.52 or 674.53, at 20 or 14 percent ad valorem, respectively.

The Committee on Ways and Means has been informed that significant im-

ports of articles falling within this tariff classification description and the expanded tariff classification description were made prior to August 31, 1963, the effective date of the tariff schedules of the United States, and were subject to a 3-percent duty. Testimony before the committee indicated that there is now a substantial amount of import trade in such articles.

The Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that the 3-percent tariff rate should be restored to the products covered by H.R. 653, which was introduced by our colleague on the committee, the Honorable MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, of Michigan, and the committee is unanimous in recommending enactment of this legislation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 653, a bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on certain nonmalleable iron castings. Although I urge favorable action on this measure, I will not make any statement at this time. When similar legislation was before the House last fall, I made a statement which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 21, page 28570, and this statement is equally applicable to H.R. 653.

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

#### DUTY TREATMENT OF BAGPIPES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 664) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that bagpipes and parts thereof shall be admitted free of duty, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 664

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 (Tariff Schedules of the United States; 28 F.R., part II, page 359, Aug. 17, 1963) is amended by striking out item 725.24 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

	Wood-wind instruments:		
725.24	Bagpipes.....	Free	40% ad val.
725.25	Other.....	15% ad val.	40% ad val.

(b) Title I of such Act (Tariff Schedules of the United States; 28 F.R., part II, page 360, Aug. 17, 1963) is amended by striking out item 726.70 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

	Parts of wood-wind instruments:		
726.70	Parts of bagpipes....	Free	40% ad val.
726.72	Other.....	15% ad val.	40% ad val.

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to articles which are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 664 is to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to make duty free the importation of bagpipes and parts thereof. The bill, which was introduced by the Honorable CHARLES A. GUBSER, of California, is identical to H.R. 1035 of the 89th Congress, as passed by the House on October 11, 1966.

The bagpipe is a reed musical instrument of great antiquity. It is said to have been introduced into Britain by the Romans, and its use and development spread to Scotland and Ireland, where it became identified with the life of the people, particularly the residents of the Scottish Highlands. In recent years, the bagpipe has become increasingly popular in the United States, where numerous bagpipe bands have been organized in various parts of the country.

Bagpipes are presently dutiable under the provision for woodwind instruments in item 725.24 of the tariff schedules. Parts of bagpipes are provided for under item 726.70. The column 1—most-favored-nation—rate for both bagpipes and parts thereof is presently 15 percent ad valorem. The column 2—statutory—rate is 40 percent ad valorem. The bill does not affect the column 2 rate.

The Committee on Ways and Means has been advised by the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Department of Commerce that there is no known commercial production of bagpipes in the United States.

Favorable reports on H.R. 664 were received by the committee from the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce and Labor, as well as an informative report from the Tariff Commission. The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending enactment of the bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 664, a bill to provide for the duty-free admission of bagpipes into the country. Bagpipes are musical instruments that are becoming increasingly popular in the United States. They are being used more and more by school and college bands, as well as many other groups in our society.

Although the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Department of Commerce have advised the committee that they know of no commercial production of bagpipes in the United States, the present tariff schedule imposes minimum duty of 15% ad valorem on bagpipes coming into this country. The committee has received favorable reports from the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce and Labor on this legislation. The bill is unanimously recommended by the Ways and Means Committee.

In order to make more readily available to groups interested in using bagpipes, I recommend passage of this legislation.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may

extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the bagpipe is a very ancient instrument, said to have been introduced by the Romans in England. From England the instrument was introduced into Ireland and Scotland. Through the centuries the sounds of bagpipes have accompanied feuds on the Scottish heath, marching revolutionaries in Ireland, and marching bands in parades and celebrations in those countries as well as here in America. The unforgettable sight of the kilted bagpipers marching has added color and excitement to countless festive occasions in this country. The haunting, indescribable sound of the bagpipes playing summons in each of us a sense of the mystery of antiquity. We know, when the bagpipes have passed, that we have lived through a few moments of history, preserved for us in its purest essence.

With the increase in leisure time in recent years, interest in bagpipe playing has grown to sizable proportions. Since bagpipes are not manufactured in this country, the 15 percent ad valorem tariff on bagpipes protects no one and places an unfair burden on the growing number of bagpipe players here. Because the removal of the tariff on bagpipes can cause no economic harm, and in the hope that more Americans might enjoy the blood-stirring music of the bagpipes, I give my firm support to the removal of the tariff.

Last year the House of Representatives passed a similar bill to remove the tariff on bagpipes. The bill was being considered in the Senate when the session ended, but we have again today the opportunity to express our good will to the bagpipers of this country by rectifying a situation which is unnecessary at best.

I urge the passage of H.R. 664 to achieve this end.

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

#### TAX-FREE WITHDRAWAL OF WINE UNFIT FOR BEVERAGE USE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1282) to provide for the withdrawal of wine from bonded wine cellars without payment of tax, when rendered unfit for beverage use, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1282

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

*America in Congress assembled*, That section 5362 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to removal of wine from bonded wine cellars), as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof, the following:

"(d) **WITHDRAWAL FREE OF TAX OF WINE AND WINE PRODUCTS UNFIT FOR BEVERAGE USE.**—Under such regulations as the Secretary or his delegate may deem necessary to protect the revenue, wine, or wine products made from wine, when rendered unfit for beverage use, on which the tax has not been paid or determined, may be withdrawn from bonded wine cellars free of tax. The wine or wine products to be so withdrawn may be treated with methods or materials which render such wine or wine products suitable for their intended use. No wine or wine products so withdrawn shall contain more than 21 percent of alcohol by volume, or be used in the compounding of distilled spirits or wine for beverage use or in the manufacture of any product intended to be used in such compounding."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, beginning in line 4, strike out "as" and all that follows down through line 6, and insert: "is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the pending bill is to provide for the tax-free withdrawal from bonded wine cellars of wine and wine products, when rendered unfit for beverage use. As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, H.R. 1282, which was introduced by the Honorable B. F. SISK, of California, is identical to H.R. 6413 of the 89th Congress, which was passed by the House on October 7, 1966.

Present law imposes an excise tax on the withdrawal of wine from a bonded wine cellar at rates varying with the alcoholic content of the wine and based on the natural or artificial carbonation of the wine. However, wine may also be withdrawn from bonded wine cellars free of tax for use in the production of vinegar and for certain other limited purposes. Present law permits a drawback of all but \$1 of tax per gallon in the case of distilled spirits where they are rendered unfit for beverage use, but no comparable provision is provided under present law in the case of wines.

H.R. 1282 will permit the use of wines withdrawn tax free in nonbeverage products, such as food flavoring, and will alleviate economic problems in some cases by helping to dispose of fruit surpluses.

To guard against evasion of the alcoholic beverage taxes, the bill provides that wines withdrawn tax free must be rendered unfit for beverage use before their withdrawal. "Unfit for beverage use" in this case means the same as when that term is used in the Internal Revenue Code in the case of drawbacks of tax on distilled spirits.

The bill excludes from coverage wines containing more than 21 percent alcohol. This is provided because it is believed that the inclusion of higher alcohol content wines might result in attempted diversion for beverage use and, additionally, because it is felt that a tax exemption of these higher alcohol content wines might, because of their resemblance to

distilled spirits, place persons now using distilled spirits in nonbeverage products at a competitive disadvantage.

The Treasury Department has indicated no objection to this legislation, and it is expected that only a negligible revenue loss will result from its enactment.

The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending the passage of H.R. 1282.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of my bill, H.R. 1282, which would provide for the withdrawal of wine from bonded wine cellars without payment of tax, when rendered unfit for beverage use. I would first of all like to express my appreciation to the members of the Ways and Means Committee, especially the chairman, for their fine work and cooperation.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, our present laws do not contain any provision for use of wine for nonbeverage purposes. Provisions similar to those proposed in H.R. 1282 are now effective for industrial alcohol and distilled spirits. This bill proposes that wine that is denatured and rendered unfit for beverage use be permitted to be withdrawn tax free. If this is allowed, it will open new markets for wine throughout the country in food, pharmaceuticals, livestock food, and other fields. Such a provision would not involve any loss of revenue.

Our entire grape industry is seriously in need of new markets. This is being gradually accomplished in the case of raisins and other grape products, through extensive research and market development in new fields. Such market development is seriously hampered, and I think unnecessarily and unreasonably so, in the case of wine grapes, because of the existing tax structure. I can see no reason, either from the viewpoint of public policy in regulation and control, or from the tax revenue viewpoint, why this serious obstacle should not be eliminated under proper and careful regulations as are proposed in H.R. 1282.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully solicit my colleagues' support for this legislation.

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

#### EXCISE TAX ON SHELLS AND CARTRIDGES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1326) to amend section 4181 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the excise tax on shells and cartridges, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection. The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1326

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That (a) section 4181 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the excise tax on shells and cartridges) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of this part, the term 'shells' and the term 'cartridges' shall not include shells or other devices that contain delayed-action explosives and that are chiefly used for frightening or herding birds without injuring them."

(b) The amendment made by this Act shall apply to articles sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 1326 is to amend section 4181 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the manufacturer's excise tax the sale of shells and cartridge shells and other devices which contain delayed-action explosives and are chiefly used for frightening or herding birds without injuring them. The bill, which was introduced by the Honorable BURT L. TALCOTT, of California, is, except for a minor clarifying change, identical to H.R. 9280 of the 89th Congress, which was passed by the House on October 21, 1966.

Present law imposes an 11-percent excise tax on the sale by the manufacturer, producer, or importer of shells and cartridges. The pending bill would exempt from this excise tax bird-scaring-type shells and cartridges which are used by farmers and others to protect growing crops from wild birds, for herding wild birds into State and Federal bird sanctuaries, for frightening birds from airports, and for other similar purposes. An example of the type shell which this bill would exempt is a shotgun shell primed with black powder which contains a firecracker rather than steel pellets in its projectile tube. When fired from a gun, the firecracker is propelled a predetermined distance and explodes with a loud report. Obviously, such a shell is useful only in frightening game and would not be used in hunting.

The Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that devices of the type described were not intended to be included under the excise tax imposed on ordinary shells and cartridges.

The Treasury Department has raised no objection to this legislation, and the Internal Revenue Service has advised that no significant administrative problems are likely to arise from its enactment. It is believed that the revenue loss resulting from the bill will be negligible.

The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending enactment of H.R. 1326.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**TO AMEND THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO THE CLASSIFICATION OF CHINESE GOOSEBERRIES**

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2155) to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the classification of Chinese gooseberries, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2155

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That schedule 1, part 9, subpart B of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended (1) by striking out "Fresh" in item 149.50 and inserting in lieu thereof "Other fruits, fresh", and (2) by inserting immediately before such item the following new item:*

" 149.48	Chinese gooseberries ( <i>Actinidia Chinensis</i> ), fresh....	0.75¢ per lb.	1.25¢ per lb.
----------	--	---------------	---------------

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, on or after the thirtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 2155, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable AL ULLMAN, of Oregon, is to make fresh Chinese gooseberries subject to the tariff rate equivalent to the general tariff level applied to berries rather than the tariff level applied to "other" fruits. Specifically, the bill would change the tariff rate from 17.5 percent ad valorem to 0.75 cents per pound. This bill is identical to H.R. 16160 of the 89th Congress, which was passed by the House on October 21, 1966.

The fresh Chinese gooseberries covered by the bill, which are unlike the common American gooseberry in physical appearance, were historically traded as berries, and they are botanically classified as berries. Such berries are believed to have originated in China as is suggested by their botanical name, *Actinidia Chinensis*. Imports of the berries, which are now primarily from New Zealand, are small in volume, are relatively high in price, and do not directly compete with any domestic product.

In recent years Chinese gooseberries have been exported from New Zealand under the designation "Kiwi fruit," in order to associate the product with New Zealand. Because of this appellation, there has developed a trade acceptance of the Chinese gooseberries as fruit rather than as berries, and they have been held technically classifiable for tariff purposes as nonenumerated fresh fruit. The Committee on Ways and

Means believes that the tariff rate applicable to Chinese gooseberries should be more in line with those rates generally applicable to fresh berries than the rates generally applicable to fresh fruit, and is unanimous in recommending enactment of H.R. 2155 to accomplish this purpose.

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

**TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 TO ALLOW A FARMER AN AMORTIZED DEDUCTION FROM GROSS INCOME FOR ASSESSMENTS FOR DEPRECIABLE PROPERTY LEVIED BY SOIL OR WATER CONSERVATION OR DRAINAGE DISTRICTS**

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2767) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a farmer an amortized deduction from gross income for assessments for depreciable property levied by soil or water conservation or drainage districts, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2767

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 175(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to soil and water conservation expenditures) is amended by striking out the third sentence and by inserting in lieu thereof the following new sentences:*

"Notwithstanding the preceding sentences, such term also includes any amount, not otherwise allowable as a deduction, paid or incurred to satisfy any part of an assessment levied by a soil or water conservation or drainage district to defray expenditures made by such district (i) which, if paid or incurred by the taxpayer, would without regard to this sentence constitute expenditures deductible under this section, or (ii) for property of a character subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167 and used in the soil or water conservation or drainage district's business as such (to the extent that the taxpayer's share of the assessment levied on the members of the district for such property does not exceed 10 percent of such assessment). For purposes of this section, in the case of any property described in clause (ii) of the preceding sentence, any amount paid or incurred by the taxpayer during the taxable year and attributable to such property shall be treated as paid or incurred ratably over the taxable year and each of the 9 succeeding taxable years."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to assessments levied after the date of the enactment of this Act in taxable years ending after such date.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2767 provides that if a farmer pays an assessment levied by a soil or water conservation or drainage district, which is attributable to the acquisition by the

district of depreciable property, the amount paid can be deducted for income tax purposes on an amortized basis over a 10-year period. Under existing law, such payments are not deductible but must be capitalized and added to the cost of the farmer's land in respect of which the assessment is paid.

Under present law, a farmer can deduct assessments levied by soil or water conservation or drainage districts to the extent the assessment covers expenditures made by the district which the taxpayer could have deducted if he had incurred them himself. Thus, if the assessment is for digging an irrigation or drainage ditch, then the assessment paid by the farmer would be deductible but, as already stated, if part of the assessment covers the cost of acquiring depreciable property by the district, that part is not deductible since a farmer himself could not deduct—except through depreciation allowances—the cost of acquiring depreciable property. As a result, the farmer in a soil and water conservation district is treated less favorably under existing law from a tax standpoint than a farmer who undertakes soil and water conservation activities for himself.

H.R. 2767, by allowing a deduction over a 10-year period for assessments attributable to the acquisition of depreciable property by the district, will provide the farmer with a deduction roughly comparable with what is allowed through depreciation when the farmer himself buys the depreciable property. The bill, which was introduced by our colleague in the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Montana, the Honorable JAMES F. BATTIN, is identical with H.R. 7030 of the 89th Congress, which was passed by the House on October 21, 1966. The Treasury Department has stated that it does not object to the bill, and the committee is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

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

**RELATING TO THE INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISTRIBUTIONS PURSUANT TO THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1956, AS AMENDED**

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of 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, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4765

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

*America in Congress assembled*, That section 1102 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special rules for income tax treatment of distributions pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) CERTAIN BANK HOLDING COMPANIES.—This part shall apply in respect of any company which becomes a bank holding company as a result of the enactment of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956', approved July 1, 1966 (Public Law 89-485), with the following modifications:

"(1) Subsections (a) (3) and (b) (3) of section 1101 shall not apply.

"(2) Subsections (a) (1) and (2) and (b) (1) and (2) of section 1101 shall apply in respect of distributions to shareholders of the distributing bank holding corporation only if all distributions to each class of shareholders which are made—

"(A) after April 12, 1965, and

"(B) on or before the date on which the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System makes its final certification under section 1101(e),

are pro rata. For purposes of the preceding sentence, any redemption of stock made in whole or in part with property other than money shall be treated as a distribution.

"(3) In applying subsections (c) and (d) of section 1101 and subsection (b) of section 1103, the date 'April 12, 1965' shall be substituted for the date 'May 15, 1955'.

"(4) In applying subsection (d) (3) of section 1101, the date of the enactment of this subsection shall be treated as being the date of the enactment of this part.

"(5) In applying subsection (b) (2) (A) of section 1103, the reference to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 shall be treated as referring to such Act as amended by Public Law 89-485."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4765 provides that in the case of a company which became a bank holding company as a result of the 1966 amendments to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, the bank holding company can distribute either its banking or nonbanking interests to its shareholders without the imposition of a tax on the shareholders. The bill, which was introduced by the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, is identical with H.R. 11257 of the 89th Congress as passed by the House on October 7, 1966.

The Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 made certain corporations bank holding companies. In general, bank holding companies are corporations which own more than 25 percent of the stock of two or more banks. In 1956, these corporations were compelled by law to distribute either their banking properties or their nonbanking properties. Because they were required to make these distributions, Congress at that time permitted those distributions to be tax free to the shareholders. Accordingly, sections 1101 to 1103 of the Internal Revenue Code, inclusive, were then enacted, granting such tax-free treatment. The tax-free treatment applied only if the property distributed was acquired before May 15, 1955.

Under the 1956 act, a special exception was made for a corporation registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940 or affiliated with a corporation so registered. Under this exception, such a company was not considered a bank holding company even though it held 25

percent or more of the voting shares of two or more banks so long as it held these interests indirectly. This exception is removed by the 1966 amendments.

As a result, at least one corporation, Financial General Corp.—an affiliate of the Equity Corp., which is a registered investment company—is now a bank holding company and must dispose of either its banking or nonbanking assets. However, a substantial part of Financial General's property was acquired after May 15, 1955, but before April 12, 1965, the date of the introduction of the bill which led to the 1966 amendments.

The Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that it is appropriate to extend essentially the same type of tax-free treatment to corporations which become bank holding companies by virtue of the 1966 legislation as was originally extended to corporations which became bank holding companies because of the 1956 legislation.

The relief granted by the bill is also consistent with the treatment Congress has provided elsewhere when a divestiture was compelled by law as, for instance, in the case of distributions required to effectuate the policies of the Federal Communications Commission or the Securities and Exchange Commission.

As stated above, H.R. 4765 extends the tax-free treatment originally provided with respect to distributions required by the 1956 act to distributions required for the first time by the 1966 amendments. The property to be distributed tax free must have been acquired before April 12, 1965. However, to be sure that no opportunity for tax manipulation is created, the tax-free treatment is made available only if all of the distributions made in kind—that is, other than in money—are made on a pro rata basis to all shareholders.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it does not object to this legislation, and the Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

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

#### TO EXTEND THE TIME WITHIN WHICH CERTAIN REQUESTS MAY BE FILED UNDER THE TARIFF SCHEDULES TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4880) to extend the time within which certain requests may be filed under the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4880

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That subsection (b) of section 2 of the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-241; 79 Stat. 933) is amended by striking out "on or before the 120th day after the date of the enactment of this Act," and inserting in lieu thereof "on or before June 30, 1967,".

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 4880 is to continue from February 4, 1966, until the close of June 30, 1967, the time in which importers may request reclassification of imports under certain lower tariff-rate provisions provided by the Technical Amendments Act of 1965. The bill is similar to H.R. 13363 of the 89th Congress as passed by the House on October 21, 1966.

After the tariff schedules of the United States were put into effect on August 31, 1963, certain inadvertent rate increases were discovered in the schedules which had resulted either from misinformation or the lack of appropriate information upon which the tariff classification rates were based. The Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965—Public Law 89-241—approved October 7, 1965, provided for the restoration of the lower rates of duty with respect to articles covered by such tariff descriptions. Section 2(b) of that act provided that the changes in rates would be retroactive to August 30, 1963, with regard to many articles classifiable under such tariff descriptions, if such articles were entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after that date and if the importer would file with the appropriate customs officer a request for such changed tariff treatment within 120 days after the act was approved by the President. The last date for applying for this treatment was February 4, 1966.

Numerous complaints have been received by the Committee on Ways and Means from importers stating that the 120-day period for requesting reliquidation of entries covering imports subject to the retroactive tariff reductions was not sufficient for them to process all of their entries. The Department of the Treasury, in its favorable report on this legislation of February 24, 1967, advised the committee that it anticipates no unusual administrative problems should the period be extended until the close of June 30, 1967, as would be provided in H.R. 4880, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable CECIL R. KING, of California.

The Committee on Ways and Means believes that such an extension of the filing period is fully justified in this instance, and is unanimous in recommending enactment of this legislation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4880, a bill to extend the time within which certain requests may be filed under the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965. Although I urge favorable action on this measure, I will not make any statement at this time. When similar legislation was before the House last

fall, I made a statement which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 21, page 28565, and this statement is equally applicable to H.R. 4880.

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

#### TO ESTABLISH A WORKING CAPITAL FUND FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4890) to establish a working capital fund for the Department of the Treasury, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4890

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That there is hereby established a working capital fund for the Department of the Treasury, which shall be available, without fiscal year limitation, for expenses and equipment necessary for maintenance and operation of such administrative services as the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, determines may be performed more advantageously and more economically as central services. The capital of the fund shall not exceed \$1,000,000 and shall consist of the amount of the fair and reasonable value of such supply inventories, equipment, and other assets and inventories on order, pertaining to the services to be carried on by the fund, as the Secretary of the Treasury may transfer to the fund, less the related liabilities and unpaid obligations, together with any appropriations made for the purpose of providing capital. The fund shall be reimbursed, or credited with advance payments, from applicable appropriations and funds of the Department of the Treasury, other Federal agencies, and other sources authorized by law, for supplies and services at rates which will recover the expense of operations, including accrual of annual leave and depreciation of plant and equipment of the fund. The fund shall also be credited with other receipts from sale or exchange of property or in payment for loss or damage to property held by the fund. There shall be transferred into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, as of the close of each fiscal year, earnings which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be excess to the needs of the fund. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to provide capital for the fund.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, at the present time, a working capital fund method of financing for centralized services is used by a number of agencies of the Government, including the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, Interior, Labor, State, and the new Department of Transportation. The experience of those Departments with the working capital fund method of financing has demon-

strated the value of this method of managing and financing for services.

Presently, the Department of the Treasury is performing through its salary and expenses appropriation for the Office of the Secretary various centralized services which benefit a number of Treasury bureaus financed by separate appropriations.

The Committee on Ways and Means believes that the working capital fund established by this bill would bring the financing, managing, and accounting operations of the Treasury Department in line with the operation of the other Departments. The fund established by the bill would consolidate the Treasury Department's operations, place them on a more systematic and businesslike basis, and assist the Department in presenting a more accurate cost-based budget.

The working capital fund, which would be a revolving fund, would finance the central buying of materials, supplies, labor, and other services, the holding and issuing of material and supplies, and the processing of materials into other forms for use. It would also provide a means for accumulating reserves to cover the cost of repairing and replacing equipment and the stocking of supplies under the most advantageous conditions.

So that the Committee on Ways and Means and the Appropriations Committee may be kept informed of the activities of the fund, an annual business-type budget would be prepared by the Treasury Department for submission to the Congress and would be included in the President's budget. The bill also places a limitation of \$1 million on the capital in the working fund.

The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending enactment of H.R. 4890.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4890, a bill to establish a working capital fund for the Department of the Treasury. Although I urge favorable action on this measure, I will not make any statement at this time. When similar legislation was before the House last fall, I made a statement which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 21, page 28565, and this statement is equally applicable to H.R. 4890.

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

#### TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 TO PROVIDE RULES RELATING TO THE DEDUCTION FOR PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS FOR CHILDREN OF PARENTS WHO ARE DIVORCED OR SEPARATED

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6056) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide rules relating to the deduction for personal exemptions for children of parents who are divorced or separated, which was unanimously reported to the

House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6056

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) section 152 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) SUPPORT TEST IN CASE OF CHILD OF DIVORCED PARENTS, ETC.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—If—

"(A) a child (as defined in section 151(e)(3)) receives over half of his support during the calendar year from his parents who are divorced or legally separated under a decree of divorce or separate maintenance, or who are separated under a written separation agreement to which section 71(a)(2) applies, and

"(B) such child is in the custody of one or both of his parents for more than one-half of the calendar year, such child shall be treated, for purposes of subsection (a), as receiving over half of his support during the calendar year from the parent having custody for a greater portion of the calendar year unless he is treated, under the provisions of paragraph (2), as having received over half of his support for such year from the other parent (referred to in this subsection as the parent not having custody).

"(2) SPECIAL RULE.—The child of parents described in paragraph (1) shall be treated as having received over half of his support during the calendar year from the parent not having custody if—

"(A)(i) the decree of divorce or of separate maintenance, or a written agreement between the parents applicable to the taxable year beginning in such calendar year, provides that the parent not having custody shall be entitled to any deduction allowable under section 151 for such child, and

"(ii) such parent not having custody provides at least \$600 for the support of such child during the calendar year, or

"(B)(i) the parent not having custody provides \$1,200 or more for the support of such child (or if there is more than one such child, \$1,200 or more for all of such children) for the calendar year, and

"(ii) the parent having custody of such child does not clearly establish that he provided more for the support of such child during the calendar year than the parent not having custody.

For the purposes of this paragraph, amounts expended for the support of a child or children shall be treated as received from the parent not having custody to the extent that such parent provided amounts for such support.

"(3) ITEMIZED STATEMENT REQUIRED.—If a taxpayer claims that paragraph (2)(B) applies with respect to a child for a calendar year and the other parent claims that paragraph (2)(B)(i) is not satisfied or claims to have provided more for the support of such child during such calendar year than the taxpayer, each parent shall be entitled to receive, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, an itemized statement of the expenditures upon which the other parent's claim of support is based.

"(4) EXCEPTION FOR MULTIPLE-SUPPORT AGREEMENT.—The provisions of this subsection shall not apply in any case where over half of the support of the child is treated as having been received from a taxpayer under the provisions of subsection (c).

"(5) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection."

(b) Subsection (a) of such section 152 is amended by striking out "subsection (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (c) or (e)".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 19, strike out "1965" and insert "1966".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, H.R. 6056 amends the provision of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the \$600 deduction for dependents as it applies with respect to the children of divorced or separated parents. The determination, under present law, of which parent is entitled to the deduction in these cases has become a source of constant irritation to taxpayers and an acute administrative burden to the Internal Revenue Service.

H.R. 6056 is, except for an amendment moving the effective date forward 1 year, identical to H.R. 14363 of the 89th Congress, which was passed by the House during the second session of that Congress and favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Finance on October 18, 1966.

Under present law, the parent who contributes more than one-half of the support of a child for a year is entitled to the deduction for the child. The problem arises from the difficulties encountered in establishing which of the divorced or separated parents meets this requirement. In many cases, each parent honestly believes that he has contributed more than one-half of the support. The problem is compounded because of the ill will which sometimes exists between divorced or separated parents. In these cases the Internal Revenue Service finds itself in the position of an unwilling arbiter between the contending parents. In addition, the handling of these cases is hampered by the provisions of present law which prohibit disclosure to either parent by the Service of information as to the nature and amount of support the other claims to have furnished.

The frequency with which cases involving this issue arise each year is surprisingly great. The Internal Revenue Service has estimated that during a recent year 5 percent of all income tax cases handled at the informal conference level of the administrative process involved this issue as the principal issue.

H.R. 6056, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, provides rules under which this issue may be resolved on a more satisfactory basis. Under these rules, the parent having custody of a child for the greater period of time during the year generally would be entitled to the exemption for that year. The bill pro-

vides exceptions to this general rule, under which the parent not having custody—or having custody for the lesser period of time—becomes entitled to the exemption. Under these exceptions the noncustodial parent is entitled to the exemption—

First, if he contributes at least \$600 toward the support of the child and the decree of divorce or separate maintenance, or a written agreement between the parents, provides that he is to receive the deduction; or

Second, if he provides more than \$1,200 of child support and the parent having custody for the longer period does not clearly establish that he provided a greater amount of support.

In determining the amount of support provided by each parent for purposes of these exceptions, amounts expended for child support are to be considered as received from the parent not having custody to the extent he provides amounts for this purpose.

In cases where the parent not having custody contributes more than \$1,200 of support and claims the deduction with respect to the child, or children, and the parent having custody claims that such support was not furnished or claims to have provided a greater amount of support, the bill provides that each parent is entitled to receive an itemized statement of the expenditures upon which the other bases his claim.

The bill is applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1966.

The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending enactment of this legislation.

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

#### TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 TO PROVIDE FOR ROUNDING THE AMOUNT OF STATE AND LOCAL TAXES FOR PURPOSES OF COMPUTING TAX ON CIGARS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6058) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for rounding the amount of State and local taxes for purposes of computing tax on cigars, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6058

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 5701(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of tax on cigars) is amended by adding after the penultimate sentence the following new sentence:

"For purposes of the preceding sentence, the amount of State or local tax excluded from the retail price shall be the actual tax imposed; except that, if the combined taxes result in a numerical figure ending in a fraction of a cent, the amount so excluded shall be rounded to the next highest full cent unless such rounding would result in a tax lower than the tax which would be imposed in the absence of State or local tax."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to the removal of cigars on or after the first day of the first calendar quarter which begins more than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 6058, concerns the way State and local taxes are to be treated when the Federal excise tax on a cigar is determined. This bill is identical to H.R. 8244 which was passed unanimously by the House on October 21, 1966. The 89th Congress adjourned, however, before the Senate could take action on the bill.

As the Members are aware, the Federal excise tax on cigars is determined under a bracket system in which the rate of tax varies with the retail price of a cigar. For example, the tax is \$2.50 per thousand for cigars which are manufactured to retail for not more than 2½ cents each. The tax is \$3 per thousand on cigars which retail at more than 2½ cents each but not more than 4 cents. The tax reaches a top rate of \$20 per thousand for cigars which retail for over 20 cents each.

It is obviously very important for Federal excise tax purposes to determine the retail price of a cigar in its principal market. At one time, this retail price was considered to include any State taxes that were imposed on cigars. This practice had some unfortunate effects. A cigar whose principal market was in a State that imposed a tax on cigars could be pushed into the next higher Federal excise tax bracket while a similar cigar whose principal market was in a State with no tax or a lower tax continued to be taxed at the lower Federal rate. In 1960, Congress sought to end this source of competitive disadvantage by providing that the retail price for the purpose of computing the Federal excise tax was not to include the amount of a State or local tax imposed upon cigars as a commodity.

It now appears that the discrimination we attempted to eliminate in 1960 still remains in some cases. This discrimination occurs when the State tax on a cigar involves a fraction of a cent. When a State imposes a fractional cent tax, the retailer cannot increase the price of the cigar by a fraction of a cent and so he raises the price to the next highest full cent. This may place the cigar in a higher Federal tax bracket. For example, on a cigar manufactured to sell for 6 cents the Federal excise tax is normally \$4 per thousand. But if, as a result of a one-half-cent State tax, the retail price is increased to 7 cents, then the price of the cigar excluding the tax is 6½ cents and the Federal excise tax is increased to \$7 per thousand. This is true even though the retailer keeps the additional half cent and the manufacturer continues to receive the same amount for the cigar.

This bill completes the action taken

in 1960 by providing that when a State or local tax in a cigar's principal market ends in a fraction of a cent, the amount of tax that can be excluded is to be rounded up to the next full cent. In this way, the Federal excise tax will not depend upon the rates at which States or localities choose to tax cigars.

This rule will not be applied, however, if rounding would result in reducing the Federal excise tax to a level below that which would be imposed in the absence of any State or local tax. The provision is to be effective with respect to removals of cigars made on or after the first day of the first calendar quarter which begins more than 30 days after this bill is enacted.

The Treasury Department has expressed no opposition to this bill, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable SYDNEY HERLONG, of Florida, and the committee is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6058, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for rounding the amount of State and local taxes for purposes of computing the tax on cigars. Although I urge favorable action on this measure, I will not make any statement at this time. When similar legislation was before the House last fall, I made a statement which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 21, page 28565, and this statement is equally applicable to H.R. 6058.

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

#### RELATING TO THE INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF CERTAIN CASUALTY LOSSES ATTRIBUTABLE TO MAJOR DISASTERS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6097) relating to the income tax treatment of certain casualty losses attributable to major disasters, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6097

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1231(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of any involuntary conversion of property (subject to the provisions of this subsection but for this sentence) which is attributable to a storm, flood, fire, or other casualty designated by the President of the United States as a major disaster for the purposes of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended, entitled 'An Act to authorize*

*Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes' (42 U.S.C. 1855-1855g), this subsection shall not apply to such involuntary conversion (whether resulting in gain or loss) if, during the taxable year, the recognized losses from such conversions exceed the recognized gains from such conversions."*

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending after November 30, 1964.

SEC. 2. (a) Paragraph (2) of section 1231 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by inserting after "losses" the first place it appears "(including losses not compensated for by insurance or otherwise)".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply in respect of losses sustained after the date of the enactment of this Act in taxable years ending after such date.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 6097 is to amend the provisions of existing law relating to the income tax treatment of casualty losses sustained in a major disaster. The bill, which was introduced by our colleague in the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Oregon, the Honorable AL ULLMAN, provides that if property is destroyed or damaged by a storm, flood, or other casualty which is designated by the President of the United States as a major disaster, then, if the losses exceed the gains, both the losses and the gains will be treated as ordinary for tax purposes.

Under present law, uninsured business losses—or those from property held for the production of income—arising from a fire or other casualty are treated as ordinary losses without regard to any gains the taxpayer may have. This rule is not changed by H.R. 6097. In the case of major disasters, the pending bill supplements this rule of existing law to provide substantially similar loss treatment for partially insured business property—or property held for the production of income. This loss treatment also is provided in the case of major disasters for losses of personal assets held for over 6 months—such as a personal residence—whether or not it is covered by any insurance.

In addition, a technical amendment makes it clear that uninsured losses arising from the destruction—in whole or in part—theft, or seizure, or requisition or condemnation of property—used in the trade or business or capital assets held more than 6 months—are to be offset against gains otherwise treated as capital gains except to the extent they are specifically excluded from the provision.

The bill is identical with the bill, H.R. 7502, as passed by the House during the 89th Congress. That bill was reported, with unrelated amendments, by the Senate Finance Committee on October 21, 1966, but the Congress adjourned without the Senate having taken any action on the reported bill.

The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending enactment of H.R. 6097.

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

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, may I proceed for 1 minute to make a statement

with reference to seven bills that I am about to call up?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, there are seven bills that were passed last year by unanimous consent that would still have to be passed by the Congress in order to provide the relief contemplated, even though we did in the last Congress approve the Florence agreement, because these matters arose before the effective date provided for by the Florence agreement.

#### DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF CARILLON FOR NORTHFIELD AND MOUNT HERMON SCHOOLS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 1566), to provide for the free entry of a four-octave carillon for the use of the Northfield and Mount Hermon Schools, East Northfield, Mass., which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1566

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty a four octave carillon for the use of the Northfield and Mount Hermon Schools, East Northfield, Massachusetts.*

SEC. 2. If the liquidation of the entry has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, immediately after "entry", insert "of the article described in the first section of this Act".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the pending bill is to provide for the free entry of a four-octave carillon for the use of the Northfield and Mount Hermon Schools, East Northfield, Mass. The bill further provides that if liquidation of the entry has become final, such entry is to be reliquidated and appropriate refund of duty made.

As reported to the House, H.R. 1566, which was introduced by the Honorable SILVIO CONTE, of Massachusetts, is identical to H.R. 13190 of the 89th Congress, as passed by the House on October 21, 1966.

It is the understanding of the Committee on Ways and Means that the carillon being imported for the Northfield and Mount Hermon Schools is being cast in France, a portion of the bronze for the bells having been obtained from eight bells which were shipped from Northfield to France for recasting. In the absence of legislation, the carillon would be classified under the provisions

of item 725.38 of the tariff schedules of the United States and dutiable at the rate of 6.5 percent ad valorem.

The Committee on Ways and Means has been advised that there is no domestic production of carillon bells and that domestic firms contracting for installations of carillons are dependent on imports of tuned bells to be used in such installations. The Tariff Commission, in reporting to the Committee on Ways and Means on H.R. 1566, stated that the information available to it indicates that "carillon bells are not produced in the United States."

The Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature, and unambiguously recommends its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1566, a bill to provide for the free entry of a four-octave carillon for the use of the Northfield and Mount Hermon Schools, East Northfield, Mass. Although I urge favorable action on this measure, I will not make any statement at this time. When similar legislation was before the House last fall, I made a statement which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 21, page 28561, and this statement is equally applicable to H.R. 1566.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, among the bills before the House today, having been reported by unanimous consent from the distinguished Committee on Ways and Means, is my own proposal for the free entry of a four-octave carillon for use by the Northfield and Mount Hermon Schools in the First Congressional District of Massachusetts.

I have the very great honor to represent the First District, and the Northfield-Mount Hermon Schools in this body and I should like to offer some brief remarks pertinent to the bill, H.R. 1566, before us today.

Our action today represents the culmination of an effort begun last year to remedy a situation that would have imposed a costly burden on the Northfield-Mount Hermon Schools. This bill was first introduced in the 89th Congress on March 1, 1966. It was reported late in the year by the distinguished Committee on Ways and Means and was passed by the House on October 21, 1966. Unfortunately, our action came too late to permit similar action by the other body and the bill failed to pass before final adjournment of the 89th Congress.

I want to extend my compliments to the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee for bringing this bill to the floor so early in the present session. I am most optimistic that the Senate will indeed have time to act on H.R. 1566.

The carillon imported by the Northfield-Mount Hermon Schools was cast in France. A portion of the bronze used in the bells was obtained from some eight bells which were shipped from Northfield to France expressly for this purpose. Unless the Congress approves this legislation, the finished carillon will remain classified under provisions of item 725.38 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States and dutiable at 6.5 percent ad valorem.

Justification for waiver of the duty is made on grounds that, at the present time, there is no domestic production of carillon bells. All firms in the United States presently engaged in installation of carillon bells must depend entirely on imported tuned bells. The U.S. Tariff Commission itself confirms that no carillon bells have been cast in this country since 1950.

Northfield-Mount Hermon Schools are private institutions operating in picturesque surroundings in Northfield, Mass. Under directions of their distinguished president and my very good friend, Dr. Howard L. Jones, these companion institutions have already established an international reputation for leadership and enlightenment, both in classroom presentations and in the general field of education administration.

I had the very great pleasure of working with Dr. Jones on the independent schools talent search program, presently funded under the Office of Economic Opportunity, which has accomplished such significant strides in breaching the barriers of ignorance and illiteracy among the impoverished ghettos and neighborhoods throughout the country.

Truly, this institution is most deserving of the suspension of duties on their carillon which this bill affords them. The carillon has been installed by now, and its sound has already become an integral part of the tradition and heritage of the Northfield area.

The bill, of course, provides for reliquidation of the entry and the refunding of the duty made, inasmuch as the bells have already been imported.

Again, may I compliment the distinguished committee chairman and my very good friend for the prompt and favorable action of his committee. I respectfully urge my colleagues to approve H.R. 1566 without delay so that we may encourage similar favorable action by the other body as soon as possible.

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

#### DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF MASS SPECTROMETER AND RHEOGONIOMETER FOR PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 1886), to provide for the free entry of certain articles for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J., which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.  
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1886

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one mass spectrometer and one rheogoniometer imported for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.*

(b) Section (a) of this bill shall apply to the articles described therein whether such articles were entered before the date of enactment of this bill, or are entered on or after such date. If the liquidation of the entry of any article described in section (a) has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

With the following committee amendment:

Beginning on page 1, strike out line 7 and all that follows through line 2 on page 2 and insert:

"(b) If the liquidation of the entry of any article described in subsection (a) has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the pending legislation is to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer and one rheogoniometer for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J. The bill also provides for reliquidation with an appropriate refund of duty should the articles be covered by an entry the liquidation of which has become final. As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, H.R. 1886, which was introduced by the Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey, is identical to H.R. 14388 of the 89th Congress, as passed by the House on October 21, 1966.

The Weissenberg rheogoniometer is a unique instrument for measuring fluid viscosity. The instrument purchased by Princeton University is a Weissenberg Model R 16 rheogoniometer manufactured by Farol Research Engineers, Ltd., of England. The Department of Commerce advised the Committee on Ways and Means in its report that it knows of "no other commercial instrument, manufactured in the United States or elsewhere, that is capable of meeting the university's requirements for which the British instrument was purchased."

A mass spectrometer is a scientific device used to provide chemical analyses, measurements, and other research features. Ordinarily, they are built to specifications to meet the particular requirements of the user. In the use of this instrument, the material to be studied is subjected to an ionizing process after which the ions formed are physically separated according to mass by electromagnetic means so that a mass spectrum is produced. The mass spectrometer purchased by Princeton University is an A.E.I. Model MS 9 mass spectrometer made in England. The Committee on Ways and Means is advised that the British instrument can perform a number of research functions that cannot be duplicated by domestically produced mass spectrometers of this type.

The Committee on Ways and Means is informed that the subject instruments were imported prior to February 1, 1967, and, therefore, Public Law 89-651, the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966, which became effective on that date, would not be applicable. The committee is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation

of this nature, and unanimously recommends its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1886, a bill to provide for the free entry of certain articles for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J. Although I urge favorable action on this measure, I will not make any statement at this time. When similar legislation was before the House last fall, I made a statement which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 21, page 28562, and this statement is equally applicable to H.R. 1886.

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

#### DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF RHEOGONIOMETER FOR TUFTS UNIVERSITY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 2470) to provide for the free entry of one rheogoniometer for the use of Tufts University, Boston, Mass., which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2470

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one rheogoniometer (including all accompanying equipment, parts, accessories, and appurtenances) for the use of Tufts University, Boston, Massachusetts.

SEC. 2. If the liquidation of the entry of any article described in the first section of this Act has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 2470 is to permit the free entry of one rheogoniometer—including all accompanying equipment, parts, accessories, and appurtenances—for the use of Tufts University of Boston, Mass. The bill further provides that if liquidation of the entry has become final, the entry is to be reliquidated and appropriate refund of duty made.

The bill, which was introduced by the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, is identical to H.R. 12197 of the 89th Congress, which was passed by the House on October 21, 1966.

Rheogoniometers are high-precision devices originally developed by a research engineering concern in England. The Committee on Ways and Means has been advised that this instrument is not commercially produced in the United States. In this connection, the Department of Commerce has informed the committee that Tufts University tried without success to purchase the instrument from domestic suppliers.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I would observe that the subject instrument was imported prior to February 1, 1967, and,

therefore, Public Law 89-651, the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966, which became effective on that date, would not be applicable.

In the circumstances, the Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature, and unanimously recommends its enactment.

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

#### DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF SHIP MODEL FOR LUTHERAN CHURCH OF THE COVENANT, MAPLE HEIGHTS, OHIO

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 3029) to provide for the free entry of one ship model for the use of the Lutheran Church of the Covenant, Maple Heights, Ohio, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

The clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3029

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one ship model imported for the use of the Lutheran Church of the Covenant, Maple Heights, Ohio, which was entered on November 30, 1965, pursuant to Consumption Entry 5096.

(b) If the liquidation of the entry of the article described in subsection (a) of this section has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriated refund of duty shall be made.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 3029 is to provide for the free entry of one ship model for the use of the Lutheran Church of the Covenant, Maple Heights, Ohio. The bill further provides that if the liquidation of the entry of the article has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and appropriate refund of duty made.

The bill, which was introduced by the Honorable WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, of Ohio, is identical to H.R. 12110 of the 89th Congress, which passed the House on October 21, 1966.

The Committee on Ways and Means has been advised that the ship model, which was made in Denmark, is a replica, approximately 53 by 40 inches in size, of the German ship *Oibers* which in 1839 brought from Europe a group of immigrants who established the Missouri Synod of the Lutheran Church. The model is to be hung in the nave of the church and is intended to serve as a memorial to these founders. The Committee on Ways and Means was further advised that the model was given to the church by its pastor and that the pastor had attempted without success to have a model of this particular ship made in the United States.

In the circumstances, the Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature, and unanimously recommends its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3029, a bill to provide for the free entry of one ship model for the use of the Lutheran Church of the Covenant, Maple Heights, Ohio. Although I urge favorable action on this measure, I will not make any statement at this time. When similar legislation was before the House last fall, I made a statement which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 21, page 28560, and this statement is equally applicable to H.R. 3029.

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

#### DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF CARILLON FOR UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 3737), to provide for the free entry of a carillon for the use of the University of California at Riverside, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3737

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty a carillon imported May 16, 1966 (entry number 66-271902), for the use of the University of California at Riverside, California.

SEC. 2. If the liquidation of the entry of the article described in the first section of this Act has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 3737 is to provide for the free entry of a carillon imported for the use of the University of California at Riverside, Calif. The bill further provides for the reliquidation of the entry and appropriate refund of duty in the event liquidation of the entry has become final.

The bill, which was introduced by the Honorable JOHN V. TUNNEY, of California, is identical to H.R. 15888 of the 89th Congress, as passed by the House on October 21, 1966.

The Committee on Ways and Means is advised that the carillon, which was purchased from Les Fils de Georges Paccard in France, will serve as the esthetic focal point of the University of California at Riverside campus, and will also be used for educational purposes by the music department of the university. In the absence of legislation, the carillon would be classifiable under the provisions of item 725.38 of the tariff schedules of the

United States and dutiable at the rate of 6.5 percent ad valorem.

In its report on H.R. 3737, the Tariff Commission advised the Committee on Ways and Means that "carillon bells are not produced in the United States."

In the circumstances, the committee is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature, and unanimously recommends its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3737, a bill to provide for the free entry of a carillon for the use of the University of California at Riverside. Although I urge favorable action on this measure, I will not make any statement at this time. When similar legislation was before the House last fall, I made a statement which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 21, page 28564, and this statement is equally applicable to H.R. 3737.

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

**DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF MASS SPECTROMETER FOR INDIANA UNIVERSITY**

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 4934), to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Indiana University, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4934

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one mass spectrometer for the use of Indiana University.

Sec. 2. If the liquidation of the entry of any article described in this Act has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 4934 is to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Indiana University. This bill, which was introduced by the Honorable WILLIAM BRAY, of Indiana, would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty a mass spectrometer for Indiana University. The bill also provides that, if liquidation of the entry has become final, the entry is to be reliquidated and appropriate refund of duty made.

H.R. 4934 is identical to H.R. 11753 of the 89th Congress, which was passed by the House on October 21, 1966.

A mass spectrometer is a scientific device used to provide chemical analyses, measurements, and other research features. The mass spectrometer purchased by Indiana University is made in England by Associated Electronic Indus-

tries. The Committee on Ways and Means has been advised that the British instrument can perform a number of research functions that cannot be duplicated by domestically produced mass spectrometers of this type. In this connection, the Department of Commerce advised the committee that no domestically produced instrument of equivalent scientific value to such instrument was available.

I would also observe, Mr. Speaker, that the committee is informed that the subject instrument was imported prior to February 1, 1967, and, therefore, Public Law 89-651, the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966, which became effective on that date, would not be applicable.

In the circumstances, the Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature, and unanimously recommends its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4934, a bill to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Indiana University. Although I urge favorable action on this measure, I will not make any statement at this time. When similar legislation was before the House last fall, I made a statement which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 21, page 28559, and this statement is equally applicable to H.R. 4934.

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

**DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF TRIAXIAL APPARATUS AND RHEOGONIOMETER FOR NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY**

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 4977), to provide for the free entry of a triaxial apparatus and rheogoniometer for the use of Northwestern University, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4977

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty a Norwegian triaxial apparatus and a Weissenberg rheogoniometer (including all accompanying equipment, parts, accessories, and appurtenances), imported for the use of Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, which were entered during July and September 1965 pursuant to consumption entries numbered 1816 and 53568, respectively.

Sec. 2. If the liquidation of the entry of any article described in the first section of this Act has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 4977 is to provide for the free

entry of a triaxial apparatus and rheogoniometer for the use of Northwestern University of Evanston, Ill.

H.R. 4977, which was introduced by the Honorable DONALD RUMSFELD, of Illinois, would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty a Norwegian triaxial apparatus and a Weissenberg rheogoniometer—including all accompanying equipment, parts, accessories, and appurtenances—imported for the use of Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. The bill further provides that if liquidation of the entry of any of the articles concerned has become final, the entry is to be reliquidated and appropriate refund of duty made.

The bill is identical to H.R. 13035 of the 89th Congress, which was passed by the House on October 21, 1966.

The rheogoniometer purchased by Northwestern University is manufactured by Farol Research Engineers, Ltd., of England. The Department of Commerce advised the Committee on Ways and Means that it "knows of no other commercial instrument, manufactured in the United States or elsewhere, that is capable of meeting the university's requirements for which the British instrument was purchased."

The triaxial apparatus purchased by the university is a Norwegian instrument used for soil testing. The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that there is no known soil-testing apparatus produced in the United States which has the required characteristics.

I would also like to observe, Mr. Speaker, that the subject instruments were imported prior to February 1, 1967, and, therefore, Public Law 89-651, the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966, which became effective on that date, would not be applicable.

In the circumstances, the Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior legislation of this nature, and unanimously recommends its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4977, a bill to provide for the free entry of a triaxial apparatus and rheogoniometer for the use of Northwestern University. Although I urge favorable action on this measure, I will not make any statement at this time. When similar legislation was before the House last fall, I made a statement which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 21, page 28561, and this statement is equally applicable to H.R. 4977.

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

**DUTY-FREE TREATMENT OF LIMESTONE FOR CEMENT**

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1141) to permit duty-free treatment of limestone, when imported to be used in the manu-

facture of cement, pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should merely like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and others interested if we could not by unanimous consent—and, before I state the proposition, I shall say that it is very simple and has been cleared with all concerned—in line 7, after the word "cement," add "chemical and industrial lime."

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that in the great western areas where cement is made, they do have to import limestone, with which we are blessed in the Ozark hills at home, and, of course, we have many plants, including the Ashgrove Lime & Portland Cement Co. They, like the Ideal Cement Co., which I believe introduced the intent of this bill, import limestone from Texada Island in the Bay of British Columbia. In addition to that, so does the Portland, Oreg., plant of the Ashgrove Lime & Portland Cement Co.

This would be, as near as I have been able to check it out—and I did not know that this bill was coming up until late last night—a great favor to the industry. There would be no objection to it, and it would simply require the insertion after the word "cement" the words "chemical and industrial lime."

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

Mr. HALL. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. MILLS. It is my recollection—and I shall try to elicit the attention of my good friend from Wisconsin on this point; if I am incorrect, he can correct me—it is my recollection that initially, when we had this matter of the importation of limestone free of duty before the Committee on Ways and Means back in the days when our former colleague from Michigan, Mr. Knox, was on the committee, that the legislation was then introduced to carry out the purpose suggested by our friend from Missouri. However, at that time there was objection to the inclusion of the language "chemical and industrial lime." In those days the objections came from interests along the Canadian border, as I remember.

It may have been that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] initially introduced his bill providing for a broader importation so far as use is concerned than that contained in the legislation. It seems to me that I am correct at least with respect to the first part of it. I may be correct with respect to the way he initially introduced his bill. But there was objection registered with the committee, and I am satisfied that, if we accepted such an amendment to the bill now, it would run into that same objection, and Mr. Pelly's purpose would be, quite frankly, impeded.

I therefore suggest to my friend from Missouri that he follow the procedure of introducing a separate bill which would carry out the purpose that he has in mind, and let us analyze it in the light of present-day circumstances to see if there continues to be the objection that I think existed in the past to such a proposal. If not, we could pass it by unanimous consent.

Mr. HALL. I would be the first to agree that this is not the way to write legislation on the floor by unanimous consent. I will follow the advice because, furthermore, I have not had a chance to clear this or coordinate it with the author of the bill, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly].

With that explanation I would be glad to withdraw my reservation.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 1141 is to authorize the President to eliminate the duty on certain limestone, when imported to be used in the manufacture of cement, pursuant to his trade-agreement authority.

This bill is similar to H.R. 5950 of the 89th Congress as passed by the House on October 21, 1966. However, H.R. 1141 is more narrow in application since it applies only to limestone chips and spalls, and crushed and ground limestone, imported under item 513.34 of the tariff schedules of the United States. It does not apply to crude limestone imported under item 514.11 of the tariff schedules, as was provided in H.R. 5950.

Mr. Speaker, the limestone covered by this bill is a commodity of relatively low unit value and the cost of transportation restricts its movement to short distances. At the present time, imports of this type of limestone are localized along the Canadian border, principally in the region of the Great Lakes and the State of Washington, and do not move in significant quantities any great distance inland.

Presently, limestone imported to be used in the manufacture of cement or for any other purpose, with certain exceptions, is dutiable under tariff schedules of the United States, item 513.34 or 514.11, depending on the form in which it is imported. The pending bill, which was introduced by the Honorable THOMAS M. PELLY, of Washington, would make section 201(b)(1)—relating to limit on decrease in duty—and section 253—relating to staging requirements—of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 inapplicable with respect to limestone, when imported to be used in the manufacture of cement, provided for in item 513.34 of the tariff schedules of the United States. This, in essence, would authorize the elimination of the duty—or reduction to a rate under 50 percent of the July 1, 1962, rate—without staging. However, no such agreement could be made before the requirements of chapter 3—relating to requirements concerning negotiations—title II of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 have been met.

The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending enactment of H.R. 1141.

Before concluding, permit me to correct a printing error which appears in the purpose section of the committee re-

port on this bill. The item number 513.34 was incorrectly printed as "513.14."

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

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

H.R. 1141

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for purposes of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, sections 201(b)(1) (relating to limit on decrease in duty) and 253 (relating to staging requirements) of such Act shall not apply with respect to limestone, when imported to be used in the manufacture of cement, provided for in item 513.34 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States.*

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1141, a bill to permit duty-free treatment of limestone, when imported to be used in the manufacture of cement, pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Although I urge favorable action on this measure, I will not make any statement at this time. When similar legislation was before the House last fall, I made a statement which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 21, page 28569, and this statement is equally applicable to H.R. 1141.

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

#### THE RISE IN THE COST OF LIVING AS RELATED TO THE TREATMENT OF VETERANS IN STATE VETERANS HOMES

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned over the rise in the cost of living, the rise of prices generally, and its effect on the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes, and I have today introduced a bill increasing the per diem allowance rate to States for the care of veterans.

In 1960, I introduced legislation to change the method of payment of Federal aid to State homes for the support of veterans and set the per diem rate at \$2.50 for each veteran. In 1964, Public Law 88-450 was enacted setting the per diem rate for hospitalization or domiciliary care in a State home at \$2.50 and the per diem rate for nursing home care at \$3.50. These rates are clearly inadequate today. My bill would increase the per diem rate for domiciliary care to \$3.50, for nursing home care to \$5, and for hospital care to \$10. The bill would also extend the \$5 million annual authorization for an additional 5 years through fiscal year 1974.

With more and more veterans seeking admission to veterans' homes and with the increased costs of services and facilities, the need for such legislation as I propose is evident. I urge prompt consideration and speedy approval of my bill.

I also include in support of this legislation a letter from Col. Robert J. Beckwith, commandant of the Veterans' Home and Hospital of the State of Connecticut, at Rocky Hill, Conn.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,  
VETERANS HOME AND HOSPITAL,  
Rocky Hill, Conn., February 8, 1967.

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: The National Association of State Veterans Homes with a 29 state membership throughout the nation, including the Connecticut Home at Rocky Hill, effects a continuing study of Federal Legislation affecting veterans' facilities operated at state levels.

One of the more important areas of study relates to Veterans Administration reimbursement under Federal Law to the States to cover a part of their costs for operating facilities for the exclusive benefit of veterans. As you know we operate the Veterans Home and Hospital at Rocky Hill (capacity of 1215 beds) which provides hospital and domiciliary care. Our Veterans Administration reimbursement is limited to 50% of operating costs not to exceed \$2.50 per patient (member) day. Many years ago this amount was sufficient, however, it is no longer the case. Costs have risen considerably up to and over \$6.00 per patient day and are still rising. Instead of a 50% factor toward reimbursement, we find that the ratio is 42% Federal and 58% State.

There is also the possibility that we may enlarge to a Nursing Home status to handle patients which the Veterans Administration is now assigning to convalescent homes. The Veterans Administration reimburses such operations at a 50% operating cost not to exceed \$3.50 per patient day. This is far below our contemplated operating cost.

(It is therefore obvious that the Federal Law is behind in recognizing that the cost of veterans' care has moved up sharply from the time of original legislation.) What with more Korean and Vietnam veterans seeking admission, some relief should be afforded the States to more equitably distribute costs. To do so will require certain amendments to Title 38—United States Code.

I would appreciate your looking at this proposed legislation, possibly if you concur with our thoughts, you could introduce similar legislation along the lines of this request. We would appreciate your support of any necessary legislation regarding this issue.

My best personal regards and good wishes.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. BECKWITH,  
Colonel,  
Commandant.

#### MARYLAND'S ROLE AS A MARITIME STATE

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 333d anniversary of the founding of Maryland, on March 25, 1634. In celebrating Maryland Day, we are paying tribute to the men and women of the Free State who, over more than three centuries, have built a remarkable record of achievement in every field of endeavor

and in every sphere of local, State, and National activity.

Today I would like to emphasize Maryland's role as a great maritime State and a consistent national leader on the seas, in commerce, and in American naval history. A fitting symbol of this leadership is the U.S. frigate *Constellation*, the first warship of the Navy to reach the seas, and now the oldest ship in the world which has been continuously afloat.

Maryland-built, Maryland-manned, and now Maryland-berthed, the *Constellation* has played a prominent role in every chapter of our naval history since her launching on September 7, 1797. In time of war, on diplomatic missions, and in humanitarian service, her work has exemplified the best in our Navy and in our entire maritime tradition. It is our task now to be true to that tradition, by restoring the *Constellation* to full grandeur and guaranteeing that she will endure as a symbol of the early and continuing strength of Maryland and the Nation on the seas.

One of the first three American ships of war to be constructed, the *Constellation* in 1799 scored the first important American naval victory when, under Capt. Thomas Truxton, she captured the French frigate *L'Insurgente* in the Caribbean. A year later, she scored a second triumph by defeating the French man-of-war *La Vengeance* in the West Indies. After seeing action against the Barbary pirates and during the War of 1812, she was stationed off South America, in the Mediterranean, and again in the West Indies until the 1840's, when she became the flagship of Commodore Lawrence Kearny and began a long voyage around the world. In 1842 she became the first American ship of war to enter the inland waters of China.

After active service in the Mediterranean and on the gulf coast during the Civil War, the *Constellation* became a training ship at the Naval Academy in 1871. During the latter part of the 19th century, her most renowned achievement was transporting food to Ireland during the famine of 1880. After 1894, the ship was berthed at Newport, R.I., and remained there, except for a few brief cruises, until 1945.

In 1940, in a dramatic invocation of naval history, President Roosevelt ordered the *Constellation* recommissioned at Newport as the flagship of the U.S. Atlantic Fleet and a symbol of American naval strength.

Since World War II, however, the *Constellation* has been preserved primarily by private energies. In 1953 title to the ship was transferred from the Navy to the Star-Spangled Banner Flag House Association of Baltimore, and in 1955 she was returned to Baltimore where she is now berthed at Pier 4, Pratt Street. Since 1955, the *Constellation* Restoration Committee has maintained the ship, conducted tours, and raised funds for her complete restoration. In 1964 she was declared a National Historic Landmark.

A bill which I have introduced—H.R. 854—with Congressman EDWARD GARMATZ would establish a permanent berth for the *Constellation* next to Fort Mc-

Henry, and would guarantee Federal support to supplement the efforts of the dedicated citizens who have preserved her and begun the great task of restoration of this historic ship.

#### THE CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a new bill—H.R. 7201—to develop the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal at once as a pilot project for the entire Potomac River Basin.

This bill would provide the authority and funds for necessary, modest expansion of the canal, to make possible the restoration of its historic features, the development of its vast recreational potential, and the active conservation of its scenic assets. Equally important, the bill would establish overall policies of cooperation, creativity and care to guide and direct this development along the paths which best promote both the general public interest in the historic canal, and the particular interests of the people, groups and governments directly involved.

For over 2 years, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, a Federal interagency task force has been shaping proposals to implement the President's pledge to make the Potomac a model of scenic beauty and recreational opportunities. The details of these comprehensive plans have not yet been released for public scrutiny. It is apparent, however, that we have not yet achieved areawide agreement on many major points, including the extent, management and means of development of any large park along both banks of the Potomac. Because these questions are not resolved, it is likely that congressional approval of any such proposals will be slow. It is also likely that Federal funding will be slower, since only very limited amounts of money are available for any park projects at the present time.

Yet such delays could be extremely damaging. Throughout the Potomac Basin there is great interest in sensible conservation, and a tremendous amount of energy and experience waiting to be put to work. The longer that proposals drift, unimplemented and often undefined, the more this good will is going to be eroded by disappointment, skepticism, and suspicion. The longer that action is postponed, the more difficult action will become.

I am convinced that the Federal Government should start exerting strong, responsible leadership now in the Potomac Basin. Further, I am convinced that the place to start is on the property which the Federal Government already owns: the C. & O. Canal. Part

of the canal has already been designated a national monument, but for too many years it has been a monument to Federal neglect. It is past time to take down the barriers and the "No Trespassing" signs, and to start opening up, cleaning up, restoring and developing the canal for public enjoyment. It is past time to restore the confidence of all the people of the basin, by demonstrating that a national park can be a great community asset, and not just an exclusive preserve for other people from somewhere else.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I have introduced today is not a final answer, but it is a beginning. It provides the framework for a program of the size we can afford, and of the scope which we are ready for. It emphasizes constructive cooperation among all the individuals, clubs, organizations, and public agencies committed to conservation and development of the canal. It sets forth clear policies to meet the difficult problems, including access rights and determination of land titles and boundaries, which have proved so troublesome in the past. Finally, it rechristens the entire canal as the "Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park," to symbolize the change from passive maintenance to active management.

A program to improve, and open up the C. & O. Canal is extremely valuable in its own right. As a model program for the model river, its importance is potentially immense. I believe that this legislation advances the objectives and promotes the interests of the canal's neighbors and the Potomac's friends. I hope that they will join me in seeking prompt congressional consideration of H.R. 7201.

I would like to include at this point the following section-by-section description of H.R. 7201:

#### A SECTION-BY-SECTION DESCRIPTION OF H.R. 7201

##### TITLE AND DEFINITIONS

Section 1 of H.R. 7201 entitles the bill the "Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act."

Section 2 sets forth the definitions used throughout the bill. For example, "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior, who is legally assigned all of the responsibilities which in fact are carried out by his subordinates, including the Director of the National Park Service and the Superintendent of the C & O Canal.

Two definitions deserve special notice:

1) "Person" is defined to include not only individuals, partnerships and corporations, but also non-profit organizations and clubs. This provision recognizes the very active and constructive role taken in the Potomac Basin by conservation groups, civic organizations, historical societies, sportsmen's clubs, scouting groups and others, and provides for their full participation as partners in the Canal's development.

2) The bill recognizes and seeks to reduce the very complex and persistent problems which often delay negotiations and agreements in the many cases where public or private titles to lands, or the boundaries of particular properties, are vague or conflicting. Thus for purposes of the title searches and surveys in section 4 of the bill, and the cooperative agreements in section 5, subsection 2(g) defines "landowner" as "any person, local government, or State owning, or on reasonable grounds professing to own, lands or

interests in lands adjacent to or in the vicinity of the Park."

##### ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PARK

Section 3 establishes the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park for the dual purposes of (a) preserving, restoring and interpreting the historic and scenic features of the Canal, and (b) developing its recreational potential.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park as so established would embrace the entire length of the Canal, from its lower end at Rock Creek in the District of Columbia to its upper end in Cumberland, Maryland. The Park would also include the Canal appurtenances, such as dam abutments, located across the Potomac at certain points in West Virginia.

In addition to the Canal property now in Federal ownership, subsection 3(b) authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire additional lands of interests in lands for restoration of historic and engineering features of the Canal, protection of scenic values, and development of public recreational facilities. The means of acquisition authorized are expressly limited to donation, purchase, easement, lease for up to fifty years, or exchange. Acquisition by condemnation is not authorized. The acreage to be acquired by purchase is limited to 1000 acres, while no limit is placed on acreage which may be donated, leased or exchanged.

##### TITLES AND BOUNDARIES

Section 4 of H.R. 7201 is intended to resolve most of the title and boundary problems which now exist along the Canal, without placing undue burdens on individual landowners.

Subsection 4(a) thus directs the Secretary of the Interior to begin as soon as practical a comprehensive title search and field survey to determine the boundaries of the Federal lands comprising the Canal property. After this work has been completed, the Secretary shall print the results of the survey, with detailed maps, and distribute them free of charge to all area landowners and interested state and local governments for their comments and questions. Interested parties shall have at least 120 days to question and discuss any part of the survey before it is filed with the General Services Administration, the agency which maintains official records of all Federal real property.

The bill expressly states that this survey is not intended to prohibit later negotiations about specific boundary conflicts, but rather is designed simply to define, much more accurately and completely than ever before, the precise boundaries of these Federal lands.

Subsection 4(b) relieves individuals, non-profit organizations and clubs of the expenses too often required to establish clear land titles and boundaries in the Potomac Valley. This provision requires that the Secretary of the Interior shall pay all reasonable costs of title searches or surveys required to establish ownership or boundaries of lands which individuals, organizations or clubs own or profess to own. The provision would apply when searches or surveys are required (a) before a land purchase or other agreement can be completed, or (b) to resolve conflicts raised by the comprehensive survey of Federal lands described above.

##### COOPERATIVE ACTION

Section 5, one of the most important sections in the bill, provides for a wide range of cooperative efforts involving all public and private interests to promote historic restoration and interpretation, public recreation, conservation, preservation of scenic values, and the other purposes of H.R. 7201.

Subsection 5(a) sets the foundations for a new, flexible and creative partnership between the Federal government and the owners of lands adjacent to the Canal. Under this subsection, the Secretary is authorized

to reach contracts and agreements with these landowners for a wide range of projects to assist these landowners, extend the benefits of the Canal and enhance its value. For example, through this program the National Park Service could contract share recreational facilities with a neighboring county or city park. Under another individual agreement, a landowner could agree to permit public use of a trail across his land, in return for Interior Department clearing and maintenance of the trail. Under a third kind of agreement, the Interior Department could give technical assistance and personnel services to a landowner who agrees to maintain an attractive woodland for a specified number of years.

Subsection 5(b) provides in general terms for cooperation among the Interior Department, other Federal agencies, state and local governments, and all interested private parties in programs which could include soil conservation, wildlife propagation, historic restoration, and recreation.

One crucial element in cooperation among public agencies is Federal recognition of local and state initiatives in land use and recreational planning. Section 5(c) of H.R. 7201 provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall take such state and local plans into account wherever they affect lands near the Canal, and as much as possible shall develop the Park in ways which harmonize with state and local efforts.

##### ACCESS

Access problems have been perhaps the greatest single source of difficulty on the Canal in the past. H.R. 7201 would minimize these problems in the future by providing, for the first time, a statement of general principles applying not to Federal properties in general, but specifically to the Canal property.

Section 6 thus sets forth the basic considerations determining access rights, and also describes two specific types of situations in which individual crossings of Canal property are guaranteed. Subsection 6(a) declares that the enactment of H.R. 7201 would not affect adversely any valid existing rights or permits relating to Canal lands, insuring that previously negotiated agreements would be continued. In addition, subsection 6(b) allows the Interior Department to approve under permit additional uses of Park lands, and crossings for highways, railways, water and sewer lines, and other utilities in addition to those presently approved.

To supplement those general provisions, two types of crossings are specifically assured:

(a) Where privately-owned lands lie between the Canal and the Potomac River, the owners of those lands shall have access across the Canal for agricultural purposes, subject only to any restrictions found absolutely essential to preserve the Park. This provision, in subsection 6(c), is not intended to suggest that access to such lands for any other purposes shall be limited, but rather simply states that access for this particular purpose shall be insured.

(b) Under subsection 6(d), sportsmen are granted authority to cross the Park at any point by foot and by the most direct route to gain access to the Potomac River or to non-Federal lands for hunting, provided only that while these individuals are on Park lands their firearms are unloaded, bows are unstrung, and dogs are on leash.

##### FEES

Section 7 declares that no fees shall be charged for public day use of the Park for recreational purposes, insuring that it will remain available to all the people for their enjoyment without cost.

##### ADVISORY COMMISSION

Section 8 establishes the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission, an advisory commission which would

give representatives of area residents a formal voice in the management of the Park and the establishment of Park policies.

The Commission would be composed of 19 members, appointed for five-year terms. Eight members would represent the four Maryland counties (Montgomery, Frederick, Washington and Allegany) through which the Canal runs, with two members being appointed by the county council or board of commissioners of each of these four counties. Eight other members would represent the States of Maryland, Virginia and West Virginia and the District of Columbia, with two members being appointed by the Governor of each of these three states and an additional two members being appointed by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Three members, including the Chairman of the Commission, would be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, and at least two of these three would represent regularly constituted conservation organizations.

Members of the Commission would serve without compensation, but would be reimbursed for reasonable expenditures.

The Secretary of the Interior is required to meet and consult with the Commission at least once a year on general and specific Park policies. He is specifically required to consult the Commission before establishing any general rules or regulations concerning access rights.

FUNDS

Section 9 of H.R. 7201 provides that any funds available for administration of the Canal property shall be used for the purposes of the Park. In addition, the appropriation of \$3 million is authorized during the first three fiscal years to carry out the specific purposes of this Act, plus such sums as may prove necessary in subsequent years.

POSTAL RATES FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill relating to postal rates on certain materials for blind persons and for persons unable to use or read regular printed matter because of a physical impairment.

In recent years, Mr. Speaker, I have become increasingly interested and actively concerned in furthering the cause of men and women with visual and other physical impairments.

It has been my privilege to sponsor legislation to establish a music scores library for the blind in the Library of Congress—and it has been very satisfying to me that my proposal, as Federal law, is enhancing the vocational, cultural, and recreational opportunities of blind persons interested in music.

Then, too, Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to introduce a measure to proclaim, annually, by Presidential proclamation, October 15 as White Cane Safety Day, in order that the presence of blind persons traveling alone upon the streets and highways of the Nation might be widely advertised and publicized—and it has been very satisfying for me to believe that blind people do travel with greater safety upon the Nation's streets and highways because the attention of

motor vehicle drivers is directed to the meaning of a person with a white cane, that such a person is a blind person, by the publicity given each year by the Presidential proclamation of October 15 as White Cane Safety Day.

Also, Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to sponsor legislation making it possible to increase the employment of able and qualified blind persons in the Federal civil service—and I am pleased to know that because of my bill, additional blind men and women are constructively and gainfully employed in the service of our Federal Government.

In the 89th Congress, Mr. Speaker, because I believed the Federal books for the blind law needed to be improved and strengthened, because I believed that persons not blind but still unable to use or read regular printed matter should be included in the Federal books for the blind law and program, I supported legislation for this purpose—and it is very satisfying to me that now, persons formerly denied the chance to read because of physical disabilities, are able to read, have reading matter also available to them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would alter and amend the postal laws for the benefit of blind persons, for the benefit of persons unable to use or read regular printed matter because of a physical impairment.

A detailed analysis of my bill, Mr. Speaker, with a full explanation of the issues raised by it and the arguments in support of its proposals follows:

MEMORANDUM RE BILL RELATING TO POSTAL RATES ON CERTAIN MATERIALS FOR BLIND AND OTHER HANDICAPPED PERSONS

Chapter 69 of title 39, U.S.C., would be amended by striking out sections 4653 and 4654 thereof and inserting in lieu thereof new sections 4653 and 4654, which would do the following:

1. Extend the free mailing privilege, presently available only to the blind, to other persons who cannot use or read conventionally printed material because of a physical impairment;
2. Materials covered by the free mailing privilege would be only those which are for the use of blind and handicapped persons, and made available to such persons without any charge at all, or, if there is a charge, when the charge made is not in excess of the cost of production;
3. The matter mailed postage free could be opened for inspection by the Postmaster General, and would have to conform in size and weight limitations prescribed by him;
4. The free mailing privilege would be extended to: Reading matter, musical scores, and sound reproductions; paper, records, tapes, and other materials for the production of reading matter, musical scores, and sound reproductions; sound reproducers or parts thereof; braille writers, typewriters, educational or other materials or devices, or parts thereof, used for writing by, or specifically designed or adapted for use of blind or physically handicapped persons;
5. The free mailing privilege would also be extended to unsealed letters sent by blind or physically handicapped persons, and written in braille, in sight-saving-size type, or recorded on tapes or discs;
6. To qualify for the free mailing privilege, mailed matter would have to bear the words "Free Matter for the Blind or Handicapped" (or similar words determined upon by the Postmaster General) in the upper right-hand corner.

A 1-cent-a-pound postage rate is presently

charged on braille, recorded, and large type reading matter sold to blind persons or to organizations for the use of blind persons, or available on a rental basis, or for magazines for which a subscription price is charged.

Under the bill, such reading matter, not only for the blind, but for physically handicapped persons unable, because of their impairment, to use or read regular printed matter, could be mailed free of postage so long as the price charged, whether sale price, rental, subscription or similar fee, is not greater than the cost of production.

Standard and large-type typewriters, and other aids and devices used by blind and physically handicapped persons to offset, reduce, or entirely eliminate the restrictions of their disabilities, presently go through the mail at the regular rates charged for packages of the same type.

Under the bill, the articles and devices above listed would be included in the free mailing privilege.

Agency control to prevent abuse of this free mailing privilege is provided in the bill by authorizing the Postmaster General to open such free-mail packages for inspection, and the Postmaster General is also authorized to specify the size and weight limitations for packages mailed without postage.

The bill also provides that unsealed letters, written in braille, large print, or recorded on discs or tapes, sent by a blind or physically handicapped person, could be mailed postage free.

Since taped letters have increasingly become a standard method of correspondence employed by blind persons, and a reel of tape is considerably more costly to mail than a typed or handwritten letter, this provision of the bill would be particularly beneficial to blind persons, by allowing them to mail such tapes without postage.

It would be beneficial to the partially sighted, too, who must cover more than the usual number of pages with their large handwriting, or large sight-saving-size print type-writing.

By providing that all matter coming under the free mailing privilege must be marked in a designated place and in accordance with a prescribed form, the bill provides a means of administrative control of the free mailing privilege.

TENNESSEE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SUPPORTS OUR TROOPS AND POLICY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee General Assembly, which is now in session, adopted on March 2, 1967, an outstanding resolution supporting our troops and policy in southeast Asia.

I would certainly like to bring this to the attention of the Congress. The resolution follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 15

Resolution in support of the President, the Congress and our troops and policy in Southeast Asia

Whereas, The foreign policy of the United States of America in the Far East has remained constant for many years and through several administrations, receiving bipartisan

support under several different presidents; and

Whereas, Our country is now engaged in a vicious war in support of this policy, striving, on one hand, to give the people of South Viet Nam the right to determine their own future, while at the same time attempting to keep the conflict confined to the smallest area possible; and

Whereas, The Congress has and is supporting, by a substantial majority, the policies enunciated by our President and his predecessors; and

Whereas, We believe the policy followed in Southeast Asia by the various presidents during the past two decades has been sound, designed to serve the best interests of our country and its people as well as the best interests of the people and countries of the whole world; and

Whereas, In support of this policy the United States of America has committed its young men, its honor, its materials, its will, and its wealth; and

Whereas, It is the belief of the members of this Assembly that a majority of the citizens of America back the foreign policy of our country in Southeast Asia and are prepared to make whatever sacrifice is necessary to support their sons in the field as they fight day by day to sustain this policy: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the house of representatives of the eighty-fifth general assembly (the senate concurring),* That by this Resolution we affirm our support of our country's policies in Southeast Asia and give our backing to the President and the Congress as they plan and carry out this policy; and be it further

*Resolved,* That we salute our servicemen in Southeast Asia for the wonderful job they are doing under adverse conditions, saying to them "we believe in you—we will not fail you at home while you risk your lives to preserve freedom and our way of life,"; and be it further

*Resolved,* That we condemn those among us who seek to divide, to avoid their duties as citizens under the law, to undermine those patriotic beliefs that have made this country great and have given our state its nickname "The Volunteer State," to hinder our troops' movements and to take other steps which are not included under the recognized and guaranteed right of protest; and be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this Resolution be sent by the Chief Engrossing Clerk of the House of Representatives to the President of the United States and to each member of the Congressional Delegation from the State of Tennessee.

Adopted: March 2, 1967.

JAMES H. CUMMINGS,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Speaker of the Senate.

Approved:

BUFORD ELLINGTON,  
Governor.

#### GUN LEGISLATION PACKAGE, 1967

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, we of the 90th Congress again are faced with the problem of providing an equitable answer to a perplexing question—how do we safeguard our citizenry from danger and death at the hands of the gun-wielding criminal while preserving the "right to bear arms" for a wide segment of our populace which pursues the

wholesome and peaceful use of guns and handles them responsibly?

Certainly it is a difficult question, one which in recent months has been somewhat blurred by emotional outcry.

Today, I am introducing legislation which I feel is a sane, deliberate answer to the gun-control problem. It seeks to deter the irresponsible and criminal elements from easily obtaining concealable weapons while preserving the sense of the guarantees provided by the second amendment to the Constitution.

Incidents have been spotlighted in recent months which draw attention to a new danger. Crimes are being committed with weapons such as antitank rifles, rocket launchers and mortars, equipment which in no sense of the word can be called "sporting."

I read recently of a young boy being discovered by police while blasting transformers from utility poles with a rocket-launcher, or as it is more commonly called, a bazooka.

A safe which was thought impenetrable in an upstate New York community was penetrated by burglars using a high-powered antitank gun. The weapon had been obtained with comparative ease at a store not far from this Capitol Building.

An attempt was made to sabotage the United Nations Building with a bazooka.

The traffic in these destructive devices, designed for use as weapons of war, cannot be allowed to continue. And I know that the gun hobbyists and gun collectors of this Nation would be the first to rally to support legislation to curb the easy access to them by irresponsible or criminal persons.

The mighty arsenal of weapons which this Nation has amassed to defend itself should not be made so easily available to the criminal element.

Therefore, I am introducing an amendment to the National Firearms Act of 1934 which would prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of such death-dealing weapons as bazookas, mortars, and antitank rifles. The bill has been written to prohibit interstate transport of any weapon over .78 caliber, thus preserving for gun collectors and hobbyists the right to buy and sell the famous weapons of our Nation's heritage—the flintlock and muzzle-loading pistols and rifles which were of a larger bore size than today's sophisticated, high-velocity weapons.

Another purpose of the legislation I introduce today is to deal with the traffic and use of less sophisticated but equally fatal weapons. In amending the Federal Firearms Act of 1938, my bill would seek to do the following things:

First. Prohibit the sale of firearms, through shipment in interstate commerce, to any person under indictment for, or convicted of, a felony crime.

Second. See to it that persons under 18 cannot obtain handguns. These provisions are included in my bill because my research has revealed that mail-order gun firms are a major source of handguns for juveniles, felons, narcotic addicts, and mental defectives.

Third. It would insure that the above provisions would be complied with by requiring the person who orders the firearm to provide the dealer or manufac-

turer with a statement of his age and criminal record. This provision cannot deter the sportsman, hunter, or collector from obtaining the firearms he desires, but it will certainly hold down the gun traffic with the criminal element.

Fourth. The bill would seek to keep local crime-control agencies abreast of the gun traffic in their communities by providing that local law enforcement officers be named in the above affidavit. The dealer, upon sending the ordered weapon, would furnish police with a description of the weapon.

Fifth. My legislation would provide higher license fees for interstate gun-dealers and pawnbrokers. Manufacturers and pawnbrokers would pay an annual \$50 fee, while gun dealers would pay \$10 for a yearly license.

I believe this is an equitable bill, effective in its approach to a problem which no longer can be ignored.

This bill is proof that we can keep dangerous weapons out of the hands of the irresponsible and criminal element, while safeguarding the pursuit of a laudable and wholesome sport and hobby.

As the most eloquent spokesman for the sportsman, the National Rifle Association must be praised for recognizing the clear need for legislation in this area, and cooperating with lawmakers seeking an equitable solution.

The NRA support the approach made by my bill to curbing the free traffic in destructive devices. It will keep the public safe from these death-dealing weapons while preserving the right of collectors to buy, sell and trade the large-bore weapons of our history.

I was pleased to have the support of the National Rifle Association for my bill controlling mail-order sales when I first introduced it in the first session of the 89th Congress.

At that time, the NRA called my bill a "sound and reasonable approach" to the matter of mail-order sales and called it "legislation which meets the legitimate needs of both governmental and private interests."

This is the purpose of the bill which I submit today. There is a clear and present need for this type of legislation. I sincerely hope that this is the Congress which passes it.

#### INTELLIGENCE BRIEFINGS ON VIETNAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, this morning the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, made available a briefing given by the Defense Department for the benefit of all the Members of the House and Senate.

I understand that 50 or 60 Members of the House attended the briefing this morning.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Carolina is to be highly com-

mended for making these intelligence briefings available to the Members of the House, but I submit that still more should be done. The intelligence briefing and photographs contained therein should be declassified and shown to the American public because they reveal, Mr. Speaker, very dramatically what the North Vietnamese did during the bombing lull in the first part of February. They give us good reason to believe that the Communist world wants a cessation of bombing in the future in order to build up further in South Vietnam. In view of the doubt apparently existing in the minds of some Americans whether our bombing should be continued and as to whether our bombing is effective I again call upon the Department of Defense to declassify the photographs used in the briefing. Our bombing must be continued in order to protect our American servicemen in South Vietnam, a cessation of bombing would undoubtedly cost the lives of additional large numbers of America's servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to insert in the body of the RECORD at this point a letter dated March 10, 1967, which I wrote to Mr. Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, requesting that the photographs be declassified and shown to the American public.

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

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

MARCH 10, 1967.

Hon. Robert S. McNamara,  
The Secretary of Defense,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Last Wednesday the House Committee on Armed Services received a DOD intelligence briefing on the North Vietnamese build-up of ammunition, material, supplies, and equipment during the three-day cessation of bombing the first part of February. The intelligence photographs shown in the briefing revealed that the North Vietnamese were loaded and waiting for the cessation to move thousands of tons of materials during the three-day period. No doubt, part of that ammunition has already found its way into the bodies of our men who are now or were fighting in Vietnam.

It is my understanding that Chairman Rivers has arranged that this briefing be shown to all Members of Congress next Tuesday. This, I think is very commendable, but I submit that still more should be done. Last Wednesday in a speech on the floor of the House I stated that the photographs should be declassified and shown to the American public. That such be done, I submit, is imperative in view of the serious doubt in the minds of many Americans that the bombing should be continued.

The purpose of this letter is to formally request that the photographs be declassified and shown to the American public.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. ICHORD,  
Member of Congress.

#### THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include an article.

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

There was no objection?

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday marked the 50th anniversary of the Russian revolution. This is not the Bolshevik revolution so well known to the world. It is, unfortunately, ignored both in Russia and in the free world. The revolution that occurred on that day was an attempt to establish democracy in Russia. This true revolution was short-lived. It was destroyed by the Communists after a few months. It is often thought that the Communists took power from the Czar. This is not true. They took power from democracy just as they try to do today.

An excellent article describing the events of 1917 in Russia by Eugene Lyons of the North American Newspaper Alliance was printed in the Washington Star of March 12, 1967. I compliment Mr. Lyons on this article, and submit it for printing in the RECORD at this point:

#### FREEDOM CAME TO RUSSIANS ON THIS DAY 50 YEARS AGO

(This year the Soviets are celebrating the 50th anniversary of their revolution. Lost in the ballyhoo is the fact that the Communists overthrew not a tsarist dictatorship but the only democracy Russia ever knew. The author of this article wrote "Assignment in Utopia" (an account of his six-year UPI assignment in Moscow, 1928-34), "The Red Decade" (a history of Communist penetration in the U.S.), "Our Secret Allies" (the anti-Communist forces in the Soviet Union) and is now at work on an appraisal of 50 years of Soviet communism.)

(By Eugene Lyons)

NEW YORK.—Fifty years ago, on Monday, March 12, 1917, the long-suffering Russian people made their first bid for political freedom. Because of the 13-day difference in the Orthodox Russian calendar, the date locally was February 27 and the upheaval is often referred to as the "February Revolution."

This was the authentic Russian revolution, climax of a century of struggle, education, preparation and heroism. It was the revolution that toppled the Romanoff autocracy, brought freedom, civil liberties and the prospect of ordered democracy.

Unhappily for the country and the world, it was fated to be extinguished less than eight months later by the Communists—then known as the Bolsheviks—who imposed a new and more odious autocracy, deeply committed to world revolution.

The collapse of the Russian monarchy was greeted jubilantly by free men everywhere. But few grasped the magnitude of the problems faced by the succession regime and the importance, for all mankind, of its survival.

#### RIOTS AND STRIKES

As so often happens in history, the revolution exploded in Russia when few inside or outside expected it. Driven by sheer hunger, the people in Petrograd early in March staged bread riots, demonstrations, followed by an epidemic of strikes.

Such disorders were not new in the capital and the tsar's government at first had little doubt it could suppress and contain the angry masses.

But this time there was a new, unexpected element in the equation. The soldiers, ordered to disperse the crowds, including the dread Cossack forces, showed little appetite for the job. Within a few days, more and more of them not only refused to shoot but began to fraternize with the people. Neither in Petrograd nor at the fronts—the Russo-German war was still under way—could troops be found to defend the government.

March 12th was the climactic day. That afternoon the Preobrazhensky and Volynsky regiments, pride of the monarchy, and other

military formations marched to the Duma (parliament) to declare their allegiance to a new government that did not yet formally exist.

They were greeted with joy by Alexander Kerensky and other democratic Duma leaders, who informed them that they had just formed a provisional committee to rule the country.

Events moved faster than the most sanguine enemies of the monarchy had dreamed. On Thursday, March 15, Nicholas II abdicated in favor of his brother, Grand Duke Michael, who in turn abdicated the following day. The ancient Romanoff dynasty was no more, leaving a nation in virtual collapse.

#### BOLSHEVIKS SURPRISED

As for the Bolsheviks, they were caught entirely by surprise. They did not play even a minor role in the popular revolution. Lenin, Zinoviev and other leaders learned of the rebellion from the newspapers in Switzerland, Trotsky and Bukharin from the newspapers in New York. Stalin was among the lesser Bolshevik figures in exile colonies in Russia.

Lenin and a group of disciples reached Petrograd on April 15, having been conveyed across Germany in a sealed train by the Kaiser's government—a calculated injection of poison into the Russian bloodstream for purely military reasons. They came well supplied with German funds. Trotsky joined them in May, others straggled in from foreign exile and remote corners of Russia.

#### MINORITY FACTION

They represented the smallest of the Russian radical movements. Launched at the turn of the century as a minority faction in the Social Democratic Party, it was barely known to the radical masses. In the Putilov factory in Petrograd, a hotbed of revolutionary sentiment, there were only 30 Bolsheviks in mid-1917.

But theirs was a movement that scoffed at numbers. In Lenin's concept, revolution was not a popular surge in the old tradition but a swift, deadly blow by a small, disciplined organization of "professional revolutionaries."

The second or Bolshevik revolution, on November 7—known in communist history as the "October Revolution" because of the difference in dates—was not a revolution at all in any normal sense. The Bolsheviks pulled off a coup d'etat, a putsch, and since it was directed against the new revolutionary regime, plainly a counter-revolution.

This is not semantic quibbling. It is a fact indispensable to keeping the historic events in focus. The successful grab for power by Lenin, Trotsky and their small following was a deed plotted in secrecy, a private cabal, with the masses so much raw stuff to be terrorized and processed.

The Bolsheviks did not overthrow the monarchy. They overthrew the first democratic society in Russian history. They did not liberate the people—the people liberated them. Lenin himself had called Russia, before he hijacked control of it, "the freest country in the world."

But to return to the first and true revolution. Kerensky, a great orator and passionate defender of democracy, before long emerged as premier. For nearly half a century he has been abused for failing to crush the bolshevik threat by arresting and executing its leaders.

But the reproach makes little logic. The mood of the time, with its emphasis on freedom, democracy and humanism, called for the kind of man Kerensky was. Had he been capable of blood-letting and high-handed illegality, he would not have risen to the top. Whatever the blame, it rests not on Kerensky but on the nature of the first revolution.

The power was increasingly divided between the government and the Soviets, which was a further source of weakness. The Leninists saw their opportunity in the dual

authority. They raised the slogan, "all power to the Soviets," at a time when they were still a minority in that institution. For them it offered a convenient "front," to be used as communists the world over would soon be using false-fronts to achieve their purposes.

Everybody promised land and peace. But the moderates under Kerensky promised it for tomorrow, when an elected parliament would lay down the rules. Lenin and his cohorts outbid them. They urged the peasants to take the land now, the workers to take over the factories at once, the soldiers to desert the fronts.

Most important, they gave no hint of the one-party dictatorship they had in view. On the contrary, they posed as champions of the fullest democracy. Lenin fumed at enemies who charged that he planned to abolish private property and impose Communism. A more complete record of deceit can hardly be found in the annals of demagoguery.

In his first weeks after the putsch, Lenin did not feel himself strong enough to renege on his earlier support of a Constituent Assembly—a democratic parliament to draw up a democratic constitution. What if the voting went against the Communists? They piously had pledged to abide by the popular will.

The balloting took place between November 25 and December 9, 1917. Although in most of the larger cities the elections were conducted under bolshevik auspices, the Communists drew only about 25 percent of the 36 million votes cast—less than half as many as the only other organized party, Kerensky's social revolutionaries.

But Lenin and Trotsky had no intention of permitting the freely chosen constituent assembly to live. When the elected deputies met on January 18, 1918, Lenin's police and soldiers disrupted the proceedings, then sealed the doors of the Tauride Palace where the meeting was held. The first session was the last. The hope born on March 12 was dead.

The titanic resistance that had been touched off by the communist *corp d'etat* was raised to fever pitch by the murder of the constituent assembly. A civil war, one of the bloodiest in all history, was under way. Virtually all the clashing guerrilla formations and armies were anti-communist. But they were so divided by mutual hatreds that the bolshevik forces—whipped into a Red Army by the genius of Leon Trotsky—would triumph in the end.

The free Russia that might have been was no more. A force fiercely dedicated to the demolition of the world of freedom now had the resources of a great country at its disposal.

#### THE 28TH ANNIVERSARY OF SLOVAK INDEPENDENCE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 28th anniversary of Slovak Independence Day.

Unfortunately, high-ranking officials in the Roosevelt administration, especially in the pre-World War II period and during the diplomatic negotiations with the Soviets in the latter days of the war, failed to understand the aspirations of the Slovak people for independence.

This tragic policy, based on misunderstanding the Communistic Soviet Russian diplomatic moves, is still plaguing us as we find the Johnson administration committing our troops to a no-win war in Vietnam while embracing the Communist government of Czechoslovakia.

As a result of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations' diplomatic blunders the brave Slovak people, along with other nations behind the Iron Curtain, are now suffering under the dread oppression of communism. I certainly hope and pray that the Slovak people's courageous spirit and love of freedom will be maintained until the day when they regain their national independence. Surely they will be freed from Communist persecution and achieve their rightful place in the community of free nations.

#### NEW BEDFORD STANDARD-TIMES WRITER WINS SAFETY AWARD

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, as long as human beings drive machines that injure, maim, and kill other human beings, the public must be reminded repeatedly of their destructive potential.

Recently the American Trucking Association held a competition for newspaper safety writing. Top winner was Everett S. Allen, of the New Bedford Standard-Times. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit an article from the Standard-Times of March 6, 1967:

#### STANDARD-TIMES WRITER WINS TOP SAFETY AWARD

WASHINGTON.—Everett S. Allen, assistant to the editor of The Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., is the winner of the first-place award of \$1,000 in the editorial-page category of the 12th annual newspaper safety writing competition sponsored by the American Trucking Association. It was announced here today.

Mr. Allen, author of a Sunday Standard-Times column entitled *The Present Tense*, won the award for a single column that was published last March 27, headed, "Empty Seat in the Classroom." It was written in the aftermath of area auto accidents that took the lives of two teen-agers, and was based on interviews with their classmates.

Nearly 400 entries were submitted in the competition by newspapers across the nation. The ATA award ceremonies will be held April 6 in Washington.

First-place award winners in other categories included Thomas J. Wertenbaker, the Albuquerque News, Albuquerque, N.M., and Phyllis Cobbs and Harcourt Tynes Jr., the Patent Trader, Mt. Kisco, N.Y. Mr. Wertenbaker, a former resident of New Bedford, in 1948 was manager of Station WFMR, when it operated a separate program schedule, and later, assistant manager of Stations WNBH-WFMR.

Second-place winners were Dennis Hoover, the Dallas Morning News, Dallas, Tex.; and C. B. Daniel Jr., the Gainesville Sun, Gainesville, Fla.

Third-place awards went to Thomas F. Darcy, the Houston Post, Houston, Tex., now with the Philadelphia Bulletin, Philadelphia,

Pa.; Francis Poirier, the Jersey Journal, Jersey City, N.J., and V. L. Bubbett Jr., the Dothan Eagle, Dothan, Ala.

A newspaper, the Record, of Hackensack, N.J., won a special plaque for the most outstanding and effective over-all traffic safety campaign last year.

In part, Mr. Allen's winning column read:

"In the newspaper of the night before, they all had seen the Page 1 picture of the wrecked automobile, twisted junk slammed against a tree, and they knew precisely how long the police said the black skid marks were, the final signature he had made in the last seconds of life . . .

"They thought probably the last bad second was before he was hurt at all, when the rear end started to swing, and the rubber was squealing, when the heap leaned into a sickening roll, and he knew this time it wasn't going to come back up, and the big thick trees, dark and ugly, were almost in his face.

"They looked at the empty classroom seat once more, and walked slowly down the corridor."

#### FEDERAL TAX-SHARING BILL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is clear to me that the present Federal aid system can be correctly characterized as a vast administrative jungle fraught with confusion and wasteful spending. That is why I am today introducing a Federal revenue-sharing bill designed to return 5 percent of the Federal personal income taxes to the States without strings attached.

There is way too much redtape and overlap involved in the 200-plus grant-in-aid programs now administered in Washington. More often than not, the Federal-aid bureaucrats distort and give low priority to State and local needs, while using every means at their disposal to increase Federal control. Accordingly, my bill is aimed at restoring proper balance to the Federal-State relationship.

The Langen revenue-sharing bill would, first, return 5 percent of the Federal personal income taxes to the States primarily on a population basis; and, second, reduce or replace existing specialized Federal aid programs that are not functioning efficiently or effectively.

Let me emphasize that the tax-sharing concept in my bill is for the purpose of replacing unnecessary or wasteful Federal aid programs that are no longer worthy of continuance.

Just a quick glance at the multiple grant-in-aid programs tells us the extent to which the present system is in need of reform—over 170 Federal aid programs, administered by over 21 Federal departments and agencies, 150 Washington bureaus, and over 400 regional offices scattered across the country, plus more than 75 different planning assistance programs, many of which are also duplicative.

Is it any surprise that local communities are often required to deal with so

many Federal agencies that insist on receiving 20 to 30 copies of every long, detailed application? Certainly this country is capable of finding better ways of providing the needed assistance to solve compelling State and local problems.

Thus I express the hope that comprehensive congressional hearings can be held on my bill and other revenue-sharing proposals early this session, as there is growing public support for the "tax back" principle and the constructive impact it will have in the effort to build and preserve what is best for our Nation.

**NO SUCH THING AS FEDERAL MONEY**

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the text of an advertisement by the Warner & Swasey Co. which appeared in several national magazines this week.

The important point made in this ad is that there is no such thing as Federal money. Too long we have labored under the delusion that all good things come from Washington. Too many people have been led to believe that Federal aid is a gift from some great benefactor at the head of the Government. The Johnson administration has outdone all its Democrat predecessors of the past 33 years in selling the idea that L.B.J. is the personal donor of funds for all Federal programs.

The truth is the Federal Government has no money of its own. It can only return to the people what it first takes from them in the form of taxes. And it can return far less than it takes in because of the cost of bureaucratic redtape through which the peoples' money goes on its roundtrip to Washington and back to the States.

Is it not about time we stop this masquerade and allow the people to keep more of their own money at home where they can initiate local projects and pay for them with 100 percent of the tax dollars collected? The Warner & Swasey advertisement is food for thought. The copy follows:

**ROBBING ST. PETERSBURG TO PAY ST. PAUL**

Why should I expect you to pay my bills? Yet this is what "Federal" funds mean.

It may be all very well for Florida, for example, in its generosity to give St. Paul a new Auditorium or some shiny transit system. But don't call it Federal money because it isn't—there is no Federal money. It all comes from Florida and New York and California—and St. Paul which sends its taxes to Washington where 2 million Federal employees must take out their "handling charges", and send back what's left, cluttered and hamstrung with Federal restrictions.

If St. Paul (and every city and state) would meet its own needs by paying its own bills under its own management, those bills would be far lower, and the money would be better spent.

**FEDERAL HIGHWAY FUNDS FOR RIGHTS-OF-WAY**

Mr. RUPPE. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to reduce Federal highway construction costs and, at the same time, alleviate inconveniences now suffered by property owners whose land is to be taken for highway purposes.

This bill is similar to, although not identical to, bills I have introduced in both the 88th and 89th Congresses. It would authorize a program to assist States to acquire rights-of-way at the earliest possible time once proposed highway routes are finalized.

It would enable States to acquire property to be eventually needed for rights-of-way at comparatively low cost and at a time when the actual arrival of improved roads has not yet drastically inflated real estate values. It would give a break to property owners, a badly needed and long-overdue one.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to advance Federal-aid highway funds to any State for early right-of-way acquisition. The funds would be advanced free of interest charges and would not be charged against current Federal aid apportionments, but would be repaid by the State when actual construction on the right-of-way is authorized, or on September 30, 1972, whichever occurs first. The total amount outstanding at any one time would not be permitted to exceed \$300 million.

The November 23, 1966, cutback of the Federal-aid-highway program has many long-range serious detrimental effects that have been felt and will be felt in the future. The 1972 target date for the completion of the Interstate System will be set back and construction costs will inevitably be increased. The bill I have introduced today would reduce in a very real way the cost of future highway construction. Advance purchase of rights-of-way would not only result in the saving of money but relieve to a great degree the human suffering caused by lengthy delays between the announcement of a route and the actual purchase of rights-of-way.

The financial savings that could be realized by the enactment of this bill would be substantial. On May 2, 1963, when I first introduced similar legislation, I explained how this concept has been tried and proven successful:

The State of California, in 1953, established a \$30 million revolving . . . by using this fund for the advance acquisition of rights-of-way, the State had saved approximately \$250 million during the 8 years since creation of the fund.

The "1965 Interstate System Cost Estimate"—89th Congress, first session, House Document No. 42—states that as of January 1, 1964, the total expense for

the rights-of-way for the Interstate System alone would cost \$3,290,617,000 and since that date the cost has increased rather than decreased.

The November 1966 cutback of Federal highway funds was, according to administration witnesses at recent joint hearings by the Senate and House Public Works Committees, an attempt to slow the inflationary increase in highway construction costs. If this was the administration's primary intention for the cutback, the frozen funds could and should be used for the highway purposes they were collected for. The frozen funds could be used to buy rights-of-way at a more accelerated rate, thereby reducing the eventual cost to both the States and the highway trust fund without beginning actual construction.

In addition to decreasing highway construction costs my bill would be most valuable in attempting to minimize the hardship imposed upon those whose land will be taken for rights-of-way. Those persons who know that their homes or businesses lie within the route of a proposed road would not be subjected to the hardships imposed upon them under the present system. As the situation exists now, a man can neither get his money out of nor make improvements on his property once it becomes within a right-of-way. He is told his property will be taken, some day, but this does not happen and he does not receive his payment until it suits the Government's convenience. This matter of advance right-of-way is not only important to the Government, but it is deeply important to thousands of individual citizens in this country.

In the hearings before the joint House-Senate Public Works Committees, Secretary of Transportation Boyd firmly backed this proposal. In response to a question he stated:

I am hopeful that there will be legislation introduced for action in this session of the Congress to resolve this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to deal with this problem Secretary Boyd was discussing. A plan for prompt and just compensation for those who will lose their property for the construction of a new highway is one that deserves immediate and favorable action.

**SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL**

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there is an all too common tendency to accept the continued success of a particular program or effort as the natural course of events. In doing so we overlook the most important fact and that is the maintenance of this success is wholly dependent upon continued effort.

I think this is true in the case of the

school safety patrols, a program first instituted 51 years ago in one particular area and adopted nationally 45 years ago.

A mark of the great success of this program can be found in the statistics which reveal the traffic death rate of schoolchildren has been cut almost in half over the years while the death rate of other age groups has doubled.

Therefore, I feel it appropriate that we pay tribute, annual tribute, to the school safety patrols.

We can do this by designating the second week of May each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week."

It will serve the purpose of not only recognizing the continued and successful efforts of the more than 900,000 safety patrol members by renewing the resolve each motorist has to exercise extraordinary care in traveling through school areas.

I might add that as part of the tribute paid the boys and girls each year, the American Automobile Association coordinates a parade down Constitution Avenue. This year over 20,000 participants will go down the avenue on May 13.

I am happy that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts will be among those 22 States represented and that there will be a group of 200 patrol members from Concord.

The Concord group, with Sgt. James Hanley in charge, is sponsored by the Massachusetts Safety Officers' League.

I hope my colleagues will join with me in introducing similar resolutions, so that this continually successful program will continue to be successful and that the boys and girls who give so unselfishly of their time may receive their proper due.

The text of my resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 432

Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"

Whereas more than an estimated fifty-two thousand Americans died in traffic accidents on the Nation's highways during the year 1966 and the prevention of such accidents has become a problem of major concern; and

Whereas the school safety patrols, since their organization on a national scale in the early 1920's, have played an important role in the reduction of highway accidents involving school-age children; and

Whereas more than nine hundred thousand safety patrol members are now serving forty thousand schools in all fifty States, protecting nineteen million children; and

Whereas the school safety patrols are a cooperative program sponsored jointly by American Automobile Association motor clubs, local schools, and police; and

Whereas more than sixteen million Americans have served as safety patrol members during the more than forty years since the program was established; and

Whereas the traffic death rate of school-age children since 1922 has dropped nearly one-half while the death rate of all other age groups has doubled and the efforts of the school safety patrols have been a contributing factor in this reduction; and

Whereas the lifesaving efforts of the school safety patrols play an increasingly important role in the nationwide campaign to reduce traffic accidents and this program should receive public attention and citizen support; and

Whereas the second week of May of each year provides an opportunity for due recognition of the foregoing achievements, accomplishments, and needs: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the second week of May of each year is hereby designated as "National School Safety Patrol Week" and the President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon all people of the United States for the observance of such a week with appropriate proceedings and ceremonies.

#### LOWELL: TEXTILE CITY ON PAINFUL ROAD BACK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the problem of economic diversification in an industrial community found a unique laboratory in my home city of Lowell, Mass. Reliance on the textile industry as the chief source of economic well-being led to disaster in the years of the depression and the trend toward movement of textile plants elsewhere in the country. For those of us who remember the dread depression years when 45 percent of the work force in Lowell was unemployed, the recent strides toward diversification and development are most heartening. In the Sunday edition of the Boston Globe, Jeremiah V. Murphy reports on the economic progress now underway in the city. I have unanimous consent to include his article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### LOWELL: TEXTILE CITY ON PAINFUL ROAD BACK (By Jeremiah V. Murphy)

LOWELL.—High over the famous Boott Mills complex in this dreary mill city on the polluted Merrimack River stands a steeple, its white paint faded and peeling.

At the top of the steeple is a unique weathervane—it has been there since the 1870's—in the shape of a textile shuttle. It is symbolic of the city's long history as a textile center.

"A textile museum has its eye on that weathervane," explained John R. Dickson, president of Boott Mills. "They want it for an exhibit."

The museum may not have long to wait, for there remains only one major textile mill—Wannalancit Textile Co.—in this old industrial city some 25 miles northwest of Boston.

Textiles are going in Lowell, but the city is well on its way along a slow and painful road towards economic diversification.

Lowell reached its textile peak in 1924. Since then it has been downhill in this city of scores of red brick mills and tenement houses.

In 1935, for example, at the bottom of the Great Depression, 45 percent of the population was on relief.

When the Lowell textile industry gradually moved to the South, it left a legacy here of high level of unemployment despite national and state prosperity, and a need for more industry.

Lowell's population is 86,000, down some 26,000 from the 1912 high, although the surrounding towns, Billerica, Tewksbury, Chelmsford and Dracut, have shown substantial population growths.

John Griffin, supervising office manager of the State Division of Employment Security in Lowell, said the unemployment rate for the Lowell area was 7.4 percent of the total work force for January. The statewide average for the same period was 4.2.

In Lowell itself, where the work force is estimated at 45,000, the unemployment rate for January is estimated at slightly higher. But figures are not kept for the city alone.

Lowell's unemployment figure has improved slightly over the last five years, but it remains one of the highest in the nation. Griffin said the situation here is not as bleak as it appears on paper.

"There is a great deal of work done of a contract basis here," he said. "It causes peaks and slow seasons. When things are slow, the number of claims jump substantially."

He added, "The economic picture in Lowell is gradually improving."

There are other reasons for the high unemployment rate, a visitor here is told over and over by industry officials. Many men, particularly those with larger families, receive as much for unemployment payments as they would be paid for a full work week.

"If anyone really wants to work in Lowell," one mill executive said, "there is a job here for him." A full page of "help wanted" advertisements in the Lowell Sun supports this view.

In the old, Gothic style city hall, Lowell's young and energetic mayor, Edward Early Jr., said, "We haven't been getting the new industries we need. It is as simple as that."

But most city officials, including City Manager Charles A. Gallagher and acting City Planner Jack Tavares, agreed that progress has been made.

They point to "incubator" industries, some employing as few as 10 or 15 persons. They include electronic, paper and plastic firms. Their total number grows each year.

Textile, thanks to Wannalancit Mills, and allied industries, remains as the city's biggest industry, but it is a matter of time before paper products or printing takes over that top spot.

But there are bright spots in the Lowell picture. For example, the Boott Mills complex, all 17 buildings, is composed of some 40 firms, with only one—a dye company—still engaged in the textile industry.

There are 2600 persons employed in the complex, the same number working there in the mid 1920's when textile was Lowell's bread and butter.

"Lowell is fairly well off today," said Dickson, head of Boott Mills. "Diversification has come gradually. But it definitely is here."

Newly completed Route 495—a superhighway running east and west of Lowell—is expected to play a key role in the city's comeback. But, according to Mayor Early, a major need is a connector highway linking the superhighway with downtown Lowell.

That project is still in the "planning stage."

The city's urban redevelopment program has completed the Church st. project and the 95-acre Northern Canal project is underway. In recent years, several schools, shopping centers and an industrial park have been built. Lowell Technological Institute, which is internationally known, has grown substantially. New dormitories to house 660 more students are under construction.

After a 50-year lag, new buildings have been constructed in the downtown Lowell area.

Economic progress here has not been as rapid as has been hoped, but the city that began as a company town is looking again to the future. They have a favorite word here—diversification.

You hear it over and over, for Lowell is determined to never again put all its economic eggs in one basket, especially a cloth (textile) basket.

### HIGHWAYS FOR LATIN AMERICA, BUT NONE FOR OHIO

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, last week I took the floor to call to the attention of the House the numbers game being played by the Johnson administration with respect to urgently needed Federal-aid highway construction. Today, I rise again to point out the administration's continuing inconsistency in the administration of our Nation's Federal-aid highway programs.

Last November 23, the President ordered a cutback in Federal-aid highway construction which amounted to \$1.1 billion, or 25 percent of the \$4.4 billion of new construction work that could be commenced during fiscal year 1967 without exceeding the estimated receipts of the highway trust fund. The cutback applied to the all-important National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, as well as the primary and secondary extensions and their urban extensions.

No other public works program was cut as drastically as was the Federal-aid highway program. No other transportation system has its funds frozen anywhere near the extent of the Federal-aid highway program's funds.

The cutback was ordered supposedly "in recognition of the need for reducing nonmilitary Federal expenditures as a contribution to the Vietnam effort and the resultant program to reduce inflationary pressure." It appears, however, after all the facts have been made available to the Congress, that the cutback in the highway construction program was another budget shenanigan of the administration—Johnson juggling—with the American taxpayers' money being tossed carelessly around. The administration witnesses at joint hearings of the Subcommittees on Roads of the House and Senate Committees on Public Works assured the members that funds would be restored as soon as the administration's brand of national economics so warranted. Unfortunately, it looks like this is not going to happen. The funds frozen by the administration have yet to be fully restored.

On Thursday, March 2, I called to the attention of the House the fact that the Federal Reserve Board was, in effect, releasing some \$850 million to be pumped into the economy. Surely this will not "reduce inflationary pressure." While the Federal Government was thereby pumping \$850 million into the economy, the administration did not release one single cent for urgently needed highway construction.

To make matters even worse, yesterday—March 13—the President of the United States sent a message to Congress on Latin American development, within which he called for an additional \$150 million authorization over the next 3

years for the construction of roads, bridges, and the development of communication and river systems throughout Latin America. That \$150 million will be paid for by the taxpayers of the United States—the same taxpayers who are being told by the Johnson administration that it would be too great of an expenditure to build highways which are needed to reduce congestion, inconvenience, traffic deaths and injuries, and property damage.

According to the President's message, approximately \$150 million over a 3-year period will be provided to "help finance preinvestment studies and a portion of the cost of new multinational projects," including the construction of roads "to link the nations and people of Latin America" and the construction of bridges "to carry the fruits of commerce over river barriers."

The President's message goes on to state that the administration will request congressional authorization to provide this \$150 million extra together with our regular \$250 million annual contribution to the Inter-America Bank's Fund for Special Operations from which come the funds for the financing of these road and bridge projects. Thus, in effect, we will have \$900 million of U.S. taxpayers' dollars over the next 3 years going into such projects in Latin America.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the President is more concerned with linking the people of Latin America than he is in linking the people of his own Nation—the people he was elected by to represent their best interests. The cutback will slow down the construction of federally aided highways in the United States substantially, resulting in hundreds of highway traffic deaths, thousands of injuries, and millions of dollars in property damage. I suggest that it is in our citizens' best interests to construct highways in the United States before we accelerate U.S.-aided highway and related bridge construction in Latin America. Yet the President asks for hundreds of millions for highway construction in Latin America and still holds back on funds for urgently needed highway construction in the United States. That just does not make sense. Roads for Latin America, but none for Ohio or the United States.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the American people are being forced to endure congestion, inconvenience, and increased travel costs in the future because the President is more willing to give highway construction money to Latin America than he is to release highway construction funds—funds which he arbitrarily froze—in the United States.

Before any additional sums are appropriated or expended for highways in foreign nations, the administration should release highway construction funds in the United States.

### EULOGY ON AMBROSE KENNEDY, A FORMER CONGRESSMAN FROM WOONSOCKET, R.I.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, 44

years ago the voice of Ambrose Kennedy was heard in the House by such notable men as Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr., W. Brooke Cockrane and Sam Rayburn. On March 9, the voice of this former Representative from Woonsocket, R.I., was eternally silenced.

Ambrose Kennedy was the second man from Woonsocket to be elected to the Congress and, as his successor from this fine city, I would like to make known before this House, which he served so well for 10 years, the exemplary accomplishments embodied in the life of this great man.

His was a most extraordinary life—one which reached out to encompass many avenues, but all of which marked the way passed by a man devoted to public service and the betterment of mankind.

He was an educator, serving as the first high-school principal and superintendent of schools in Blackstone, Mass.; a lawyer, whose late career was marked by early success; an author, with two books to his credit; a father, who was loved by his family; a scholar, whose degrees included a doctor of philosophy; a military aide to Governor Pothier, of Rhode Island, which earned him the title of colonel; a devoted layman, who was honored by his faith; a State representative, who was honored by his colleagues to be their Speaker; and a Member of this House, which he so admirably served from 1913 to 1923.

Life for Ambrose Kennedy began almost a full century ago in Blackstone, Mass.—which is contiguous to Woonsocket, R.I.—on the first day of December in the year 1875.

He attended school in Blackstone, the town of his birth, which also is where I was born, and later studied in Canada before beginning his studies at Holy Cross College in Worcester, Mass. At the age of 22, he was awarded a bachelor of arts degree and 3 years later, a master of arts degree. His alma mater further honored him with the bestowal of a doctor of philosophy degree in 1918.

After college, he turned his efforts towards the education of others, teaching French, Latin, Greek, English, physics, and math from 1 year prior to the turn of the century to 4 years into the 20th century.

While teaching school in Blackstone, his interest turned towards a legal career, and he enrolled at Boston University, where I also had the privilege of preparing for my legal career. In his usual manner of academic achievement, he completed the three year course in 2 years and received the coveted honor of being class orator at commencement exercises. His oratory ability would soon become well known in the Congress as it had been known to his classmates at Boston University and the House of Representatives in Rhode Island where he served from 1910 to 1912.

Prior to being elected to the Rhode Island House of Representatives, he served as military aide to Gov. Aram J. Pothier. Soon after becoming a member of the Rhode Island House, his eloquence and outstanding characteristics were easily recognized by his

colleagues who chose him to be their speaker.

In 1912, Colonel Kennedy's popularity and achievements won him a seat in the Congress, the only Republican to win a seat in the Congress during the elections of that year. Standing with him when he was sworn in was the beloved, late Sam Rayburn, whose distinguished career in this House is so well known to all of us.

These were uneasy times and the role of the House Foreign Affairs Committee assumed even greater significance. One of its members was the eloquent member from Woonsocket, R.I., the Honorable Ambrose Kennedy.

The gentleman from Rhode Island was well received and acclaimed by his colleagues. When his term came to a close in 1923, he declined to run again after having served the people of the then Third District from Rhode Island in a most exemplary manner for a full decade.

The entire State of Rhode Island is deeply indebted to the unselfish efforts of this extraordinary man but the people of the city of Woonsocket owe particular homage to Colonel Kennedy, for he brought great honor to them.

In the city of Woonsocket we are proud that such a man as he was one of us. His many accomplishments and exemplary ways shall serve as a great inspiration. For those who wish to give of themselves that others may live a little better, his life will serve as a guide.

#### HALPERN BILL PROVIDES BUSINESS LOANS AND JOB TRAINING FOR COLD WAR VETS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, during the past year, the Congress has moved in a number of ways toward providing pensions and readjustment assistance for veterans of previous wars, widows and dependents.

Last year, the cold war GI bill was approved by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am proud to be a member, and it was enacted. This year, we have seen the introduction of many bills, including my own, to expand educational opportunities, increase pensions and provide benefits for veterans, widows, and dependents of the Vietnam hostilities since August 5, 1964.

But, in all this spate of new legislation, enacted and proposed, there is still a gaping hole. There is still no provision for small business loans for veterans of the cold war since Korea. There is no provision for on-the-job and on-the-farm training for these "peacetime" fighting men after they return from the wars.

During the period when the Committee on Veterans' Affairs was discussing and holding hearings on the cold war GI bill, I received many letters from veterans and men still on active duty indicating intense interest in this kind of readjustment assistance.

Many veterans, and spokesmen for all

the major veterans organizations, stopped into my office, or buttonholed me in public places in my district, and made it clear that they considered small-business loans as important as any kind of assistance we have ever provided.

They pointed out that, especially as a result of the cold war draft, many men are called to active duty after completing their educations, and require special help to bridge the gap and reestablish themselves in their home communities.

Others, having interrupted their educations for military service, found they were forced to drop plans for entering professions, and instead to move toward the business and industrial world. They certainly are deserving of help from their grateful Nation.

In my own bill for cold war veterans' benefits, I included provision for small business loans, and I sought to amend the committee bill accordingly. Though my amendment fell one vote short of committee adoption, enough support was shown—and has been shown during the past year—to warrant separate legislation to this end.

This is especially so in the light of the fact that about a quarter of a million small-business loans were processed under prior readjustment acts, and we have a remarkable record of success in these ventures.

Today, I am making another effort to fill the gap left in our cold war bill by introducing an amendment to provide for small-business loans. The same reasons which make small-business loans a worthy assistance project, also prove the need of on-the-job and on-the-farm training for veterans of the cold war. My amendment would also make those provisions.

It is not reasonable to help only those who would go back to school to learn. Many people can learn the skills which will do them most good in their future lives right at the machines, behind the desks, and in the fields in businesses, industries and on farms.

Mr. Speaker, it is only fair to give our cold war GI's the same opportunities for reestablishing themselves as we gave our veterans of previous wars.

What is more, it is only fair to recognize the fact that thousands of our American men were called upon for hazardous duty in many parts of the world after the end of the Korean war, and before the Gulf of Tonkin incident in Vietnam, August 5, 1964.

As I pointed out before a Veterans' Affairs' Subcommittee last week, none of our currently proposed veterans' benefit bills, nor any existing laws, provide for the veterans, the widows, and the dependents of this period.

For that purpose, I have introduced a second amendment today to expand all of the cold war benefits to those who fought at the wrong time, in the wrong place, to qualify under existing and pending legislation.

Included among these would be the 14,000 Americans sent to Lebanon and the Navy men who convoyed Nationalist troops toward Quemoy and Matsu in 1958. Also included would be the 15,000 "advisers" in Vietnam before August 5, 1964, the pilots sent to the

Congo in 1961, the thousands deployed to the Dominican Republic in 1965, and perhaps others.

All of these have earned the gratitude of the Nation. I urge speedy action to fill the gaps in our GI legislation.

#### FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mrs. SULLIVAN. 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 gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of Members of the House of Representatives have a stake, and a very important one, in a bill on which the Committee on Agriculture will be holding hearings tomorrow, Thursday, and Friday. This bill is H.R. 1318, a bill I have introduced for the administration for the continuation and expansion of the food stamp program. Unless this bill is passed this spring, many of the food stamp projects now in operation will have to be terminated on July 1 and proposed new food stamp projects will not be able to start. This is because the food stamp law passed in 1964, while being permanent legislation, contains authorizations for appropriations only through the current fiscal year. A new authorization section must be written into the 1964 act. I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an extensive report on the food stamp plan, listing all of the congressional districts which will be affected. I urge every Member to read this material tomorrow to see how the failure to pass H.R. 1318 would affect his district. Only a few Members are scheduled to testify on this bill this week. I would think Members would want to make sure that the Committee on Agriculture knows of the importance of this legislation to their congressional districts.

#### FIFTY THOUSAND VISIT SS "HOPE" IN 2 DAYS AT MIAMI

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, last month the SS *Hope* visited Miami en route to Colombia and her sixth medical teaching-treatment mission. The reception for this famed white hospital ship was overwhelming as more than 50,000 residents turned out to greet her in the two days she was moored at Dodge Island Seaport.

The interest and enthusiasm for *Hope* shown in Miami underscores the warm respect this symbol of good will holds in the American people. Now in its seventh year, this ship time and time again has proven to be one of our country's most effective efforts in carrying knowledge and understanding to less fortunate nations.

Fred Shaw wrote of Project Hope in his column in the Miami Herald and illus-

trated some of the reasons why *Hope* has been so successful. I know my colleagues will share my interest in Mr. Shaw's remarks and I ask unanimous consent that his column be printed in the RECORD:

[From the Miami Herald, Feb. 12, 1967]

**OF PROJECT HOPE: THE PEOPLE WHO WALK ON WATER**

(By Fred Shaw)

Trailing after the news, as I occasionally must, has its disadvantages. By the time you read this column, news and editorial writers will have told you that the SS *Hope* is here to dedicate the port of Miami, and that for the first time in the history of the project, a city has been permitted to tour the hospital ship.

Writing well before the beginning of the news barrage, I can only guess that the directors are honoring Miami because of the contributions of its doctors, dentists, and nurses and the devotion of the 400 members of the Dade County Women's Committee for Project Hope.

Several years ago, I became interested in Project Hope when a doctor friend, a gifted young surgeon who can recognize the phony as far as he can smell it, served a two-month turn and came back refreshed in mind and spirit.

Project Hope is a living idea that the A.M.A. can unite on—the right and left wings and all those physicians in between who are tired of being tarred with the brush of reaction. Nor do the rest of us escape. No matter how innocent our motives or how good our works, in many areas of the world we are looked on as fat and indifferent. Our halo has slipped; the Communists have attempted to equate change with progress and capture them both.

Dr. William B. Walsh, founder and president of Project Hope, and those who work with him are playing for big stakes. They are taking the best in American medicine to places where it's needed most. They are setting up training programs for nurses, technicians, and physical therapists and they are establishing blood banks and other supporting organizations so that medical care can continue to improve.

Without intending to, doctors and nurses have also become some of the most effective fighters in the cold war. Dr. Walsh has told the thrilling story in two books. The first was *A Ship Called Hope* (1964); the new one is *Yanqui, Come Back* (Dutton, \$4.95), the story of the work in Peru.

Conditions in Peru were all but impossible. All over Latin America, the people were demanding a change; and as Dr. Walsh says, "Why not? If existing conditions assured the average citizens of only 30 years of life, wouldn't any change from the status quo be an improvement?"

A peon could live a lifetime without a bath. As many as five thousand people depended on a single water tap. Garbage and excrement piled up in the streets. The puffed bellies and skinny legs of thousands of children could mean only one thing—protein starvation. Many native doctors were suspicious or jealous. And always the propagandist pulled out the same old stops: Beware of the Yankee warmongers. Communists si, yanqui no.

**GOOD WILL AND PROTEIN**

The Americans tried not to talk back. They treated the sick, built clinics, and started their training programs. They answered no to political expediency and to the caste system; the haciendada waited with the Indians and Mestizos. They took along for the poor "the best kind of package deal from a democracy: good will and protein simultaneously." Here and there "all the objectives of Project Hope" were realized: "self-

help, partnership, and a response to Yankee initiative."

Once when the Americans planned a mass immunization, the Communists spread the word that the Yankee imperialists were trying to find and experiment on deformities resulting from their nuclear mistakes.

As the Americans approached the clinic on what was to be the big day, they thought no one had come; but when they turned the final corner, they saw a tremendous crowd of scrubbed children and well-dressed parents. A roar went up from the crowd: "Hople Hople, Hople!" As one doctor said, "They thought we could walk on water."

**CONGRESSMAN CLAUDE PEPPER INTRODUCES LEGISLATION IN SUPPORT OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES' RECLASSIFICATION**

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, once again my concern for our postal service has prompted me to action. This time that action takes the form of legislation that will provide more pay to our postal employees by reclassifying certain key positions ranging from carrier and clerk to the postmaster himself. This action is timely, it is essential, and, it is logical.

For many years I have watched the workload of our public servants increase, and on numerous occasions I have introduced and fought for appropriate remedial legislation. The workload has increased in all of our executive departments—including Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, Commerce, and Labor—and it will continue.

But the work demanded of our postal employees has increased beyond the horizons of our imaginations and it will continue to typify and exceed the tempo of our Nation's social and economic advancement. As each of our executive agencies becomes more effective in reaching the farmer, the sixth-grade teacher, the custodian, the electronic technician, and the banker, the postal service must carry more responsibility.

Increased responsibility necessitates reward—not as a prize, but as frankly commercial acknowledgment of services rendered. No dreamy philosopher's compliments to the public servant can compensate adequately for the personal satisfaction an employee derives from his position's paycheck enabling him to advance his own social and economic status.

Our Nation cannot afford to allow a lag in any sector; our progress must continue and the advancement of our Postal Service is crucial.

Let us look at this crucial advancement from the economic angle: According to the President's 1967 economic report, our gross national product has grown 50 percent in 6 years. In constant prices, the President has computed the gain to average 5½ percent a year; and has observed that the physical output of our factories and mines is up more than 50 percent.

This economic advancement obviously

affects our communications system. In 1965, the Postal Service carried 72 billion pieces of mail. Estimates for 1970, just 3 years away, are set at 90 billion.

This 90-billion-pieces-of-mail estimate, however, should neither awe nor inhibit us. The estimate represents a document of faith in our economic progress; it is a challenge to us.

Last fall we saw an example of what can happen to us when our communication system falters when the well-respected Chicago Post Office employees suddenly discovered they were being submerged in an unprecedented avalanche of mail. Due to population increases and the economic boom, postal authorities had predicted an autumn increase of 4 percent for the Chicago mail volume. Instead, the main post office found itself responsible for twice that increase, and reports show that the increase might have been 28 percent higher than that of the previous year at some points.

As a result of this unexpected volume, one department store claimed a \$2 million loss because their sales flyers were logjammed; and other business enterprises as well as the public were doubtlessly penalized to a similarly oppressive degree.

Until regulations could be altered in Washington, about 500 postal workers had volunteered to stay on the job on their days off in dedicated service to move the mountains and keep the correspondence from continuing its spilling momentum.

Certainly these postal workers and their counterparts throughout the country are performing vital services, and I am convinced that the time for meaningful action has arrived. Reclassification for certain key positions in the postal field service is essential, and it is a logical step toward enabling our communication system to maintain its contemporary tempo.

Mr. Speaker, in this session I have previously introduced legislation to assist and upgrade the level and salary of our postal employees. My proposal embodied in H.R. 6992 and introduced March 9 was intended to include and assist as many of our public servants in the postal service as possible. After becoming more concerned about the needs of our clerks and carriers who actually make up the vast majority of our postal employees and perform a vital function, I introduced H.R. 7103 on March 13 as an additional form of assistance.

The legislation I have introduced is far reaching. In order to assist as many of our employees as possible, I have devised a grade-level reclassification that will provide more meaningful recognition and a salary more commensurate with the responsibilities carried by the clerk and carrier as well as the postmaster charged with keeping the mails running smoothly in Chicago or in our villages and towns scattered throughout our vast land.

We must recall that in addition to the reliance we place on our own local mailman in city or country, we must also rely on the large post offices and the services they perform for every rural route and hamlet resident. It has been brought to

my attention that the postmaster of our largest first-class office maintains responsibility for approximately 18,000 employees and boasts 3,000 carrier routes within his jurisdiction.

Clearly, this is big business.

It is this sprawling, vast, and vital communication network that gives us such an awesome challenge to keep current in the face of a booming economy, increasing population, and surging correspondence. It is a business that cannot fail, and a business that cannot allow its employees to work without pride and satisfaction. Every employee—clerk and carrier as well as supervisor—must be dedicated and capable. In the words of an old but perceptive slogan every chain is only as strong as its weakest link.

These proposals seek to strengthen every link. It provides an up-to-date reclassification for key postal employees' positions at various levels. It gives the questionable position the positive slant rather than downgrading it, and computes the amount of work transacted in each office in a more realistic manner. Most important to the individual employee, it gives him greater compensation in recognition of his rapidly increasing letter and package burdens.

I am convinced that enactment of this legislation is a logical, essential, and timely step forward.

#### AMERICANISM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by the kindness of the Right Worshipful J. Milton Brown, secretary of Riverview Lodge No. 306 F. & A.M., Jacksonville, Fla., I have been advised that on February 6, 1967, Riverside Lodge observed Americanism Night. On this occasion, the Rainbow Girls and the DeMolay boys presented and read essays on Americanism which had been prepared for this occasion. All of the essays presented were excellent, but three were adjudged the best of all. One was entitled "America: the Land of Giants," by Toni Donaldson, 2685 Sandra Lane, Jacksonville, Fla., and won first prize. Another, entitled "Americanism," by Brenda Duane, 6933 Cartier Circle, Jacksonville, Fla., won second prize. The third, entitled "Americanism," by Helen Carver of 9164 12th Avenue, Jacksonville, Fla., a student in the eighth grade of Ribault Junior High School, won third prize.

These essays are movingly eloquent and patriotic by these bright young Americans of whom we are very proud.

Mr. Speaker, I commend them to my colleagues and to my countrymen.

#### AMERICA: THE LAND OF GIANTS

(By Toni Donaldson, Jacksonville, Fla.)

Joe Margarc, hero of the steel industry; John Henery, towering Negro steeldriver, whom tradition has credited with the building of the Big Ben Tunnel. Paul Bunyan, a giant of a man; a hard-working, unpretentious, "ordinary man." John Luther Jones,

who became a giant of a legend bearing a pseudonym derived from the name of his home town of Caycee, Tennessee. He was a man of courage and integrity. We remember him as Casey Jones. Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Roosevelt, giants of words, thoughts, and deeds—their memories are perpetuated in the granite of Mount Rushmore. An inhabitant of Bedloe's Island (now known as Liberty Island) in New York Harbor, is our greatest lady giant. She is a citizen of the world given birth in the copper foundries of France and transported to America as a gift-symbol of freedom.

Together they comprise a veritable army of colorful personalities whose collective character is representative of the American image—eager, free-wheeling, inventively creative, self-determining, freedom-loving—fashioned of clay, born out of wanderlust and colonialism, fired in the battles of a revolution for independence, aged and mellowed by the blessing of a common cause: conquest of the vast frontiers. These are persons symbolic of a mighty nation, a nation with mighty good ways.

A mighty nation? I do not know. When I look around me and see the status of our local government; when I realize that the majority of our voters, who are deciding the fate of our nation, are unconcerned, uninformed, and disinterested; when I see democracy being overrun by Socialism; when I see our only touch with God, namely prayer, taken from our schools; and the majority suffering because of these few who find it necessary to protest against protesting, then I find no alternative but to doubt the greatness of our "mighty nation."

When we speak of America, we generally have visions of a land with majestic mountains, crystal lakes and golden flowered meadows. We think of Americanism as no more than a sophisticated word for patriotism. We think and we visualize, but we do not do and see. Stand up! Be counted! How long has it been since you have sung our national anthem, or saluted Old Glory as it unfurled against the sky? Can you remember the last Independence Day that was celebrated with patriotic songs, cheering, fireworks and speeches?

Remember, ours is a land of plenty, we share our treasures with the rich and poor alike. Ours is a land of beauty, with green valleys and mountains high. Ours is a land of strength! When talking about the Statue of Liberty someone once said:

"This lady is 151 feet tall and weighs 225 tons. Her strength is beyond belief. If you can imagine 186 million people hand in hand all pulling together, that's just how strong she is."

We are all proud to be able to walk beside the great figures of our history. Men and Women who have made our nation a Land of Giants. Now let our children and those of the generations to come have this same pride. Dig deep, get that old Stars and Stripes patriotism! Stand up! Look the world in the eye and say:

"I am an American!"

#### AMERICANISM

(By Brenda Duane, Jacksonville, Fla.)

"I am an American!" We should be proud to say that. Why? Because to make that little sentence mean anything, took hard work and determination. You should be glad you are an American. I know I am! Because I am an American I have many rights and freedoms people from other countries don't have.

It took many hard fought battles, many innocent peoples' lives, to give me this grand heritage. I am sure that many other battles will be fought and more lives will be taken in preserving this heritage for the generations to come. It is my responsibility to help in every way I can to keep our heritage something to be proud of.

As an American I have more than the peo-

ple of some other countries can dare dream to have. But they can if they have the courage and determination the early Americans had to get our country started, and the same that the Americans of today have to have to keep it going.

I like to think about the early Americans, the brave men and women who got our country started. It was these men and women who won the respect of the foreign nations for our new nation by their honesty, dignity and determination to make for themselves a new home in a new country. Our nation was born on July 4, 1776. It took hard work, a hunger for freedom and the love and strong belief in God.

One man everyone remembers is George Washington, first in war, first in peace and first in the hearts of his countrymen. It was George Washington, who was honest, kind, trustworthy and who loved and protected his country, that was chosen to be our first president.

If everyone loved and defended the United States the way George Washington and many other Americans did, think of all the problems that we would not have today. We should all try to be like these early pioneers in our feeling toward the United States.

Stephen Decatur, a naval hero in the early 1800's once said in a toast which he is remembered for:

"Our Country! In her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be in the right, but *Our Country, right or wrong!*"

To me this best describes how to be a proud American. Decatur said we should be proud of our country and defend her when she is right, and when she is wrong, to be honest and to still be proud because, "*You are an American!*"

#### AMERICANISM

(By Helen Carver, Jacksonville, Fla.)

The dictionary defines Americanism as an attachment or allegiance to the traditions, interests or ideals of the United States.

The attachment Americans by birth have for their country comes mostly through the teachings of their adult relatives and friends. In school we learn American History. We learn about heroes, frontiersmen, and statesmen. Here we learn to love and appreciate what they have given us. When we get out of school we experience some of the things we have learned.

People who come from other countries usually come to America for our freedom. They have probably learned about our country and the rights we have in America. They too would like the privilege of saying, I am an American. Often in other countries they have to work for something and then allow the government to take it away. Americans can work to improve themselves, in business and in social life without fear of the government interfering.

Americans have freedoms or traditions. The freedom of religion was the first and most important one. This is what the Pilgrims were looking for. Freedom of speech is another. We have the freedom to say what we desire. We may contradict the laws if we wish. Freedom of the press allows us to find out about our elected officials. Freedom of justice is another important one. In America we have laws to protect us and law officers to enforce these laws.

In America, Americans have an interest for each other. The government cares. They have established such things as Medicare and Welfare for older people. Many people care and that is one of the things that makes this country so great.

The Preamble to the Constitution states: We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United

States of America." This is the most important document of the American people and I think it shows true Americanism.

**KEY TO AFRICA**

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House before it became my privilege to serve on the House Rules Committee, and as an officer and director of a savings and loan association organized during the period between my Senate and House service, I have always been deeply interested in the potential of savings and loan associations for the development of better housing and greater homeownership.

The success of the savings and loan industry in our country is reflected in the high level of individual homeownership among the American people. This is, I believe, the major factor in the stability of our economy and of our democratic society.

I have been anxious to encourage the development of similar savings and loan associations in the underdeveloped countries of the world. During the Easter recess of the Congress I plan to attend an International Conference of Savings and Loan Institutions in Buenos Aires. I have attended similar conferences in the past and I know they contribute very meaningfully to the development of these associations, especially in Latin America.

I was pleased to read, therefore, a very informative article by Mr. Norman VanderClute, Director of the Office of Private Enterprise, the African Bureau of the Agency for International Development which appeared in the March issue of the Journal of the National League of Insured Savings Associations, in which Mr. VanderClute points out the progress which is being made in the development of savings and loan associations in Africa. In order that all of my colleagues may have an opportunity to read this article I request permission to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

**KEY TO AFRICA**

(By Norman VanderClute, Director, Office of Private Enterprise, Africa Bureau, A.I.D.)

One of the major concerns of local governments in the developing countries of Africa, is the lack of adequate housing, particularly in the urban areas. Because mortgage funds are generally unavailable in the private market, the expanding population and rural migration to the cities has forced these countries to use scarce government funds to finance home construction and long-term mortgages.

Many of the families that receive mortgage money from the government represent a segment of the middle class (professionals, government employees, skilled workers and entrepreneurs) that would qualify for private enterprise loans, if such sources existed.

AID's Housing Guaranty Program in Africa is an example of one attempt to introduce modern construction techniques which would result in a limited number of homes

being built but it is not a long range solution to the housing needs of these countries. Some of the shortcomings of the Housing Guaranty Program are:

1. It does not develop long-term financial institutions to help meet the housing needs for the future;

2. It has a negative short-term effect on the United States balance of payments due to the lack of United States procurement provisions. In fact, procurement of construction materials can and is often being made from third countries benefiting neither the United States nor the underdeveloped countries concerned.

3. The program has an adverse effect on the host country's balance of payments due to the high commercial interest rates, lack of any principal grace period, and the cost of the guarantee fee.

The purpose of this paper is to outline a concept presently under consideration at A.I.D. on the establishment of thrift institutions, modeled after U.S. savings and loan associations, which will mobilize local private capital for construction loans and mortgage financing.

Housing schemes by themselves often result in a drain on the foreign currencies available to governments of developing countries because of the imports required for construction.

However, the large-scale investment by these proposed savings and loans in home mortgage financing will give rise to a peripheral construction industry which, in turn, will contribute to a more favorable net balance of payments by producing items previously imported.

Furthermore, by substituting private savings for government expenditures, the local government will have additional funds available for higher priority economic development projects. Experience in Africa and Latin America has proven that thrift institutions can attract capital for residential construction which would not otherwise be available for productive use.

The private sector's approach to home financing has also found favor with the governments of the countries concerned—a significant change from the government-financed, government-owned, and government-operated approach taken by many African nations just after independence.

A recent conference on housing and house financing held in Lagos, Nigeria, and attended by delegates from some ten African countries, adopted the following policies:

1. Only minimal-standard housing for low-income families should be a concern of government.

2. The governments should eliminate any unnecessary restrictions pertaining to the attraction and mobilization of private capital for housing.

3. Thrift and home-financing institutions of the savings and loan or building society types are the most desirable institutions for the collection of capital which may be used for financing housing for the growing middle-class. In the long run, most of the funds for housing must come from private sources and these institutions seem to be best adapted to the accumulation of such funds for housing. In addition, the education of the public and the desirability of thrift and prudent money management will be of long-range benefit to the populace.

The Congress of the United States has also recognized the substantial contribution savings and loan type organizations can make. In Section 601 of the Foreign Assistance Act, as amended, the Congress declared that:

"It is the policy of the United States to encourage the development and use of co-operatives, credit unions, and savings and loan associations."

The alternative to establishing mortgage type financial institutions would be to utilize the existing commercial banks or build-

ing societies. The problem of using commercial banks for this purpose is that the laws in many of these countries do not provide for commercial banks to make long-term investments in mortgage loans.

Also, most commercial banks are not interested in long-term mortgage loans since consumer and commercial loans are more lucrative.

To reach the maximum level of operations for a new association at the earliest possible date and to insure the success of these newly formed savings and loan associations, A.I.D. wishes to transplant the knowledge and know-how of the savings and loan industry in the U.S. and to enlist their support and technical assistance. To do this, A.I.D. may offer the opportunity to form stock type savings and loan associations or mutuals, if one prefers, with maximum profit incentives and freedom of operations.

A.I.D. recognizes the fact that competent and imaginative management is the key issue in establishing a lasting institution provided that reasonable amount of seed capital is available in the early years.

To provide the catalyst for savings and loan associations, A.I.D. would participate in making seed capital loans/deposits to the proposed associations on a ratable basis in conjunction with the host governments.

The A.I.D. participation which would require correspondent tied procurement with respect to house construction may take the form of a two step loan, utilizing a letter of credit with either the use of a central home loan bank or a direct loan to the individual associations with an agency of the host government to control and regulate the activities of the savings and loan associations.

The possibility of forming and backing a central bank would depend greatly upon the size and market conditions of the country in question.

Without trying to define the exact mechanics of each individual case, the general idea would be to disburse approximately 1 million dollars as the initial contribution of seed capital, with a maximum capital of 3 million dollars as a total contribution from both countries in phase one.

The U.S. share would be sufficient to cover U.S. foreign exchange cost.

Phase two, would be a combined contribution of a maximum of 3 million dollars contingent upon a percentage of capital being attracted by the local savings and loan associations. The first phase of 3 million dollars should easily amortize organization expenses and net operating losses within a period of three years (one year start-up plus two-year operations). The second phase would make available additional U.S.-host government loans/deposits at a set ratio to new private deposits.

In the 1930's the U.S. fostered the establishment and build-up of savings and loan associations by offering a three-to-one ratio of government deposits to private deposits. This, or a similar ratio, could be used by A.I.D. to increase its total participation in any one institution to a limit of 3 million dollars.

To assure continued and orderly growth, to provide for loan flexibility, and to increase confidence among the local depositors, A.I.D. should require that the host government both agree to guaranty all deposits up to a fixed amount (such as the average individual mortgage as is presently the practice in the U.S.) and to provide a stand-by line of credit up to 50% of the savings and loan's total deposits (as is provided in the U.S. by the Federal Home Loan Bank).

These provisions are particularly necessary in Africa because of the unknown and often undeveloped debt-repayment habits and attitudes of the local nationals.

Consistent with A.I.D. purposes and interests, low gross interest spreads should be encouraged so that competitive rates may be paid on deposits and the lowest-possible

mortgage rates can be offered to prospective homeowners.

The average U.S. interest spread of 1½%–1¾% for savings and loan institutions is inappropriate for several reasons.

First, the total deposits of the savings and loan would be much smaller in Africa than in the U.S. simply due to the much lower incomes of prospective depositors and homeowners. Expenses are also increased, by the fact that it would take at least five times as many local savings accounts to support a mortgage loan in Africa than in the U.S., and at least three times as many mortgages to produce the income of one U.S. mortgage.

Figures for Peru indicate it takes twenty savings accounts to support one loan versus four accounts in the U.S. and two to three mortgages in Peru to equal one U.S. mortgage. Savings and loan officials in the U.S. believe an even higher ratio would result in Africa.

Organization expenses are also higher and the efficiencies of computers and other labor saving devices are either unavailable or inappropriate.

In actual practice in Latin America, new savings and loan associations operating at a 6% spread have required three years in which to amortize organization expenses, absorb beginning operating losses and arrive at break-even operations.

When these associations accumulated seven or eight million dollars in capital, they were generally able to operate with a spread of 4% or less.

The U.S. Home Loan Bank during the 1930's actually encouraged what today we classify as a conflict of interest.

Builders, real estate brokers, insurance brokers, etc., were the only ones interested in the savings and loan associations and we would anticipate that this would be the case presently in the developing African countries.

Although freedom of operations and the profit incentive are prime prerequisites for inducing U.S. sponsors to invest, A.I.D. would insist on reasonable controls. One of these would be to insure an "arms length relationship" between the association and the U.S. sponsor in the event that the sponsor also owns stock in a company applying for construction loans.

In any event A.I.D. would have to assure itself that the management of the savings and loans was both competent and committed. To enforce this, A.I.D. would require its approval of the investor's management plans as a condition precedent to loan disbursement.

Assuming that the U.S. sponsor did plan to invest in construction or if the organizers were host nationals, A.I.D. would insist on a management contract with an organization experienced in running savings and loans in the U.S. This organization would be required to demonstrate both a depth of personnel talent and sufficient back-stopping ability to perform work in a professional manner over a continued period.

As a means of assessing this ability, A.I.D. could ask for submission of tentative plans by the management organization of such items as how it intended to attract savings, assure efficient operations and train local employees.

A.I.D. is looking to the American savings and loan community for advice as to whether the concept presently under consideration makes sense; which elements of the concept need revision, or removal, and also what considerations have been overlooked. Having developed a program with the help of the American savings and loan community, we are hopeful that members of this community will wish to join with us in assisting in the development of a savings and loan organization in Africa. A.I.D. is particularly hopeful that the American savings and loan institutions will be willing to assist in the provision of management to the newly formed savings and loan organizations in Africa, and that

the industry will wish to participate in the ownership of these savings and loan organizations.

### CONTRIBUTION TO DEMOCRATIC PARTY FUND

Mr. CONTE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 1967, I received a letter from a fellow by the name of John M. Bailey, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, requesting funds for support of the Democratic Party.

The letter referred to follows:

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE,  
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1967.

SILVIO O. CONTE,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FELLOW-AMERICAN: Will you back your political beliefs with money?

Fifteen weeks ago, when some great Democratic candidates went down to defeat, some of your more deeply-felt political beliefs were probably beaten down, too. Many people whose candidate did not win were shaken by that loss. Some, who had devoted much effort to the campaign, still feel it quite personally.

You cannot alter the verdict of the November elections of 1966, but you can do something, starting now, to begin setting matters right.

You surely know that a key part in any political battle is played by the countless citizens who work for the candidate they believe in . . . and for the party they believe in.

If the Conte name was among the Democratic supporters last November, I offer you our thanks. Your help contributes to the good health of our country's political system, for public-spirited support is the very life blood of our party organization.

That is why the Democratic Party needs your support now, to strengthen its activities at a time when the opposition (which outspent us nationally \$7 to \$4) would like to surge into the lead. We cannot draw on the "wealth in depth" that is available to the GOP. Instead, we must ask for a few dollars from the many—from sensitive, loyal Americans like you.

If you believe in the Party of the People, you can support its ideals by enrolling as a Sustaining Member now. Please mail your contribution today in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope. Your gift will strengthen the voice of the Democratic Party. If that's where your political beliefs lie, Fellow-American, I hope you'll back them now.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. BAILEY,  
Chairman.

This day I answered Mr. Bailey as follows:

Mr. JOHN M. BAILEY,  
Chairman, Democratic National Committee,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. BAILEY: I want to express my sincere gratitude for the high honor and flattering opportunity you have accorded me by inviting me to contribute to the Democratic Party campaign fund. I am deeply impressed that you have apparently read some of my speeches over the years in which I have stressed the vital importance of a sound, well balanced, two party system in the United States.

I have shown your letter to a number of my fellow Republicans and they, too, are highly impressed. One of the more visionary of our number even went so far as to suggest that your letter may represent the humble beginnings of a new era of political ecumenism in America. To which the rest of us could only add a solemn, "Amen."

On the balance, however, after reviewing our relationship over the years, I find I must respectfully and regretfully decline your gracious invitation. In all candor, I find that, in spite of my commitment to a sound two party system, the Democratic Party has been somewhat niggardly in rendering financial assistance to me in my own campaigns. As a matter of fact, outside of a handful of cheap cigars which I was able to cadge several years ago from a Democratic ward chairman who didn't know that I was a Republican, I cannot recall a single instance in which the Democratic Party has offered material support of any kind.

Nevertheless, I am deeply grateful for your thoughtfulness and generosity in offering me this opportunity. With sincere best wishes and highest regards, I am

Cordially yours,

SILVIO O. CONTE,  
Member of Congress.

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

Mr. CONTE. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have heard two or three of my Republican friends comment on the floor about receiving a letter. I enjoyed very much their comments because many months ago I received a letter from the chairman of the Republican National Committee. I knew he made a mistake. I felt highly honored. I was almost inclined to send him a dollar—I was—not in any derogatory sense, but appreciating the humor of it, and appreciating that mistakes might be made, and because of my profound respect for the two-party system.

The purpose of my observation on this occasion is to call attention to the fact that letters were received by Democrats from the chairman of the Republican National Committee. I was one of them. As I have heretofore stated, I felt pleased. I realized that it was a mistake, and I did not take the floor and make any comment about it.

Mr. CONTE. If the honorable Speaker will permit me, I stated in my opening remarks—and I echo every word the Speaker has said—that I feel highly honored also at the flattering opportunity. Unfortunately, I just do not have the funds to spread out to the Democratic National Party. Knowing the Speaker and his great wealth—not only his great material wealth, but his great wealth of wisdom and understanding—I believe it was very wise of the Republicans to write to the distinguished Speaker for a contribution from his ample resources in both categories.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I say, Mr. Speaker, the most pertinent part of my few observations was that I did not take the floor to make any comment about it.

Mr. CONTE. Well, Mr. Speaker, it was a very slow day and I thought I would occupy a few minutes in the hope that the President's message will come in. I was trying to cooperate.

Mr. McCORMACK. It was all done in good humor?

Mr. CONTE. It was all certainly in-

tended in good humor, as far as I am concerned, and I had no other purpose or motive.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts and the Speaker both made a mistake. I will be glad to provide a dollar just so we can keep the gentleman's name on the list so that we can see what is going on all the time.

#### CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. HECKLER], is recognized for 30 minutes.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. As a new Member of this body, Mr. Speaker, and very junior in status, I would be reluctant to speak out on the national issues requiring subtle judgment until I absorbed more of the great tutelage available in the House of Representatives. However, there are issues of national significance which are so compelling in themselves and by the force of public opinion behind them that even the most junior among us can speak out, and must, should the occasion arise.

It is in this regard that I wish to speak today, not as the author of complex legislation. This I will gladly relieve myself of, and rather allow the opportunity for that, the authorship of legislation, to be the prerogative of those more experienced than I.

However, Mr. Speaker, I come before the House today in the role of a spur to necessary legislation which this Congress should enact—the passage of legislation regarding congressional ethics.

It is my sincere belief that there is no more important issue before this Congress than the one we are now discussing. That issue is the laying down of the highest standards of behavior for the membership of Congress, the continuing enforcement of these standards by consistent and objective methods, and the resulting growth in confidence and trust on the part of a concerned citizenry and a watching world.

For how can a people place unqualified reliance on this body to deal with the hard questions of national order, and the harder questions of international disorder, when the Congress appears reluctant or even hostile to dealing with the question of disciplining itself?

How can we summon our youth—and many members of that group are present in the Chamber today—to the uncertainties of fighting today's battles—how can we call our people to the insecurity of meeting tomorrow's challenges—when

we are less than resolute ourselves in answering the summons of a battle for integrity, or in hearing the call of a challenge to our honor?

And honor is the key, Mr. Speaker, honor is the key. The very legislative forum in which we now exchange our views, is many times referred to as "this honorable body." And indeed it is honorable—honor in its traditions has been earned—honor in its membership—and honor in its expectations. Why then is this honor not reflected in the image of Congress that is growing in our land?

No literate person can ignore the increasing number of editorials, columns and cartoons that bespeak—and in none too subtle a way—disillusionment with, if not contempt for, the conduct of the Congress itself in the area of ethical standards.

No Member of Congress can afford to ignore this growing disenchantment of our people with their national legislature. At a time when public confidence in the Nation's leadership can hardly be described as overwhelming, it is more than disconcerting to find a spreading popular cynicism about the Congress itself.

Here in this House of Congress are those elected participants in Federal affairs who are closest to the people and most truly attuned to their needs and representative of their interests.

What is the greatest public need, Mr. Speaker? It is the need of our people to stand at the foot of the Capitol and to know that, although its aging dome may crumble into dust, the honor of those beneath it is not likewise decaying.

What is the public interest, Mr. Speaker? It is the interest of our people in relying on a Congress which, composed of individual humans with particular strengths and weaknesses, is strong enough to legislate leadership.

For how else can our people trust the Congress with the security of the country? How else can a world look to the Congress to help guarantee the survival of civilization?

The people do not expect unreasonably. If they did, there are surely more than a few of us who would not be eligible to participate here today. Members of Congress are people, chosen from among the ranks of the people themselves. But the point is, Mr. Speaker, we have been chosen—and that places special demands on us—and imposes sacred trusts. These are reasonable demands—and they must be reasonably met.

The people do not expect miracles. Congress, because it is of, by and for the people, can never be a fraternity of angelic spirits. Nor, from the shortage of distaff members alone can it expect to become a sorority of Caesar's wives—all above reproach.

But the Congress can and must be the repository of national trust and the receptacle of national confidence. How can that faith in Congress be developed among the people?

All that the country is asking from the Congress is that its Members acknowledge the special responsibilities of public trust. Their private acts within

the area of public responsibility should be open to inquiry and inspection.

In short, Members of Congress could go on being "people" and not "goldfish in a bowl"—at least no more "goldfish" than they have already chosen to be by entering the aquarium of politics.

It is said, Mr. Speaker, that giving the conduct of the Members of Congress such a public nature will open the way to the calling of a witch hunt. And yet I can think of no more effective way to thwart the hunters than to open one's broom closet to full inspection.

Mr. Speaker, there are only 535 Members in the House of this Congress. But they speak with the voice of 200 million. It is us, then, Members of Congress, to whom the honor has been given. They expect honor from those whom they have elected to this honorable body. Let us, by the stern demands of our collective conscience, and the uncompromising adherence of our own individual integrity, add honor in our service to the honor that is already ours.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to yield to the distinguished ranking minority member on the Committee on Government Operations and my leader on that committee, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

Mrs. DWYER. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, although the House has now voted to exclude our former colleague, as punishment for his official misconduct, the House has not—as some have suggested—"redeemed itself."

It would be self-deception of the worst kind if we allowed ourselves to believe that by depriving one man of his seat in Congress we have guaranteed the integrity of this body or restored the faith of the American people in representative government. And if, by failing to take additional and more effective steps toward the objective of enforceable ethical standards, we give the impression that these are now unnecessary, then we should be guilty of trying to deceive the people we represent.

Neither form of deception, Mr. Speaker, would befit us—whether collectively as a lawmaking body of unexcelled authority, or individually as public officials who have sought and accepted the public trust and responsibility with all its consequences. In our own best interests and those of the people we represent and the institution of which we are a part, we have no alternative but to move ahead and enact the kind of reforms that will make us fully accountable. It is too late for gestures or for half-measures. We must do the job right, or not at all.

In this respect, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important to place in proper perspective the action of the House last Wednesday in approving funds for the Committee on House Administration. Although this action was widely interpreted as indicating that the House had decided to rely on the committee as presently constituted as its agent in the field of ethics, rather than to establish a select committee and adopt related proposals for this purpose, I do not think the record supports this interpretation.

The resolution adopted by the House

was completely routine. It simply provided the funds necessary for the conduct of investigations, studies, and other activities which already come within the jurisdiction of the committee. It conferred no new jurisdiction on the Committee on House Administration. It did not, in any way, inhibit the Committee on Rules from considering legislation to create a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct and recommending to the House whatever combination of jurisdiction and powers it believes is necessary. Nor did it preclude the House from determining, in the final analysis, and for itself, just what it wants to do in this area.

On the other hand, by establishing a new subcommittee—or renaming an old one—on ethics and contracts, the Committee on House Administration undoubtedly signaled its intention to bid for at least a part of whatever new authority in the field of ethics the House may see fit to assign. If this was, in fact, the committee's intention, it acted clearly within its right. The committee presently has jurisdiction, under the Rules of the House, over several matters of direct relevance to the conduct of Members: appropriations from and expenditures of the contingent fund; the auditing of accounts charged to the contingent fund and measures relating to accounts of the House generally; the employment of persons by Members and committees; and the measures relating to the travel of Members.

In my own judgment, Mr. Speaker, this area of jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration not only should be retained but should be strengthened and expanded. Since recent experience demonstrates that part of the ethical problem confronting the Congress involves the misuse of funds in one or more of the accounts maintained for the House: stationery, clerk-hire, committee payrolls, travel, and the like, it would seem to me that the House should take steps to assure that the jurisdiction of its Committee on House Administration is broad enough to require regular, independent audits of all the accounts and expenditures of the official funds of the House. The Comptroller General, presumably, would be in the best position to do the actual auditing subject to the direction and supervision of the committee.

This is just one of the things the House should do, Mr. Speaker, in its effort to restore public confidence in the integrity of the legislative branch. There are many others. In common with many of our colleagues, I have long been convinced of the need for systematic, enforceable standards and procedures which can equip this body to deal with any misconduct in its midst. I testified to this effect before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, and I shared the disappointment of many when that committee limited its recommendations in this area to the single proposal that the House establish a Committee on Standards and Conduct.

Late in the 89th Congress, as our colleagues recall, the House did establish a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. But the committee was not given the time, the resources or the au-

thority to do an effective job. Indeed, the committee found it impossible even to conclude its one assigned responsibility: to recommend additional rules or regulations to insure proper standards of conduct. To date, of course, the select committee has not been reconstituted by the 90th Congress.

Since the beginning of the year, Mr. Speaker, I have conducted an intensive restudy of this entire field—reviewing the existing inadequate statutes, analyzing past proposals for reform, and contrasting the conflict-of-interest regulations and standards of ethical conduct which govern officials of the executive branch with the virtual absence of effective standards and regulations governing the Congress.

As a result of this review, I am more convinced than ever that any ethics program which the House might adopt will be deficient unless it includes three main features:

First, it must provide for full disclosure, so that Congress and the people will have access to the facts of what is being done and how its money is being used.

Second, it must establish specific standards of behavior and prohibit the violation of these standards.

And third, it must be enforceable, on a regular, continuing, and systematic basis.

Each of these features, Mr. Speaker, will reinforce the others. Without any one of them, the whole will be inadequate. Disclosure alone, for example, may lead nowhere unless there are standards against which to measure the facts which are disclosed. Likewise, standards by themselves can be meaningless unless we have the capacity to determine when they are being abused. And, finally, unless there is assurance that punitive action of some kind will follow from proven violations, then the restraining influence of both standards and disclosure will be gravely weakened.

Acting on these assumptions, I have prepared an ethics program which I believe will go a long way toward establishing the procedures, standards, and conditions under which the House can exercise effective supervision of the behavior of its own Members—a responsibility which it cannot delegate to others and which it must not refuse.

The principal elements in my program, Mr. Speaker, include the following:

First. Public disclosure of all income, including identification of sources, gifts of more than nominal value, assets, liabilities, and transactions in real and personal property and commodities by all Members of the House and Senate, candidates for the House and Senate, top congressional staff employees and higher-ranking officials of the executive branch, in annual reports filed with the Comptroller General which shall be available to the public and the press.

Second. Public disclosure, as part of the published record of each case, of all communications or contacts with administrative agencies by Members of Congress or others outside the agency in connection with contract awards, licenses, grants of authority, et cetera.

Third. Public disclosure, through au-

ditions conducted by the Comptroller General under the supervision of the Committee on House Administration, of all spending of appropriated funds by Members, committees, and officers of the House from all accounts maintained by the House including those for salaries, expenses, travel, clerk-hire, et cetera.

Fourth. Adoption of an interim code of ethics for the guidance of Members, officers and employees of the House pending approval of a more comprehensive code.

Fifth. Establishment of a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct composed of 10 members which shall have authority to (a) investigate allegations of improper conduct, (b) recommend disciplinary action to the House, (c) report violations of law to appropriate Federal and State authorities, (d) recommend to the House changes or additions to its rules and regulations with respect to standards of conduct, (e) render advisory opinions on ethical questions upon request, (f) conduct a thorough study of existing conflict-of-interest statutes applicable to the legislative branch and determine how they should be strengthened, and (g) recommend a comprehensive, specific, and enforceable code of ethics.

Sixth. Provision of stricter controls over expenditures by Members of Congress or employees traveling outside the United States.

Seventh. Prohibition of the use of contributions to Members of Congress for personal purposes.

Eighth. Prohibition of the employment of relatives on congressional payrolls and the requirement that all employees regularly attend and perform the duties for which they were employed.

Ninth. Provision of appropriate penalties for violations of the above.

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that not all our colleagues will agree that all the provisions I have mentioned are necessary. There will be disagreement about the ways and means of accomplishing what I hope is the common objective of all of us, the revival of confidence in the Congress. I for one shall welcome such debate—so long as we can be assured effective action will follow.

We cannot go on much longer as though we were oblivious to the mounting criticism of Congress, to the loss of prestige, to the periodic scandals that reach out and touch us all, and to the demands from every side that we put this House in order.

I am amazed that our people have been so patient, Mr. Speaker. They are, after all, the ones to whom we must account, the source of our funds and our authority. The Congress has given them too many reasons to wonder and doubt; we have stretched their patience to the breaking point. We would be wise, I suggest, if we get about our business.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for giving us the benefit of her very penetrating analysis of the need for present legislation, and her specific reform measure. It is obvious from her distinguished career in

the House of Representatives that her proposals carry the weight of experience.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlewoman from the State of Washington, our distinguished expert on the Committee on Agriculture [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mrs. HECKLER]. I also commend her for taking this time to discuss what I agree is a tremendously important national issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would commend both of my colleagues who have spoken previously for a well presented and well articulated presentation of all of the facets of this issue. I would just rise to indicate my agreement with their remarks, and to go on record in support of the pending resolutions before the Committee on Rules which would reestablish a select committee of the House of Representatives to be known as the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct.

Mr. Speaker, my bill, House Resolution 71, was introduced the opening day of the new Congress, January 10, 1967.

Mr. Speaker, I would say, as we have all pointed out here so far today, public office is a public trust. I am sure that most Members of Congress recognize this by maintaining the highest standards of personal conduct. They recognize that the office a public servant holds belongs not to that individual but to the Nation, or to their State, as the case may be.

One of the greatest concerns which we all share is the damage done to the public image of the Congress by the questionable practices, intentional or unintentional, of a few. These actions of the few have quite understandably resulted in a great public indignation, and if we neglect what I consider to be the real problem—a need to tighten up congressional standards and procedures out of which abuse of public office tends to grow—the public would have the right to be even more indignant.

Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER], has commented that a committee similar to the one proposed in the pending resolutions was created in the waning days of the last Congress. I was privileged to have been appointed to serve on that select committee which, as we all know, was able to hold only two meetings. It was recognized during the discussion in those two meetings that the creation of that select committee came far too late in the year to make time sufficient to carry out the responsibilities with which it was charged.

However, I would like to comment that in those two meetings we held, and in which I was privileged to participate, we discussed many of the things that have been discussed on this floor today—how best to set up an objective, efficient, and really judicious committee, and what fields we should go into.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Massachusetts did in her remarks refer to the fact that there have been some fears expressed about this committee becoming a body to foster a witch hunt. I would like to carry her thinking and her criticism a little further. There is a very important other side to this coin. This com-

mittee could also have as one of its very important functions that of protection of the honest people against malicious, irresponsible charges that might be brought in an attempt to embarrass them or to distort the picture. I think it is just as important in this way that the Members of this distinguished body be protected from those individuals or groups who might use a technique of an irresponsible charge in an attempt to influence the outcome of an election or the honesty or the integrity of one of our colleagues.

I have high hope, Mr. Speaker, that this new legislation to create a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct will meet with swift approval. It may not be as much as we should do, but certainly it is the least we can do in these times.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. HECKLER], for yielding me this time.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentlewoman from the State of Washington [Mrs. MAY] for her very penetrating comments. Her remarks certainly reach the heart of the problem. I feel she has made a very important contribution as a result of the experience she has had as a member of the committee in the previous Congress which only held two sessions on the subject of ethical conduct.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlewoman from the State of Illinois [Mrs. REID] who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations and in whom I have great confidence and hope since she, together with others, controls the "purse strings" of the Congress.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my colleagues in the House in this discussion on the need for adequate standards of conduct and ethics for Members of Congress and I would like, at this time to commend the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for the positive stand which she has taken on this issue.

Certainly the events of the past year, and particularly those of the past few months, have focused much nationwide attention on the public image of Congress; and this is a matter which for good reason should cause all of us a great deal of concern. When we talk about the public image of Congress, it seems to me that there are three broad areas to be considered—the structural organization of the House and Senate, their combined functions as a legislative body, and the ethical practices of those who make up these two Houses.

During the past several years, a great deal of worthwhile study has been devoted to the first two areas—the structural organization and functions of Congress. As we know, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress has conducted exhaustive studies in the field, the House Minority Task Force on Congressional Reform and Minority Staffing has submitted its proposals, and there have also been excellent studies made by various groups in the academic world. Last Tuesday, the Senate overwhelmingly passed the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967, which is tangible evidence of the progress being made toward

remedying some of the inadequacies and reforming some of the outdated procedures in the Congress which have been the subject of public criticism for some time.

To, me however, no matter how much we modernize the Congress—no matter how much we reorganize to expedite the legislative process to make it more responsive to the plethora of public problems which confront each session—the public image of Congress will continue to suffer until we forthrightly face the question of ethics and standards. By our own inaction in this important area, Members of both Houses tacitly condone unethical conduct, however infrequent, which may occur among our membership—and such inaction can only serve to continue to cast suspicion on the integrity of all Members and adversely affect the vital quality of public confidence in the people's representatives.

Let me say here and now that I honestly and sincerely think that the great majority of the Members of this Congress are as honorable men and women as you can find. I have no patience with those who decry the prevalence of dishonesty and graft on Capitol Hill because I sincerely believe this is not true. The point I want to make, however, is that in my judgment the public will never be satisfied that the overwhelming majority are honest and decent unless we are willing to prescribe realistic rules to deal with unethical behavior among the very few colleagues involved. Not only will the public not be satisfied to settle for less, they have a right to expect as much.

For this reason, on January 19 I introduced House Resolution 162 to establish a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct in the House of Representatives. My bill provides for a select committee having a bipartisan membership of six majority and six minority Members to be appointed by the Speaker. It would be the duty of the committee to recommend to the House appropriate rules and regulations to insure proper standards of conduct by Members, officers, and employees of this body in the performance of their duties and the discharge of their responsibilities. Furthermore, the committee would have the authority to report by a majority vote, violations of any law to the proper Federal and State authorities.

Such a select committee would also have the power to investigate any violations by Members, officers, or employees of the House of any standards of conduct established by the House or already in effect. This investigation would be made upon receipt by the committee of a complaint, in writing and under oath, made by or submitted to a Member of the House and transmitted to the committee by such Member. Upon the completion of the investigation, the committee may recommend appropriate resolutions of censure for its consideration and action thereon.

I would be the first to concede that my bill may not provide the perfect panacea to deal with this problem, but I feel that all the various legislative proposals introduced thus far, even though they may differ in content and approach, have one outstanding feature in common—

they propose action—and this I think is what the public wants. Furthermore, I feel that an established select committee, if properly constituted and administered, would inspire far greater public confidence than a continuation of the policy of appointing an ad hoc committee to investigate improper activities by any Member as the need arises. We cannot escape the fact that under the Constitution, the House has the specific responsibility of judging the qualifications of Members to sit in this body—and by the same token, I believe we have the corresponding responsibility for insisting upon the highest standards of conduct in the exercise of their official duties after they are seated. Unless we do this, we find ourselves in the untenable position of demanding higher standards from others in Government than from the people's representatives themselves. We are in effect setting up a double standard—and under these circumstances, public indignation is readily understandable. Standards of conduct should apply equally to the executive and legislative branches—and the very existence of a Select Committee on Conduct and Standards would have a salutary effect on the public image of Congress. If this image is deteriorating, as some contend, then we who serve in this body have only ourselves to blame for the absence of remedial action.

In this context, it was most encouraging that the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967 which passed the Senate recently does provide for the establishment of a Select Committee on Conduct and Standards for the House of Representatives. It is encouraging, too, that the Committee on Rules has initiated hearings on the many bills already pending in the House to authorize such a committee. It is my hope that this important issue can be resolved in the near future.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. I wish to thank the gentlewoman from the State of Illinois for her very important and specific contribution to our proposals today. The Congresswomen who have joined with me—the distinguished Congresswomen from New Jersey and from the State of Washington, and our last speaker, the Congresswoman from Illinois—have been very gracious in joining me to underscore our commitment to integrity in public office.

I have acted merely as their spur. They have offered the substance from the proposals in the legislation which they have suggested based upon their experience in Congress, and it is a distinct privilege for me to join with them in underscoring our commitment to this important public cause.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment that it is very obvious the distaff side of the Republican Members of Congress have really organized and are moving in the right direction. I wish to compliment them.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for his gracious compliment.

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

#### SECURITY COUNCIL IS AT FAULT OVER RHODESIAN ISSUE

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] 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 Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the publication, "Rhodesian Commentary" has two articles which are very enlightening relative to the compulsory sanctions which the United Nations Security Council is imposing on Rhodesia. It does seem as though the Security Council has violated one of its basic precepts in taking action against an organization without giving them an opportunity to be heard.

The first article is in regard to the hearing and the second article relates to the lost telegram which the U.N. says they never received from Rhodesia, asking for a hearing.

It is extremely unfortunate that we find our Government being a party to this kind of undemocratic procedure.

The two articles follow:

#### THE STORY OF THE LOST TELEGRAM

The perfidy of the U.N. Secretariat General is revealed in its performance over the request from the Rhodesian Government to be heard by the Security Council.

Only when it was found necessary for the British Foreign Secretary himself to blame the inefficiency of the U.N. Secretariat for an untruthful reply given by his fellow Minister, Mrs. Eirene White, to a question raised in the House of Commons, did the Secretariat consider it advisable to process the telegrams received from Rhodesia.

The telegrams were not in fact the beginning of the story.

Rhodesia's efforts to be heard by the Security Council began in April, 1966, when its telegrams to New York were acknowledged by U Thant by presenting copies to the Security Council and informing the Members that he did not intend to reply to them.

On June 15, 1966, Rhodesia addressed respectful letters to the Secretary General, the President and each member of the Security Council in which a well-documented case was presented of Rhodesia's right to be heard.

#### REQUEST RENEWED

On December 7, 1966, and prior to the opening of the Security Council debate on Rhodesia, telegrams were addressed to the same addressees drawing attention to the earlier written communication of June 15 and renewing the request to be heard. Proof has been obtained that the telegram to the President of the Council was received at 6.12 p.m. on December 7.

On December 19, the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, Mrs. E. White, replied to a question in the House of Commons: "Neither the President of the Security Council nor the U.N. Secretariat have received a request for a representative of the Smith regime to participate in the Council's current discussions on Rhodesia. The question of how the Council should deal with any such request has therefore, not arisen".

The conspicuous falseness of this statement has provoked the British Foreign Secretary, Mr. George Brown, to write, inter alia, on January 30:—

"Mrs. White's reply on December 19 reproduced the information available to us on that date, after the Mission in New York had, at our request, made enquiries in the U.N.

"We, too, were surprised that neither the President of the Council nor the Secretary General had by their own account received this telegram, of whose existence we were aware, and the Mission were therefore instructed to pursue their inquiries.

#### TELEGRAM FOUND

"On December 29 the U.N. Secretariat informed our Mission that they had found the telegram, which had evidently been mislaid in the Secretariat, and that they were putting it before the President of the Security Council (the Uruguayan Permanent Representative).

"On December 30, the latter circulated the telegram to all Members of the Security Council under cover of a note which explained that owing to a regrettable misunderstanding, the telegram had only been made available to the Office of the President of the Council on December 29, when it was at once brought to the attention of the President."

On January 31, a U.N. spokesman admitted in a Press statement that a Rhodesian request to be heard by the Security Council when it discussed sanctions against the "Tan Smith regime last December had simply been mislaid".

He also admitted the telegram had been delivered to the individual members of the Council directly by the commercial cable company, at the time it was first received by the Secretariat.

"Only the original addressed to the President of the Council had been misplaced he added, and the Council Members were told on December 29 that its circulation by the U.N. had "inadvertently been delayed".

#### A RIGHT

So rests at present Rhodesia's endeavours to seek the simple and fundamental right of any individual, let alone a community of over four million, to be heard—a right to ably expressed by U Thant himself when Communist China and North Vietnam were under discussion by the Security Council.

On that occasion he observed: "Of course my attitude regarding Security Council involvement is guided by one single consideration: if the Security Council has to take any action on any dispute, the first prerequisite is that it must be in a position to hear both sides of the question: this is a must".

#### SECURITY COUNCIL IS AT FAULT OVER RHODESIAN ISSUE—CONDEMNED WITHOUT HEARING

One of the aspects of Britain's action in submitting the Rhodesian case to the United Nations which is becoming increasingly clear to people throughout the world, is that Rhodesia was condemned by the Security Council without having a hearing, in spite of the fact that under the U.N. Charter it was obligatory on the Security Council to give Rhodesia a hearing.

The Security Council should have gone through the process of attempting to reconcile the differences between Britain and Rhodesia before applying mandatory sanctions.

Great play has been made of the fact that Rhodesia's application for a hearing did not reach the Security Council in time. This is disputed by Rhodesia, but whatever the merits of the case, it is clear that there was a responsibility on the Security Council to invite Rhodesia to present its case, whether or not it had received an application from Rhodesia to do so.

Last year Rhodesia sent a document to all members of the U.N., setting out Rhodesia's claim for a hearing, and this document has been released by the Ministry of External Affairs.

**OVERRULED**

The document points out that at the time of the Netherlands dispute with Indonesia, while the Netherlands, U.K. and France opposed the proposal that Indonesia should be given a hearing on the grounds that it was not a full sovereign state, they were overruled and the motion to invite the Indonesian Republic representatives to the Security Council was carried despite the votes against by the U.K., France and Belgium.

Some of the points made by delegates during the discussion which took place on the Indonesian case are given.

Australia's U.N. delegate, Col. Hodgson, said: "There is no provision in the Charter stipulating that, in order to appear before the Council a State must be sovereign . . . this is a case where we have to act with a sense of fair play."

"We have heard one side of the case, surely we are entitled to hear the other."

Mr. Johnson, the U.S. delegate, said: "I find no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that the representatives of Indonesia should be invited to the Council table . . . Article 32 referred to States but the plain intent of that Article and of the authors of the Charter was that justice should be done to both parties to a dispute by ensuring that, in cases where more than one State, or one group, or one interest is involved, both parties to the dispute . . . should have a chance to present their views . . ."

Mr. Gromyko, the Russian delegate, said: "I think the Council would be acting unjustly if it refused the legitimate request of the Government of the Indonesian Republic and if it did not allow (their) . . . representatives . . . to participate in our discussion."

**TRADITION AND PRACTICE**

At the time of the Korean conflict, Mr. Malik, the Russian delegate, when, expressly stating that he was acting under Article 32, said: "When considering questions of peaceful settlement, it is the practice of the Council as a rule to invite both parties involved in the hostilities to participate in the consideration and discussion of such questions; that is the tradition and the practice established in the Council."

"It was followed in the consideration of the Palestine question, the question of Indonesia and a number of others."

"Moreover, as is known, both parties were invited regardless of whether or not they were members of the U.N. and whether or not they have been recognised by all members of the Council."

"There have been cases where representatives of parties that are neither governments, nor states, were invited to participate in consideration of such questions . . ."

The document issued in Rhodesia says it would appear that Rhodesia must be invited to attend as clearly the "opposite number" in the dispute with the U.K., and it quotes precedence to establish that Rhodesia should not even have had to apply for a hearing by the Security Council.

It points out that during the discussion of the Corfu Channel dispute between the U.K. and Albania, the President of the Council, the Australian delegate, said: ". . . there would seem to be an obligation on the Council to invite Albania to participate in the discussion . . ."

He later commented: "The Council has invited the Albanian Government to participate in the discussion of the complaint brought against it; that is only fair and it is a procedure which is enjoyed by the Charter. The obligation of the Council . . . as required by the dictates of common justice, is to issue the invitation and give the Albanian Government a reasonable opportunity to be represented."

During the discussion of the Indonesian dispute, the Syrian President of the Council said, with reference to Article 32: "There is

no necessity for a special application to be made by the nation which is not a Member if it is a party to the dispute under consideration. The Security Council is bound to invite such a State to participate, even if it does not apply for participation."

During the discussion of the Vietnam dispute the American delegate, Mr. Stevenson, said quoting Article 32: ". . . I should think it necessary to observe that if the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam wishes to take part in the meetings of the Security Council, it will be the obligation—I repeat, the obligation—of the Council, in accordance with the Article I have just quoted, to invite forthwith representatives of that country at once, to take part in the Council's work."

The French representative, M. Seydoux, agreed.

The Rhodesian document claims that Britain could not veto Rhodesia's representation at the Council, because this was a procedural matter on which the veto could not be used.

In another article in this issue which deals with the "lost" telegram, it is pointed out that U Thant himself had clearly established Rhodesia's right to be heard when he commented on the Vietnam dispute. He said that if the Security Council has to take any action on any dispute, the first *prima facie* is that it must be in a position to hear both sides of the question.

**BUILDING CODE REFORM**

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, a little over a year ago the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations made a series of recommendations to the Federal, State, and local governments for modernizing and updating building codes. The Commission's report, "Building Codes: A Program for Intergovernmental Reform," has focused upon some of the critical problem areas in the field of building codes and has stimulated a good deal of discussion among public officials and leaders in the building industry.

Last summer I called my colleagues' attention to the policy statements adopted by two major organizations of public officials—the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National Association of Counties—concerning building code reform.

More recently, a number of articles dealing with the Commission's recommendations have been published. An excellent appraisal of some of the Commission's recommendations appeared in the November 24, 1966, issue of the Engineering News-Record. The editors of this publication have performed a public service in bringing their expert opinion of the building code situation to the attention of their readers.

The text of the editorial follows:

**ARCHAIC, CHAOTIC BUILDING CODES IMPEDE CONSTRUCTION TECHNOLOGY**

In a thick volume entitled 1967 State Legislative Program, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR),

has made several controversial recommendations designed to accelerate building code modernization, to encourage uniformity, and to improve the quality of building department personnel. ACIR urges the drafting of a model national building code and promulgation of state and model codes, based insofar as possible, on the national model code. To strengthen construction's perennially weakest link, inspection, ACIR recommends state licensing of inspectors.

As a high-level group comprising representatives from federal, state, and local governments, ACIR is considered important enough to cause concern among opponents of its proposals. Early this year the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, prodded by members who produce building materials, began mobilizing its dormant Construction Industry Advisory Committee to fight the national code proposal and other "threats" in the ACIR report.

**IN DIVERSITY, STRENGTH?**

Some of the familiar protests greeting these proposals come, of course, from the various owners of oxen that might be gored. Dissenters on the ACIR itself raise the specter of dictation by higher governmental authority—city officials fearing domination by state government, state officials fearing domination by the federal government. There are also less partisan objections, conservative views that, whatever shortcomings exist in our present system, things will get worse if the ACIR's proposals are accepted.

The idea of a national building code inspires the most fear and suspicion among ACIR's opponents. The specter of a "federal takeover," a central government dictation to states and municipalities, lurks behind this suspicion. If we have a national building code, promulgated for voluntary adoption by state and local governments, we risk—these opponents claim—anything from totalitarian control to stultification of building technology.

Some opponents press the argument that code diversity promotes free enterprise; that the myriad code-writing bodies, by sharpening competition, somehow help the manufacturers contending for approval of products. They claim that code chaos at least precludes the rule of one strike and you're out.

Transplanted to major-league baseball, this argument would have the suppliers of baseball equipment supporting individual rules for each city instead of uniform league rules. Each manufacturer could then compete more vigorously for acceptance of his products by the hometown club and the umpires. In Dodger Stadium the regulations might permit plank-sized bats, and baskets for outfielders.

**THE PRICE OF CHAOS**

Building codes, of course, are only one obstacle to technological progress in building, but they are basic and insidious. The more obviously ridiculous provisions that needlessly raise costs, generate red tape, and harass designers and builders are only the visible handicaps. But the potential innovations that die premature deaths in the minds of designers, contractors or manufacturers who are discouraged from trying them are incalculable. If we could focus efforts largely dissipated in repetitive investigations endlessly reenacted by individual city, state and even national code-writing bodies into a concentrated national effort, we could make great improvements in our codes.

Notwithstanding the disclaimers by defenders of the status quo, the costs of archaic codes are undoubtedly tremendous. In residential construction, generally agreed to be the worst hampered by code obsolescence, a HOUSE & HOME study of a conventional house priced at \$16,500 indicated an additional \$1,000 was squandered in needless expense required by perhaps a majority of communities.

A 1963 survey by the National Association of Home Builders revealed that, for example, nearly half of the 1,200 surveyed communities prohibited concrete post and grade beam foundation walls.

Archaic codes are not confined to small cities or to residential construction. New York City's existing code, last revised in 1938, is basically a relic of the late Nineteenth Century. Estimated savings that might be realized by enactment of the city's newly written code range from \$10 million to \$100 million a year, depending on whether they are computed at 1% or 10% of the city's annual \$1-billion-plus building bill.

The established modern building techniques banned under the existing New York code range from dry-wall gypsum partitions to precast, prestressed concrete. Sharing in this negative distinction of banning prestressed concrete is Boston, and until last year, when it lost a four-year court battle, Chicago stubbornly fought to deny the benefits of this long-proven material.

One of the materials most handicapped by archaic building codes is masonry. Under the existing bearing-wall provisions of U.S.A. Standards Institute (formerly the American Standards Association), the basis for most U.S. building codes, masonry bearing-wall design has been frozen in the horse-and-buggy era. As a consequence, a structurally sound design permitting 8-in. bearing walls for a 25-story building designed to conform with Canada's National Building Code would have to have 20-in.-thick walls for the first eight stories in most U.S. communities. Until the battle is won to get the Structural Clay Products Institute's new recommended building requirements accepted by all the major code-writing bodies, and by the many localities that don't accept these code authorities, brick bearing-wall construction will continue laboring under severe, needless handicaps.

In some communities the ultraconservative provisions in the building codes spring from willful exercise of local power as well as professional incompetence and timidity in their building officials and inertia in their legislative councils. Among other ludicrously conservative provisions imposed by the building code in Parma, Ohio, for example, is a ban on 2x4 roof trusses at 24-in. centers. An Ohio court, however, upheld the right of Parma to impose its archaic code in a decision against builders who sought to have the questionable provisions nullified as arbitrary and capricious.

#### SYSTEMS BUILDING LAGS

If codes are a drag on the present, they can be a virtually insurmountable barrier against the future. Lack of uniformity alone impedes the modest move toward prefabrication that has taken place to date. In comparing code standards for floor construction in 12 of his market areas, a home manufacturer cited in the ACIR report found that design live loads varied by 33%, and span limits by 32 in., for the same floor joists, and plywood subfloor thickness by 1/4 in.—from 3/8 to 1/2 in. To exploit the benefits of standardization, the fabricator must design components to meet the highest standard, at additional material cost and overhead administrative expense required merely to unravel the added red tape.

Prefabrication techniques that are becoming commonplace in industrialized building systems of Europe would run into difficulty in most U.S. communities. Connections of precast concrete wall-and-slab panel construction, which is helping dent the Europeans' housing shortage, pose an obstacle in this country.

Evaluation and approval of complete building systems for use throughout the nation is one future benefit promised by a national model code commission, according to the ACIR. Central approval by a prestigious national commission could accelerate progress by giving any builder,

designer or manufacturer a convincing argument to present to a city council or building official.

Perhaps the complacent members of the construction industry could profit from some words from A. Allen Bates, chief of the Building Research Division of the National Bureau of Standards. With the construction volume of decades now equal to the volume of past centuries, the tremendous demands on the construction industry can't be met by traditional methods. All other industrial nations are moving toward adoption of a single building code, and the United States can hardly follow a unique course, says Bates. For a variety of reasons, the U.S. is lagging in industrialized construction. Building code modernization and uniformity would remove a formidable obstacle.

Several of the Advisory Commission's recommendations emphasize the need for cooperation between the building industry and public officials. A new group called the Committee for Code Improvement has just been organized to encourage adoption of uniform modern building codes by localities and States in the New England area. Jon Robison, a staff writer for the Hartford Times, describes the significance of this new organization's program in a recent article. Mr. Robison points out that the committee is represented by many segments in the construction field who often have been bitter enemies in the building code battleground.

The text of the story from the Times follows:

#### ALLIANCE SEEKS UNIFORM BUILDING CODE FOR NORTHEAST

(By Jon Robison)

AUBURN, MASS.—An alliance for a common purpose has been formed by often bitter enemies in the construction field—the wood, steel, concrete and plastics industries, architects, engineers, builders, public officials and the carpenters' union.

The new group, called the Committee for Code Improvement (CCI) met this week in Auburn, Mass. and heard a federal expert support its efforts for uniform modernized building codes for New England.

The group feels that if a 10 inch thick foundation or plastic pipe is adequate for a building in, say, West Hartford, it should be adequate for the same building in East Hartford, Simsbury, New Haven or Voluntown.

Connecticut, like most states, has a model building code which any town can adopt—and many have. The code is based on the one drafted by the Building Officials Conference of America (BOCA).

But any town can tack on any added restrictions to the state code, and many do. These restrictions are usually the product of intensive lobbying by various groups.

No town can afford to do its own research; few towns can afford to hire scientists and engineers capable of analyzing the research performed by the U.S. Government, BOCA, or one of the other national groups.

So, a town's restrictions, in the opinion of the CCI, are often decided by who has the best lawyer, or the best local political connections.

Many in the new group have no stake in the building materials industry. They just want to get rid of restrictions they think are arbitrary and which retard construction and make it more expensive.

CCI members said they didn't care which of the national codes (there are four major ones) was the basis for state laws in New England.

The BOCA code is commonest, but CCI

members said there were no significant differences between it and the others.

BOCA is a conference at which most of the different sides in the buildings materials industry are present to argue for their products. There is an apparent tendency for the influence of each side to equalize and leave the decision in the hands of the disinterested parties present.

The BOCA code is an extremely cumbersome instrument, far too large to be digested by any individual town official.

The BOCA code booklet itself is 464 pages long, and the entire code is a library. The BOCA code refers to hundreds of other books, pamphlets, manuals, and other documents. For example, its standards for a certain type of paint would be another book, often published by the U.S. Bureau of Standards. Some of the "referents" used in the BOCA code are a few pages long, others are thick volumes.

Maurice Roddy, Greenwich town director of buildings, said that the CCI was not posing to prohibit towns from writing their building codes as they saw fit. But the group was proposing a bill which would make it easier and cheaper for towns to adopt the state law without changes, and make it more difficult for a town to adopt its own rules.

But the government expert addressing the CCI called for more radical new laws.

He was James Pickford, senior advisor for the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, a presidential commission of various government leaders and private citizens which includes Gov. Dempsey and New Haven Mayor Richard Lee.

He advocated a state law giving a state building code agency the right to overrule any modification of the state code within a town. Pickford also would establish a state board of appeals against any administrative decision by a town.

Pickford also advocated laws facilitating the modernization every year of the state and local codes. The BOCA code is changed every year, after vigorous arguments and extensive experimentation to weigh technological innovations.

Pickford proposed as well state licensing of a town's chief building inspector, and states laws to encourage smaller towns to share the services of technical specialists.

Those at the CCI meeting greeted Pickford's suggestions warmly, except for some Rhode Island and Massachusetts building inspectors, who objected strongly to the licensing suggestion.

The role of the States in building code reform is an extremely important one. I understand that the State of California is presently removing conflicts among building construction standards used by a number of its agencies. Editor James McCawley of the American Roofer & Building Improvement Contractor presents a convincing argument for State action in the December 1966 issue of this magazine.

Mr. McCawley's editorial follows:

#### BUILDING CODES/PERFORMANCE OR SPECIFICATION

(By James McCawley)

The Government of the United States thinks there are too many building codes, and building material manufacturers are in total agreement with the Government, but that is where agreement ends, for these manufacturers prefer to live unhappily with local building codes rather than have the Government draft a building code that would cover the entire nation.

At a recent meeting of the Building Research Advisory Board (a unit of the National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council) a brief discussion of building codes made it seem apparent that if the

building industry did not originate a national building code, the U.S. Government would.

In 1965 President Johnson asked Congress to initiate an investigation of building codes, and the fire thus lit flamed into a \$1,500,000 appropriation for a study by the Housing and Urban Development Department, despite the fact that the agency head, Secretary Robert Weaver claims that no federal building code is contemplated.

There is in fact a national building code drafted by the Building Officials Conference of America, which could be adopted tomorrow says BOCA. Not so—says the International Conference of Building Officials, the Southern Building Code Conference and the American Insurance Association, all of whom make similar claims for their codes, and incidentally all four have done an excellent job of code drafting.

Building codes can be divided largely into two types—Specification codes and Performance codes. The former is beloved of politicians who have used them to reward their friends and punish their enemies by finding loopholes for approval of a non-listed specification, or disapproval of an improvement on a listed specification. The late Sewell Avery of U.S.G. countered a Chicago politician's offer of aid for a fee in connection with a product by a strident—"Not a cent for tribute". Chicago has since adopted a Performance Code, under which products old and new adhere to a certain standard, rather than a specified number of piles.

Across the nation there are literally thousands of city building codes. To eliminate an estimated \$100,000,000 added to building costs by conflicting codes in California, the State is drafting a Uniform Building Code, which has been favorably received by all cities except San Francisco. It is our opinion that State Codes offer the best opportunity to the building industry to aid in the drafting of modern performance codes.

Finally, the Advisory Commission has pointed out that modernization of building codes will be meaningless unless States and localities take steps to improve code administration and employ competent building officials who can deal with an increasingly wide variety of building practices and materials. The following article by Paul E. Steiger, staff reporter for the Wall Street Journal, discusses the serious problem of dishonest inspection practices:

**NEW YORK, LOS ANGELES STRIVE TO HALT PAY-OFFS TO BUILDING INSPECTORS—INVESTIGATORS TAIL, PHOTOGRAPH SUSPECTED OFFICIALS; GRAFT FLOURISHES IN SOME CITIES**

(By Paul E. Steiger)

**LOS ANGELES.**—Who watches the city building inspector while he watches contractors and landlords?

In most cities, probably nobody—a fact that for years has helped produce great temptations for building inspectors to take graft. Although most city inspectors are no doubt honest, law enforcement officials strongly suspect that more than a few around the country have long been collecting fat payoffs from contractors and building owners.

In Los Angeles and New York City, however, accepting bribes has become a risky proposition. D. O. Woodward, the genial chief investigator for Los Angeles' department of building and safety has 19 undercover men available to keep a close watch on any city inspector suspected of graft.

Charles G. Moerdler, New York City's commissioner of buildings, won't reveal how many secret agents he has tailing the city's 900 inspectors. But there is no secret about the results Mr. Moerdler's men have achieved in the 11 months they have been on the job.

Their work has led to suspensions and grand jury investigations of inspectors charged with taking bribes in all five of New York's boroughs. In Manhattan alone, 10 inspectors have been charged with graft.

#### SHADOWING CITY INSPECTORS

New York investigators sometimes pose as landlords or contractors to catch crooked inspectors. Often they gather evidence simply by shadowing inspectors. In October a grand jury indicted three city painting inspectors for allegedly taking \$400,000 in bribes over a nine-year period.

A few weeks earlier, 12 of the New York fire department's 13 electrical inspectors were suspended after being charged with soliciting bribes. Investigators found the fire inspectors were receiving "tips" ranging from \$5 to \$150 for their inspections. "I've been in the department for 18 years, and this was going on before I got here," one of the suspended fire inspectors told investigators.

Besides spotting grafters, Mr. Moerdler's men have uncovered a number of gold brickers in the inspectors' ranks. One investigator tailed five inspectors to the beach, where they spent the day, and followed another to a New York race track.

To nab dishonest Los Angeles inspectors, Mr. Woodward's men sometimes rely on hidden microphones and long-range photographs. As an example, Mr. Woodward recalls what happened after one Los Angeles building owner reported that an inspector had demanded money.

Just before the inspector made his rounds again, Mr. Woodward equipped the landlord with a microphone concealed in a tie clasp and connected to a pocket tape recorder. Knowing that courts often won't consider evidence gathered by "bugging," Mr. Woodward also had a team of his agents hiding inside a bakery truck to photograph the payoff. The inspector was convicted on bribery charges.

New York and Los Angeles officials also have tightened up procedures in their building departments and streamlined paperwork involved in reporting building violations to reduce opportunities for graft. But in many other cities bribing inspectors is an expensive way of life for building owners and contractors—or so say some who concede they have made such payoffs.

#### KEEPING BRIBES "SMALL ENOUGH"

No one is certain how much money building inspectors gather illicitly but there are indications the sum is substantial indeed. One newly retired contractor who now lives in San Francisco says he has paid off inspectors in Boston, New York, New Orleans and Cape Kennedy. The bite ran as high as 10% of the cost of a construction project, he says, although it usually was 5% or less. A bribe is "always just small enough that it won't inflate bids way out of line," when the contractor passes the cost of graft along to taxpayers and customers by adding the payoff to the project's estimated cost, says the retired builder.

There is a great temptation to offer an inspector payola. His decisions can halt work on construction jobs and may mean the difference between profit and loss for a contractor. A friendly inspector sometimes will even make inspections at night and on weekends to help a builder speed completion of a project.

"You've got to get along with an inspector just to get the same breaks the competition is getting," claims a San Francisco builder. "Sometimes it's either bribe him or go over his head, and usually it's easier to bribe him." Joseph Pass, general manager of Pioneer Builders in Los Angeles, says an inspector recently slowed one of his projects by a week when he ordered work stopped on a house until four vents required by building codes were installed.

Mr. Pass didn't try to bribe the inspector, and he says the official "was within his rights." But Mr. Pass believes "if we'd had a better relationship and he had been familiar with the quality of our work, he could just as easily have let us go ahead with other work while we were having the vents put in."

Another Los Angeles builder, however, boasts of his success in going over the head of an inspector who couldn't be bought. The builder had a sizable contract to repair a building damaged during the Watts riots. "I figured out a way to cut a few corners and turn a real nice profit on this thing," says the builder. But "the inspector, a young guy, didn't want to give me a permit until I had the plans okayed by the engineering department. I tried having lunch with him, to let him know there would be something in it for him if he went along, but it was no go."

So the contractor says he went to see a private consultant who has friends in the city engineering department. For \$150 the consultant told a city official, "this guy's all right," and got permission to start on the project before it was formally approved, says the contractor.

To establish friendly relations, most contractors rely on occasional lunches for inspectors they deal with regularly. Christmas presents, typically gift-wrapped bottles of liquor, are standard procedure. "Who can be bought for a bottle of booze?" asks the owner of a Chicago remodeling firm. "It's just a way of trying to be nice, that's all." But inspectors also have been known to receive more valuable gifts, including color television sets and free weekends at expensive vacation resorts.

#### CROSSING THE LINE

Whatever the value of the gifts involved, "sooner or later the contractor begins to feel the inspector is his man, and the inspector begins to feel he is owed these presents," says Arnold G. Fraiman, New York City commissioner of investigation. When that happens, the line between friendship and bribery has been crossed, says Mr. Fraiman.

Los Angeles forbids its inspectors to accept gratuities of any kind, including lunch, from contractors or landlords. The city sends letters each winter to remind builders and owners that acceptance of any gift by an inspector "could affect the objective judgment of the recipient and would definitely impair public confidence" in his integrity. "If you're doing a good job and he wants to show his appreciation, let him write you a letter of commendation," Mr. Woodward tells inspectors. San Francisco allows inspectors to accept lunch, but not gifts, from contractors.

Sometimes there isn't even a pretext of friendship involved. A site superintendent at an industrial development in Southern California says an inspector recently informed him he expected a bottle of bourbon each week when he visited the project. About 20 miles away, a contractor says several building inspectors have told him recently that "some other inspector they know of is getting this or that from other contractors." He says, the inspectors haven't asked for bribes, "but you know what they're hinting at. If you play dumb and don't come across, they start showing up a week late" to make their inspections.

#### A PUMP PROBLEM

A homebuilder in suburban Chicago tells of a recent incident in one village where housing codes allow the building commissioner to decide whether a new house must have a sump pump in its basement. On sites where good drainage and adequate sewers make flooded basements unlikely, the pumps presumably aren't needed.

But when the commissioner inspected 21 new houses the Illinois contractor was putting up on high ground, he told the builder, as the builder remembers his words: "It will

cost you \$100 a house to put in the pumps. For \$50 a house, you don't have to put them in. Take it or leave it." The builder adds: "I took it. If you don't play ball, he'll be back the next day citing you for faulty soil grading or something like that."

Contractors say that if they report a shakedown attempt they expect retaliation from friends of the crooked inspector. "If you turn a man in, odds are his friends are going to make life pretty rough for you for awhile," says a West Coast builder.

It is often tough for a city inspector to turn in a contractor or landlord who offers him a bribe. A Los Angeles city official tells of an electrical contractor who took an inspector to lunch at a posh restaurant and gave him an expensive bottle of whisky. Later the contractor offered the inspector \$100 to ignore defects in five neon signs the contractor had installed. The inspector reported the attempted bribe and was suspended for several weeks without pay for accepting the whisky and free lunch. But the contractor wasn't prosecuted, says the official, because the "district attorney's office thought our case wasn't strong enough."

The Advisory Commission's recommendation that States establish professional qualifications for building inspectors and license candidates as to their fitness for employment generally would upgrade inspection practices and discourage such activities as described by Mr. Steiger. I am pleased to advise my colleagues that the Board of Building and Safety Commissioners of the city of Los Angeles has urged the State of California to establish qualifying criteria and to license construction inspectors under the business and professional code. While we should recognize that professionalization means more than requiring qualifying examinations and certifications, building technology in the future undoubtedly will require increasing technical competence on the part of building inspectors. I commend the board for its interest and vital concern for improved methods of building inspection.

The resolution of the board follows:

#### RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Board of Building and Safety Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles are continually considering methods to improve service in the construction field; and

Whereas, the field of construction inspection is of vital concern to the public and industry alike; and

Whereas, it is their desire to create a greater unity in code enforcement and construction inspection; and

Whereas, the professionalizing of construction inspectors would be of great benefit to all; and

Whereas, the establishment of a licensing criteria would guarantee qualified people in the inspection field,

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Board of Building and Safety Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles hereby recommend legislation at the State level to establish qualifying criteria, and license construction inspectors under the Business and Professional Code of the State of California.

ROBERT FENTON CRAIG,  
*President.*

ROY G. LEWIS,  
*Vice President.*

MIKE HOLLANDER,  
*Member.*

ROBERT J. LEE,  
*Member.*

EARLE R. VAUGHAN,  
*Member.*

#### SENATOR HARRISON WILLIAMS CHAMPIONS SENIOR CITIZENS' CAUSE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the junior Senator from New Jersey, the Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., has been associated with, and the author of, many innovative, groundbreaking laws that serve to protect and aid our ill-housed, ill-cared-for, and forgotten senior citizens. Prominent among these accomplishments is his pioneering legislation in the field of effective regulation over mail order land sales that would protect the financial investment of senior citizens who seek an adequate, esthetic homestead to fulfill their retirement dreams. This deserving legislation is now included in the President's 1967 legislative program, and I am proud to add my name to those who desire to see this much-needed protection become the law of the land.

The older Americans community service program offers but another example of legislation for older Americans for which Senator WILLIAMS and I are working cooperatively and tirelessly.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a forthright and deserved appraisal of Senator WILLIAMS' legislative courage contained in an editorial from the March 9 issue of the Nutley Sun, a fine weekly newspaper published in Nutley, N.J.:

#### WILLIAMS ACTS TO PROTECT SENIOR CITIZENS

Demonstrating more patience than is usually credited to public officials, New Jersey's junior United States Senator Harrison Williams has been engaged in a three-year effort to reduce the risks of senior citizens falling prey to real estate promoters palming off unusable land through mail order promotions on the \$10 down, \$10 per month gimmick.

Williams is chairman of a U.S. Senate subcommittee which has held public hearings throughout the country eliciting evidence indicating real estate in the middle of a swamp, a desert, a flood control area, the side of a mountain or a remote arid plateau has been sold to gullible citizens through misrepresentation, misleading advertising and outright fraud.

Last week Senator Williams presided over open hearings in Washington on the proposed Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act, legislation required to establish effective authority over mail order land sales to protect both the buyer and the legitimate seller against financial loss.

State laws are inadequate to protect the elderly person looking for an idyllic retirement home who is beguiled by the blandishments contained in misleading advertisements. They must be protected from the sleazy real estate operator interested in a fast buck and promising a paradise in the southern climes only to end up with a piece of inaccessible land or swampy wilderness.

It is not new for Williams to champion seemingly lost or politically unrewarding causes. It was Senator Williams who originally focused the public spotlight upon the deplorable living conditions of the migrant

worker—espousing a cause to upgrade the living standard of non-voting workers, and since the migrant can't and doesn't vote, it is obvious Senator Williams' only interest was strictly humanitarian.

Senator Williams, a Democrat, continues to discharge the duties and responsibilities of his office as an American, unmindful of party labels, in much the same manner as our senior Senator, Clifford P. Case.

New Jersey is most fortunate to be represented in the United States Senate by men of the stature, dedication, and ability of Case and Williams.—F.A.O.

#### AIR POLLUTION CONTROL: TIME FOR ACTION IS RUNNING OUT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, evidence continues to mount on the deadly menace of air pollution. Warnings of climactic conditions conducive to development of dangerous pollution situations are increasingly frequent. We can well fear that one of these days an alert will precede a genuine crisis, for we live in an ocean of air we must breathe, polluted or not.

All levels of government must now act. The study and evaluation time is past. Much depends, of course, on the Federal Government, through aid under the Clean Air Act and the establishment and enforcement of regional standards of control. But there is also an essential role for the individual States. In New Jersey action is awaited on legislation that would give the State powers to deal effectively and rapidly with the sources of pollution. The Newark Star-Ledger, in an editorial on March 13, stressed the urgency of action now, and I place the editorial in the RECORD together with my remarks:

#### LESS TALK, PLEASE

New Jersey's air pollution problem has been minutely reviewed and studied; it has been talked about and discussed interminably. There is virtually little ground that has not been covered in these areas; it should be clear to anyone intimately involved with this affliction to the public health that the time has arrived for action.

The current hearings on air contamination disclose that the same topics, the same concern, the same demands for governmental action are being spread on the record with deadly repetitiveness.

The statutory sines for direct, forceful action are now available in the packet of five bills before the Legislature. The provisions are geared to the realities of the dire situation of a poisoned atmosphere: The creation of a clean air agency within the State Health Department, fines of up to \$25,000 per day for code violators, and investing of power in the governor's office to close down polluters during an emergency.

This is a meaningful start in Trenton, the realization that the state government must act expeditiously on vigorous enforcement against continued pollution of the air. The federal government must continue to exercise a watchdog vigilance on a regional basis, the overall jurisdiction involving New Jersey and New York; the Interstate Sanitation

Commission also has a vital responsibility in this sector with its new powers in curbing air pollution.

### THE BURDEN OF LEADERSHIP

Mr. MONTGOMERY. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I recently was fortunate enough to receive a copy of an extremely lucid and moving address which was delivered December 5, 1966, by Dr. John A. Hunter, president of Louisiana State University. Dr. Hunter made his remarks, entitled "The Burden of Leadership," at a meeting of Boyd Ewing Post No. 58 of the American Legion.

Dr. Hunter, one of our Nation's leading educators, spoke not as a hawk, not as a dove on the situation in Vietnam. He spoke with the cool reflection of an educator of an American. He offers us some intelligent advice on how to face the pivotal years which lie ahead for Americans, for mankind.

Boyd Ewing Post No. 58 approved a resolution in which it adopted Dr. Hunter's address as an affirmation of the post's position.

The post commander, J. H. Jones, Jr., has been kind enough to send me copies of the post's resolution and Dr. Hunter's address and I am inserting them in the RECORD for the benefit of all of us here today:

#### A RESOLUTION, JANUARY 9, 1967

Whereas, this country is engaged in a difficult and complex test of free-world leadership in opposition to the thrust of communism on many fronts throughout the world and

whereas, United States opposition to that thrust in Viet Nam has generated adverse commentary by individuals and groups both in this country and abroad and

whereas, Boyd Ewing Post #58 of the American Legion supports the basic policy of the United States in opposing Communism, including opposition by armed force in Viet Nam,

be it therefore resolved, that Boyd Ewing Post #58 of the American Legion hereby adopts, as a clear affirmation and statement of this Post's position, the address made to the Post by President John Hunter titled "The Burden of Leadership" on December 5th, 1966.

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution and President Hunter's address be formally transmitted to President Lyndon Johnson, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, the House and Senate of the U.S. Congress, the National Commander of the American Legion, the State Commander, other Louisiana Posts, the *American Legion* magazine, and other national and state news media.

J. H. JONES, JR.,

Commander, Boyd Ewing Post No. 58,  
American Legion, Louisiana State  
University, Baton Rouge, La.

### THE BURDEN OF LEADERSHIP

(By President John A. Hunter)

Public speakers these days are enjoying what appears to be a period of unprecedented oratorical prosperity. Behind every

tree and beneath every rock can be found a likely subject for a public address.

A casual look at contemporary society will give you an idea of what I mean. Among the more popular topics of public discussion in recent months have been the intricate problems of inflation, the shrinking dollar and rising costs at the supermarket. To these we might add the heightening challenges of overpopulation, automation, civil rights and the bomb.

And, finally, we come to the continuing dilemma of Viet Nam. It is a dilemma that has come to be very real to all of us, just as real as the rising cost of bread and milk. It is, unfortunately, a dilemma that in recent months has become a serious, divisive force in the affairs of our nation. Because of the war in Viet Nam, America has become, in many respects, not a nation united, but a nation divided—split asunder into two irreconcilable groups.

On the one hand are the hawks, those who are not yet embarrassed to use the word "victory" in polite company. The hawks view escalation, not as an evil, but as a meaningful military tactic, a tactic that the current situation in Viet Nam clearly calls for. On the other hand are the doves, the Vietniks and the Peaceniks, the apologists of victory, the champions of peace at any price.

I do not presume to be an authority on this or any other war. Nor do I consider myself one of those highly vocal individuals who claims to have the final answers to this most critical problem of our time. I do believe, however, that this seemingly interminable conflict has made apparent a few facts of life which Americans must somehow face. These facts of life are the inescapable burdens of twentieth century leadership.

I speak to you today, not as a hawk, nor as a dove, but as an American—a tired and indignant American. I am tired of the endless attacks that are being made upon the integrity of our nation. And I am indignant that they should come at a time of such crisis, when the stakes may be our very survival.

It is vexing enough that these attacks arise from nations whose ambitions and objectives are at cross purposes with our own. But as you know, such attacks upon the moral character of American government have arisen from within our borders as well, even in the halls of Congress. Let me make it clear that I do not for a moment question the sincerity nor the patriotism of these American voices of dissent. But I do believe that we must challenge their wisdom and their ability—or, rather, their inability—to learn from the lessons of the past.

I, for one, do not regard my government as an international bully that is blindly determined to enforce its will upon the rest of the world. I, for one, do not regard my President as a trigger-happy gunman who by whim and caprice insists upon prosecuting a barbarous war. I, for one, regard my country as one of the few—the woefully few—nations that is willing to take a stand in this time of peril and crisis, that is willing to assume the awesome burdens of leadership.

You and I, gentlemen, have seen the face of battle and the horrors of war. You and I have experienced the uncertainties of impending armed conflict. We have learned—from that dear teacher, experience—of the unspeakable destruction that is unleashed when one nation takes up arms against another.

But we also know—and the world knows—the sheer folly of peace at any price, the utter futility of attempting to appease an aggressor that can never really be appeased.

America today occupies a most unique position, one that perhaps has never before been conferred upon any other world power. On the one hand, America is the leading

power, the world leader in a hundred different fields of human endeavor. In terms of national prosperity, in terms of individual productivity, in terms of international philanthropy and commitment, in terms of concrete contributions to the advancement of mankind the world over, we stand alone, unmatched, unrivaled by the achievements or the capability of any other nation.

But to that story there is a parallel. In our determination to protect the national interests of South Viet Nam, we also stand virtually alone. A mere handful of the world's free nations have stepped forward with tangible and moral support. And what of the rest of the world? They have chosen to follow one of two courses: the politically safe course of neutrality or the easy course of outright opposition.

This, I believe, constitutes a vivid example of the burden of modern-day leadership, an example of the price our nation has paid and can expect to pay in the future as the voice of the free world.

If our goal is popularity, if our overriding objective is to be loved the world over, then it is certainly time to reassess our policies and actions. But as the leader of free nations, we cannot afford the dubious luxury of allowing our policies to be guided by the vagaries of world opinion. There is a higher, more meaningful test to which American policy must be subjected—the test of freedom versus its alternative, the test of right versus wrong.

I firmly believe that in recent months, through our involvement in Viet Nam, one fact of life has been confirmed in spades. It is simply this: If American foreign policy is, in fact, to help protect the interests of smaller nations around the globe, then we should steel ourselves now for what is certain to be an era of perpetual conflict, a lengthy period in which the full burden of international leadership will rest squarely upon our shoulders.

If, as a matter of national policy, we have elected to draw a line of demarcation across the globe, a line which aggressors are forbidden to breach, then we must expect to devote a large measure of our national resources and energies to maintaining that policy, regardless of whether we are joined by a dozen allies or whether we stand alone.

As President Johnson has reaffirmed time and again, that is our policy. The President has declared without compromise, without equivocation, that the interests of our sister nations among the world's community of free nations are, indeed, synonymous with the interests of America.

Thus, in regard to Viet Nam, our responsibility seems unmistakably clear. Let us resolve to get on with the task at hand, to brace our shoulders, tighten our belts and do what must be done to bring peace with honor to that part of the globe.

We can talk of negotiation. We can talk of appeasement. We can shuffle our feet and drag our heels in the hope that by some miracle the aggressor will change his spots, forgo his plan of conquest and agree to peace. But that hope, gentlemen, is merely an illusion, a mirage, a false hope inspired by false prophets.

We have among us in this critical age more than a fair share of false prophets. What America so desperately needs today is a fair share of true citizens who by word and deed indicate a willingness—and a determination—to place national security above international popularity, to prefer the rigors of steadfastness above the ease of retreat.

I refer not to those who would preach a radical brand of patriotism, nor to those who delight in rattling the saber, nor to those whose only thought is to wave a tattered olive branch and spout apologies for America. I speak instead of citizenry whose resolve to pursue and achieve a just and lasting peace is matched only by their love of country.

When future generations reflect upon these times of crisis, they will wonder where did you and I stand. Not long ago there was a popular comedy making the rounds in movie theaters entitled, "What Did You Do In the War, Daddy?" As Legionnaires, we might ask ourselves a similar question today. Where do we stand? How are we contributing to America's determination to do what must be done?

I believe that Legionnaires possess an influential voice that, in these critical times, could well be decisive. Legionnaires command a unique position of leadership, a position from which their voices can become effective instruments in molding public opinion, in reuniting our nation and in restoring the term "victory" to our national vocabulary.

Before I leave this subject, there is one other point that I feel must be made. If we divide the nations of the world according to their political persuasions—with separate categories for the neutrals, the communists and the free world—we find that America belongs to a distinct minority group. We are far outnumbered by our adversaries.

We cannot hope, for example, to match man-for-man Red China's horde of some 750 million people, a majority of whom regularly undergo some form of military training. If, then, we cannot outnumber them, there is but one alternative: We must *outthink* them. We must make more effective use of our intellectual capabilities. We must use to maximum advantage the vast educational resources at our command.

In this age of perpetual crisis and continuous upheaval, there are few doctrines upon which mankind can, with absolute certainty, rely. One of these is the unlimited power of education. Personally, I have no doubt—none whatsoever—that during the challenging years ahead, the very survival of our nation will depend in large measure upon the priorities we assign to education and the extent to which we support it, develop it and use it.

This means that universities such as LSU must redouble their efforts during the pivotal years ahead. We must pursue more diligently than ever before the elusive goal of true educational excellence. We must effectively combine educational quantity with educational quality. We must train and educate more people than ever before, far better than ever before.

This educational challenge represents one of the foremost examples of the burden of leadership that has been placed in America's hands. How effectively we meet this educational challenge could well determine how long that leadership will remain secure in America's hands.

#### NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—XXXII

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, universal military training is suitable only for an age of mass armies, and not, to a complex and technical age, wherein our defenses are associated with rockets, supersonic aircraft, and atomic weapons. The effectiveness and readiness of our military services would be greatly impaired by the tremendous training burden and the constant turnover. Men

under training for a year would just begin to be of usefulness when they would be discharged. Universal military training, then, would only create a partly trained reserve. In addition, our Military Establishment does not need the millions of young Americans that would receive such training.

No one knows what universal military training would cost. Estimates run from \$3 to \$6 billion a year. At the outset, General Eisenhower estimates that the costs would be even greater, due to the building and equipping of many new military camps. Wrote Hanson W. Baldwin:

In short, universal military training might provide military quantity at a price; it would not provide quality.

Furthermore, while supporters of universal military training contend that it is intended and designed to strengthen freedom's defenses, universal military training can carry within itself the very seeds of freedom's destruction. Universal military training etches the pattern to a military state. It tends to emphasize the influence of a purely military power in an age when economic, industrial, technological, and moral powers are even more major elements of national power.

Historically, militarism has no roots in this Nation. De Tocqueville observed, during his travels through the young American Nation, that the American people lacked the militaristic spirit that was so prevalent on the European Continent. He wrote:

The ever-increasing numbers of men of property who are lovers of peace, the growth of personal wealth which war so rapidly consumes, the mildness of manners, the gentleness of heart, those tendencies to pity which are produced by the equality of conditions, that coolness of understanding which renders men comparatively insensible to the violent and poetical excitement of arms—all these causes concur to quench the military spirit.

Let us also recall that many of our ancestors sought refuge in America to escape the arrogance of European militarism.

Fifteen years ago, on March 4, 1952, the House defeated a bill that would have established universal military training. During the floor debate, the words of our first President, urging his fellow countrymen to "avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which, under any form of government, are inauspicious to liberty," were heard echoing throughout this Chamber. Washington's warnings are as relevant today, as when he first made them.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing this resolution to extend the congratulations of this body to the Canadian Parliament on the occasion of the Canadian Centennial.

As chairman of the House delegation to the annual Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, I can unhesitatingly attest to the numerous and close ties between the United States and Canada. The many official and unofficial relations between our two countries are evident on the national as well as individual level. The more than 5,000 miles of undefended frontier between the two countries is as much an example of mutual trust as it is of mutual understanding. And while this may sound like a well-worn cliché, how many other countries in the world can make a similar claim?

Moreover, the unity that is exemplified by the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group is not only a symbol, but a manifestation of the growing harmony that defines our relationship. This is to be seen in our mutually beneficial trade patterns as well as the obligation we share in the defense of North America through the combined command known as NORAD.

So, it is well that we should take time out of our busy days—days when every decision made seems to be a decision which will bring us closer to peace in the world—to recognize the peaceful and harmonious relations that have existed between the United States and Canada since 1867 when the four provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick were united and formed the nucleus for present-day Canada.

I would hope that everyone in the House will vote for this resolution, and that our Canadian counterparts to the north will be reminded of the esteem and respect in which we hold them and their beautiful country.

#### TO PROHIBIT NONRESIDENT TAXATION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, there has grown up throughout the United States during the last half century a discriminatory and inherently inequitable system of taxation by many of the States. I refer to the tax laws of some 29 States which permit the State to tax the income or salary of a person who is neither a resident or domiciliary of that State, but who only performs some service in that State for which he receives some compensation. This has come to be commonly known as nonresident taxation.

To alleviate the unfairness that has surrounded this taxation procedure in the past, I have today introduced legislation to prohibit the States, or any political subdivision thereof, from levying an income tax on persons not residents of or domiciled in that State.

The problem of nonresident taxation is particularly acute in areas surrounding large metropolitan centers. The best example I can think of is the situation

in the New Jersey-New York-Connecticut area, where every day approximately 200,000 people commute from outside the State into New York City to work. New York imposes a nonresident income tax on commuters from New Jersey and Connecticut, and, in fact, from any other State who work and earn their living in New York. The main justification relied on by those who support this tax is that New York State provides certain services to the commuter—part of the cost of which, they feel, should be borne by the commuter.

The statistics, however, tend to discredit this theory. For example, a recent study breaks down the general expenditures of all States and local governments. This study showed that the only expenditure of funds which is substantially used by commuters is for highways and transportation which constitute only 19.3 percent of the total expenditures. On the other hand, commuters do not benefit at all from education, public welfare and health, and hospital expenditures which total 51.3 percent of the overall amount. For the remaining 29.4 percent of the general expenditures—fire, police, sanitation, and so forth—the commuter benefits to some extent, but substantially less than residents. Therefore, in approximately 80.7 percent of the expenditures, the nonresident benefits either not at all, or to only a relatively small extent.

In addition, the nonresident while working in another State will generally pay other taxes—sales taxes, entertainment taxes, gasoline taxes, cigarette taxes—and these all go to pay for the general expenditures of the State.

Therefore, it seems to me that by imposing such a tax, the State requires the nonresident to pay for his equal share—equal to the residents—of the services and benefits derived from this tax revenue, while in actuality he receives little more than 20 percent of the benefits. To require a nonresident to contribute to the expenses of a State in which he happens to earn money is to require him to pay something which in public policy and according to right and justice he does not owe.

It should be recognized that travelers going from State to State are not taxed for the highways they use, other than gasoline taxes, and they are not charged for the fire and police protection or sewer and water facilities they use while in the State. Why, then, should nonresidents working in a State be charged for these same services?

Of equal importance, the nonresident tax violates one of the very basic precepts upon which our Government was founded and which drove the early colonists to rebel—taxation without representation.

A nonresident, by his very status, has no recourse to the State legislative body for he is not a qualified voter of the State. As a result, he has no voice in the taxation policy of the State, much less any voice in other legislative decisions concerning benefits which he is alleged to be receiving and for which he is paying.

The Congress has ample power derived from the commerce clause of the Constitution to enact this legislation. The

nonresidents who travel across State lines are certainly considered to be in interstate commerce. Additionally, most of the businesses in which they are employed are interstate in nature.

The fact that the Supreme Court upheld nonresident taxation some 40 years ago does not mean that the Federal Government may not now preempt the States in this area. Times have changed since 1920. At the time of the Supreme Court decision only a very few States had any income tax in any form. There was no problem requiring congressional action. The decision bears neither relevance nor relation to the power of Congress to act in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the Congress will act this year to remove this inequity of unequal taxation. As long as it continues, a great number of our citizens will suffer discrimination and economic deprivation without justification.

#### RELATION OF NEW JERSEY'S WAR ON POVERTY TO RISING WELFARE COSTS AND CASELOADS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the January 31 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix, a comment on the progress of the war against poverty in New Jersey, and, more particularly, its effect in reducing welfare costs. The comment is based upon an article which appeared in the Newark Sunday News of January 29. The material which I am about to commend to my colleagues is not intended as an apologia of the news story. Rather, it is an effort to place that article in proper perspective. The following comment has been prepared by the New Jersey Office of Economic Opportunity:

#### THE RELATION OF NEW JERSEY'S WAR ON POVERTY TO RISING WELFARE COSTS AND CASELOADS

An article in the January 29th edition of the Newark Sunday News examined the "steady rise in welfare rolls across the state" despite "more than \$77 million worth" of anti-poverty programs. Although the article documents this premise with statistics, the suggestion that a causal relationship exists between the total amount of anti-poverty dollars invested in New Jersey and the rising welfare costs and caseloads needs further analysis and clarification.

To begin with, the article draws an illogical and unfair comparison of unlike factors—the total amount of anti-poverty money committed in New Jersey versus the total number of persons on the welfare rolls.

The total amount of anti-poverty dollars invested in New Jersey since 1964 did, in fact, amount to some \$77 million; but only some \$10 million of that total was devoted to work experience and training programs. Under Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act (including 1966 amendments), these programs provide constructive work experience and job training for needy persons unable to support themselves or their families. Such projects are designed to help them develop

skills which may assist them in finding jobs. This includes unemployed heads of families on welfare, farm families with less than \$1,200 net family income and other needy persons.

Indeed, if any valid measure of the effect of anti-poverty programs on the welfare rolls is to be drawn, only those anti-poverty programs directly related to manpower training and its related services, namely, Title V programs, should be taken into account. The alternative approach—to include some \$60 million in other anti-poverty programs, like Head Start or the Neighborhood Youth Corps which are long range in scope—misuses the general to prove the particular; mixes, so to speak, apples and oranges, and is very misleading.

A more equitable approach would be to measure the effect of this \$10 million in anti-poverty work experience and job training programs, which have been in operation since the war on poverty was launched in New Jersey in October of 1964. At present, there are seven Title V Work Experience programs operating in New Jersey. The State itself operates one project in Passaic County and the cities of Newark and Trenton have been conducting programs for the last two years. In addition, Camden, Union, Monmouth and Bergen Counties have Title V projects.

In all, however, these seven projects—utilizing a sum total of some \$10 million in anti-poverty funds—have reached approximately 3,300 welfare recipients from August 1965, when the program began, through December 31, 1966. Of these, some 820 have found permanent employment and either no longer receive welfare payments or have had their payments sharply reduced; 1,200 are still in training; and about 1,100 are still unemployed after having received training. It is this latter group which is difficult to place in jobs due to a multitude of education, cultural and environmental reasons.

It is misleading and unfair, therefore, to expect seven work experience programs with just \$10 million to reach any more than the 3,300 welfare recipients they were designed to reach. Yet, the article points out that "in spite of all this spending, the number of persons collecting welfare in New Jersey rose from 158,550 in December, 1964, to 187,668 in December, 1966. Total payments rose from \$101 to \$125 million, not counting administrative costs." Such a comparison lacks perspective.

Secondly, it should be noted that only a small number of the 187,668 welfare recipients in New Jersey—comprising just 2.6 percent of the State's population of nearly seven million—are employable; that is, capable of being trained and educated so they may eventually support themselves and their families and leave the welfare rolls. A careful examination of the welfare rolls will demonstrate why.

In the first place, the State welfare rolls are comprised of several different kinds of categories, including: old age assistance for those elderly citizens too old or incapacitated to hold jobs to support themselves and whose social security payments, pensions, or other income are insufficient for their minimum requirements; disability assistance for those New Jerseyites under age 65 who are unable to work because of permanent and totally disabling conditions; blind assistance for financially needy persons who are classified as legally blind and unable to support themselves as a result; medical aid for the aged whose other sources of income cannot cover the costs of major medical expenses; assistance to families with dependent children, if one of the parents is missing from the home or is incapacitated for employment; and general assistance for those people who are either awaiting categorical assistance through one of the above categories or are unemployed,

underemployed or temporarily incapacitated through sickness, lay-off, etc.

Of the approximately 187,000 welfare recipients in New Jersey, some 32,000 or about 16 per cent receive welfare assistance in one of the first four categories, namely, old age assistance, disability aid, blind assistance, or medical aid for the aged. Certainly these recipients should not be included in determining the effectiveness of anti-poverty work training programs in reducing the welfare rolls. For surely no amount of anti-poverty money or programs can ever reduce the number of aged, the number of disabled or handicapped or the number of blind; nor can such programs reduce to any significant extent the number of such persons who are financially needy.

Of the remaining two categories, some 122,000 recipients or 67 per cent of the total number of welfare recipients receive Assistance for Dependent Children. This category provides monetary aid for families with children, if one parent—usually the father—is missing from the home or is incapacitated for employment.

It is important to note, however, that of the 122,070 A.D.C. recipients during November, 1966, some 92,995 or three-fourths (75 per cent) were children; only 29,175 (25 per cent) were adults.

This is significant because only the adults are potential members of the labor force; and for every adult that can be trained to hold a job, two or three times as many children will be removed from the relief rolls.

The question, then, is how many of these nearly 30,000 adults are employable? The answer, unfortunately, is very few. To begin with, 90 per cent of them are mothers; the remaining 10 per cent cover cases where the mother is not in the home and where the children are living with other relatives.

The last "characteristic study" of Assistance for Dependent Children recipients was made in 1961 by the New Jersey State Department of Institutions and Agencies, under the auspices of the federal government. Although the study is now more than five years old, much of its result could be safely applied to the present statistics.

According to that study, approximately two-thirds—65 per cent—of all A.D.C. mothers were classified as needed in the home to care for small children, a disabled husband or some similar reason and, therefore, were unable to work; about eight per cent were already employed, but had earnings insufficient to meet family needs; three per cent had no marketable skills; nine per cent were physically or mentally unable to work; six per cent were actively seeking employment but could not find it; and the remaining nine per cent were unclassified in the survey.

Using those percentages in relation to the 30,000 A.D.C. adults in November of 1966, we will see that some 22,500 were needed in the home and hence unable to work; 2,400 were working but not earning enough to support their families; another 2,400 were physically or mentally unable to work; 900 had no marketable skills and the remaining 1,800 sought but could not find employment.

This is extremely significant: that of 122,000 A.D.C. recipients, only 30,000 are adults, and that of these, only 2,700 were unemployed simple because they could not or would not work.

It is also significant that although the number of A.D.C. recipients increased from 102,218 in November of 1964 (when the anti-poverty program began) to 112,835 in November of 1965 and then to 122,170 in November of 1966, the rate of increase or growth is steadily decreasing. From 1964-65, the rate of increase amounted to 10 per cent; from 1965-66, the rate of increase amounted to eight per cent. This indicates a drop of two per cent in the rate of increase between 1964 and 1966. The same drop in the rate of increase was apparent in the Essex County figures for A.D.C. assistance.

This trend is a salient point, for the increase in numbers corresponds with the increases in population and the increases in welfare costs are in line with rises in the cost of living. The article made no mention of either of these factors.

The last welfare category is General Assistance. A breakdown of this category shows that as of October, 1966, there were some 29,000 persons receiving this kind of welfare aid, distributed through the local municipalities throughout the state.

According to State Division of Public Welfare Statistics, the 29,000 persons aided in October, 1966, represented some 9,762 cases. Of all cases opened in 1966, less than 25 per cent were opened because of unemployment, and less than 10 per cent were opened because of underemployment. Applying these percentages to the October 1966 caseload of 9,672 general assistance cases, less than one third were opened because of unemployed or underemployed people. The great bulk—about 75 per cent—were opened for other reasons, such as pending categorical aid (22.2 per cent), physical or mental disability (33.3 per cent), insufficient income or resources (6.5 per cent) and domestic problems (5.9 per cent).

Further, the Division of Public Welfare Statistics report points out that there was "less case activity in fiscal year 1966 than in the preceding year, with 1,212 fewer cases opened and 601 fewer cases closed. Case closings exceeded case openings by less than one per cent (36,837 closings and 36,534 openings) and the net case load decreased by 303 cases. In contrast, in the preceding year, case openings exceeded case closings by a net of 308 cases (37,746 openings and 37,438 closings)."

The statistics also point out that of all the case closings for FY 1966, employment factors account for the largest percentage. Of all those general assistance cases during FY 1966, 23 per cent were closed due to "return to employment", six per cent due to "increase in employment income" and two per cent due to "receipt of unemployment compensation benefits." "Combined, the three reasons account for 31.81 per cent of the total, about four percentage points less than the corresponding year," the report adds.

I think this careful scrutiny of the welfare rolls gives raw statistics a new meaning and perspective. As has been shown, only a small portion of the 187,000 welfare recipients are actually potential workers, and as such able to be reached, so to speak, by anti-poverty or any other kind of work training programs.

Whatever the causes, however, the anti-poverty program must not be regarded as a short term solution to problems that have taken decades to emerge. There are no quick answers, no easy solutions, no cure-alls for all of society ills. It is hardly practical or even feasible to measure the effect of 10 million dollars worth of anti-poverty programs in just two short years. All new programs, especially those of the war on poverty which embrace new and sometimes radical approaches to solve these problems, must be judged by their long-term effect on the problems they were created to combat.

There is no way to estimate the sum total of disadvantaged who may have been on the welfare rolls today were it not for some form of anti-poverty assistance provided somewhere along the way. Who is to judge whether the welfare rolls might have been larger yet, whether the rate of increase might have spiraled upward, instead of downward, were it not for anti-poverty projects that are preventive, rather than corrective in nature? These issues cannot and should not be answered now. Only time will tell.

During the two short years since the Economic Opportunity Act was enacted, the Federal Government has taken a new look at family planning as a potential weapon against increasing welfare rolls. The coun-

try has witnessed a full cycle—from President Eisenhower's disavowal of any government participation in family planning, to President Johnson's endorsement of such proposals—without coercion—in both anti-poverty and welfare programs. In time, New Jersey and the other states may find in this a partial solution to the size of the dependent population.

In his recent Economic Report to the Congress of the United States, President Johnson reaffirmed this country's commitment to "end poverty within its borders." But he added: "Yet, with old weapons and new, the war on poverty will not be won in 1967—or 1968. There is no wonder drug which can suddenly conquer this ancient scourge of man. It will be a long and continuing struggle, which will challenge our imagination, our patience, our knowledge and our resources for years to come. Our capacity to stay with the task will be a test of our maturity as a people."

But this is only the beginning. Much remains to be done. There is need for better coordination of federal money, for streamlining the costly investigative procedure of welfare eligibility, for new and innovative ways to reach those mothers of dependent children whose husbands are not at home, and for providing increased job opportunities for persons presently frustrated in their quests for employment. And finally, there is the need to recognize that, even with all these programs and more, the problems of unemployment will not be eliminated overnight.

A November 7, 1966 edition of *Newsweek* puts it clearly: "But the depth of the problem is a dimension seldom faced squarely either by its victims or its would-be solvers: the fact that most of the hard-core unemployed are, by traditional economic definitions, unemployable. They are, in brief, persons with records of defeat and consequent emotional problems, with few skills and little or no independent interest in acquiring them, and often with a low motivation to do a good job even if a job comes their way."

#### VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA

Mr. MONTGOMERY. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Americans—and particularly young Americans—are not selfish people. Most stand ready to help their neighbors, whether they live next door or in another country. All that many need to make a real contribution to the needs of others is opportunity—a way to channel their energies and interest in the proper direction. The Peace Corps provided such a way for service in foreign countries and the response was tremendous and gratifying.

Now VISTA offers a similar opportunity to serve the poor in this country and people young and old are meeting the challenge. By summer it is expected that more than 4,000 VISTA volunteers will be teaching and helping organize community action in places as different as city slums and Appalachian hollows.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has called for even greater efforts to permit

more full and part-time volunteers to be of service as this struggle goes on to help the poor help themselves.

VISTA volunteers have helped hundreds of communities and neighborhoods participate in the programs set up for them, and take action to help themselves.

VISTA volunteers live and work amidst poverty conditions. Their unusual position enables them to reach people and motivate them, to help them to change their attitudes. They are spokesmen and advocates for communities which often have no other effective spokesman.

In many of the 400 urban and rural communities where they serve under local antipoverty agencies, VISTA volunteers have helped to bring about change.

They have helped residents to form community and block organizations that give them a new voice in the community.

They have persuaded tens of thousands of people to discard apathy and make a fight for opportunity.

They have informed the poor where opportunities and services could be found. They have put them in touch with health, education, employment, and legal services.

They have helped the poor develop and run self-help programs.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the 3,300 VISTA volunteers now in service, more than 1,000 have finished a year of service and left the Corps. These VISTA volunteers have shown there is no substitute for a worker who lives in the slum and shares the problems—such as dysentery from drinking polluted water, rats and cockroaches, and uncollected garbage.

VISTA recently launched an exciting new effort to enlist 100,000 part-time volunteers in the war on poverty. This Citizens Corps is a major broadening of VISTA to include those students, professional people, and others who want to serve 10 or 15 hours a week in their hometown or campus. Local agencies operate Citizens Corps projects in cooperation with VISTA. Selected VISTA volunteers are assigned to coordinate and set up these part-time programs under the local agencies.

This new corps is expected to infuse much-needed manpower into poverty areas where help is needed most.

Eventually, the program is expected to need 1 million part-time volunteers.

Mr. Speaker, VISTA has become one of the most important programs in the antipoverty effort, and I am delighted that the President has given it such a prominent place in his message on America's unfinished business.

**MRS. JOHNSON VISITS CHARLESTON, W. VA.**

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, March 13, the citizens of West Virginia and particularly those from my own district of Charleston, had the distinct honor to welcome into our community the wife of the President of the United States, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson. The First Lady visited Charleston as part of her "adventure in learning" tour which is designed to observe first-hand some of the accomplishments that our citizens have made in the field of education with the assistance of Federal programs, such as those sponsored by the office of Economic Opportunity and the Office of Health, Education, and Welfare.

One of these programs that Mrs. Johnson had the opportunity to visit was the Women's Job Corps Center in Charleston. The 300 young women who are enrolled at the center greeted the First Lady with a warm and friendly welcome that particularly delighted her. She had the chance to meet each girl personally and exchange a few words; something that will long be remembered by the Job Corps women. Most of the girls at the center come from deprived and broken homes and it was heartening for Mrs. Johnson to learn that the Job Corps women have developed a nursery school which they use in their spare time to care for some of the children of needy families in the Charleston area.

Mrs. Johnson visited other educational centers in Charleston, including Glenwood and Woodrow Wilson Junior High Schools. Everywhere she was received with the cordiality and cheerfulness that is extended to a true friend, and one who happens to be the wife of our President.

Like her husband, Mrs. Johnson has a deep and abiding commitment to the principles of improving educational advantages to all of our citizens, ranging from the Headstart program, to the Job Corps, and efforts in the field of higher education.

On behalf of the citizens of Charleston, I wish to acknowledge our deepest gratitude to the First Lady for her visit to our community and extend our fondest hope that she will visit us again very soon.

**A MODEL VICE PRESIDENT**

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, HUBERT HUMPHREY has done an outstanding job in every public office to which he has been elected. I first entered Minnesota politics in the 1940's in support of HUBERT, and I have never ceased to admire him.

Last week President Johnson recognized the outstanding contribution HUBERT HUMPHREY is making to American public life, and the Washington Post praised him as the "model Vice President." I join in the approval of the Vice President, and include the Washington Post editorial with my remarks:

**A MODEL VICE PRESIDENT**

It is good to know that President Johnson appreciates the qualities of Vice President Hubert Humphrey as a public servant. His kind remarks about the Vice President at the press conference on Thursday certainly are deserved. It would be dismaying indeed if the President did not hold these views.

The Vice President has brilliantly succeeded in an office that presents the greatest difficulty to a man of his temperament and genius. Congress has given him two special tasks to which he devotes great attention—outer space and undersea exploration. The President has showered him with special duties and missions. He has dealt with all of them competently and quietly. History will have to disclose how valuable he has been in the inside councils of the Administration but there is reason to believe he has been very useful there.

The most important legacy that he will leave the country will be a concept of the Vice Presidency that fits both its subordinate position in the Executive Branch and the necessities of modern administration. Not for an instant has he allowed himself a word or a deed that would indicate any confusion about the place where there resides the constitutional duty and power to speak for the Government of the United States. He has rightly said, and repeatedly said, that there can be only one authoritative voice—and that is the voice of the President. He has been the President's echo on every public policy discussion of the Administration. And whenever the Vice President, under our system, tries to be anything other than that, "the trumpet maketh an uncertain sound."

No wonder the President admires his public service. The thoughtful citizens of this country also admire it and understand it. He is, in truth, the very model of a model Vice President.

**PATENT REFORM ACT HEARINGS**

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Judiciary, through its Patents, Trademarks, and Copyright Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, has scheduled public hearings on H.R. 5924, the Patent Reform Act of 1967, and companion measures. The hearings will begin on Monday, April 17, 1967, at 10 a.m. Transmitted by the President and introduced by our subcommittee colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, BOB KASTENMEIER, this important legislation is designed to aid America's economic growth by strengthening the U.S. patent system.

The patent system is as old as our Nation. It has not been substantially revised since 1836. Meanwhile, major developments have radically altered our technology, placing great strains on the patent system and affecting its functioning. In this context, the President, by Executive Order No. 11215, dated April 8, 1965, established a Commission on the Patent System and directed its activities toward, first, ascertaining the degree to which our patent system currently serves our national needs and interna-

tional goals; second, identifying any aspects of the system which may need change; third, devising possible improvements in the system; and fourth, recommending any legislation deemed essential to strengthen the U.S. patent system. The Commission transmitted its report to the President on November 17, 1966, unanimously agreeing that a patent system today is capable of continuing to provide an incentive to research, development, and innovation. The report contains 35 major recommendations designed to improve and modernize the system.

H.R. 5924 is based in substantial part upon the Commission's report. Its purposes are threefold:

First, to raise the quality and reliability of U.S. patents; second, to reduce the time and expense of obtaining and protecting a patent; and third, to speed public disclosure of scientific and technological information.

These changes are also expected to bring the U.S. patent system into closer harmony with those of other countries.

I have requested Congressman KASTENMEIER to preside over the subcommittee's hearings on his bill and he has agreed to do so.

The subcommittee wishes to afford all interested persons the opportunity of submitting their views on this vital legislation.

Persons desiring to testify or to submit written statements relative to the measure should address themselves to Mr. Herbert Fuchs, subcommittee counsel, room 2137, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

#### PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE COMMISSION BILL PASSES THE SENATE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to note that the Senate yesterday passed legislation to establish a statutory Pennsylvania Avenue Commission to oversee formulation of plans for development of this beautiful and historic boulevard, subject always to congressional approval. The bill passed yesterday is almost identical to House Joint Resolution 115, which I introduced early in the session.

This legislation stemmed from President Kennedy's keen interest in our city of Washington and in particular in the proper treatment of our major ceremonial avenue. He appointed the temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue, and President Johnson has warmly endorsed its continuation by statute in his District of Columbia message. Last year, the distinguished Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held extensive hearings on the same bill and reported it out favorably. Unfortunately, the House was unable to take final action.

I would hope that now, in light of these

developments, this measure will be reported out once again by the Interior Committee and approved in the House. It will, in my judgment, provide statutory sanction and continuing congressional oversight for the important work of making the Pennsylvania Avenue area what it ought to be, contributing greatly to the beauty and stateliness of our Capital City.

#### NATIONAL FOREST RECREATION AREAS BOOST ECONOMY OF RURAL AMERICA

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, because of the submission today to the Congress of the President's message on urban and rural poverty, I would like to discuss the effect of the Department of Agriculture's outdoor recreation program on the economy of rural areas.

Sometime this spring, summer, or fall it is likely that we all will have an opportunity to spend some time in the magnificent American outdoors. Many of us will spend that time in one of the outstanding national forest recreation areas across the land, which are provided us by the Department of Agriculture's Forest Service.

I wonder if we realize what a boost these recreation areas are to the economies of our rural communities.

Last year, there were more than 170 million visitor days of recreation use on the national forests. These visitors came to picnic areas, camp grounds, lakes, and trails. They came to ski, collect rocks, view the scenery or do anything else people enjoy doing out of doors.

Many of these people came a long way. Most came by car. They had tremendous impact on local business. They bought gas, groceries, meals, film, camping supplies, and souvenirs. They hired guides, rented boats or horses, and paid for lodging. This brought millions of dollars to rural people—many of whom rely on recreation as their entire source of income.

National forest recreation helps support rural Americans in yet another way.

The Forest Service manages about 13,000 recreation sites. These have to be operated, cleaned after each day's use, repaired and maintained throughout the season. This is done by local people. This means wages and a healthful livelihood.

The Forest Service invariably turns to rural craftsmen, too, when it comes to constructing new recreation sites. Over 500 new areas are being built each year. Often they are constructed in the "off" season—and this helps provide year-round job opportunities.

I want to commend the Forest Service for the work it is doing to revitalize rural America. When I visit a national forest campground this year, I know I will enjoy the finest recreation opportunities

available on some of our finest Federal recreation lands. But it is good to know, too, that my visit, along with Forest Service efforts in helping me enjoy it, will help rural Americans be a vital force in the American economy.

#### HEADSTART

Mr. MONTGOMERY. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the opportunity to visit the White House, at the invitation of Mrs. Lyndon Johnson, to participate in a significant ceremony concerning Headstart. Mrs. Johnson has given the country far-sighted leadership as the Honorary National Chairman of Headstart.

The occasion marked the premiere of a film called "Pancho," the dramatic story of a little boy in California who participates in Headstart. His experience probably has been duplicated around the country thousands of times. The star of the movie, Pancho Mansera, was actually present along with his parents, his Headstart teacher, and others who had participated in this very moving event that revolved around Pancho's life. In the short space of 1 year, Pancho grew 5½ inches; he progressed both mentally and physically from the state of a 2-year-old to that of a 5-year-old. The dramatic film shows how Headstart tackled Pancho's problem at the right time and in the right way, giving him not only a "head" start, but a "good" start in life.

After viewing the film, it is not difficult to understand the support behind the President's proposal to extend the program to 3-year-olds, and to have a "follow through" of the program in the early grades of school.

At the premiere, Mrs. Johnson said:

Headstart is many things. It is a child looking for a chance to be somebody. It is his parents determined that he shall have that chance. It is a teacher and a teacher's aid, trained and caring, guiding the child's first step on the road to knowledge; a doctor and a nurse, making sure his body is sturdy; a social worker showing the parents and child to sources of help.

It is a pleasure to insert in the RECORD all of Mrs. Johnson's excellent remarks telling about the premiere, and her 3-day three-State tour of new schools and educational programs in Appalachia.

Following Mrs. Johnson's remarks, I also would like to place in the RECORD, excerpts from Sargent Shriver's remarks at the ceremony. I am sure all of the Members of the House will be interested in Mr. Shriver's hard-hitting facts as to the worth of Headstart.

The articles follow:

REMARKS OF MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT BEGINNING OF "ADVENTURE IN LEARNING" TRIP AND SHOWING OF "PANCHO" FILM, THE WHITE HOUSE

Friends: Today is an important one for me: important because of the premiere we will soon be seeing. But it is important also

because it marks the beginning of a journey I am taking to some of the schoolrooms of this country—a journey that will take me during the next three days to West Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee.

The map shows that this area—Appalachia—lies deep in the heart of the nation. It is no less deep in the heart and the thoughts of the President.

The map shows that Appalachia is 1200 miles long and 250 miles wide and some call it poor, but it should be measured, not in its shortage of material goods, but in its wealth of promise for the nation.

No one knows that promise better than the teachers of Appalachia for the great transformation of the region is taking place in their schoolrooms. Schools don't close their doors at 3:30 any more. Late into the night they are beaconlights to the community—teaching and enriching the lives of the people of all ages.

In visiting some of the classrooms of these three states, I will be glimpsing classrooms in every state where we are attacking old problems in new ways.

There is a great new fever for learning in this country, and a greater commitment by government to wipe out illiteracy than ever before. When you read the statistics in Washington, they are too hard to comprehend. By visiting the classroom, I can better understand the impact of one overwhelming statistic: one third of our people are in school.

Our journey starts in this room this morning with one small boy. His name is Pancho and he is a movie star. He has come all the way from California to be here.

Pancho Mansera is six years old. You will see in this film, as the President and I have seen, that Pancho is more than a movie star. He is one of thousands of children, who, because of Head Start, are getting a fair start in school, instead of being dally dulled by problems too big for a child to master alone.

You in this room are literally the producers of this show. With thousands of other Head Start workers and volunteers, you have made the dramatic success story possible.

No one more than you who work in the 10,000 Head Start Centers throughout the country better understands the deeper meaning of this program for pre-school children. You have made the difference between what is and what might have been.

As you have discovered, Head Start is many things. It is a child looking for a chance to be somebody. It is his parents determined that he shall have that chance. It is a teacher and a teacher's aide, trained and caring, guiding the child's first steps on the road to knowledge; a doctor and a nurse, making sure his body is sturdy; a social worker showing the parents and child to sources of help.

Head Start is a crusade of individuals and organizations with special skills, and very special dedication, and we pay tribute to them all for all they have done. They will have the satisfaction of seeing the results of their efforts as demonstrated by one dramatic Head Start story.

It shows that Head Start tackles the problem at the most crucial age—when the difference for good or ill can be made, when the most can be done, when the investment in time and money brings the most telling results. Ideally, we would hope that Head Start could be applied for longer and to more children. That is why the President has proposed that the programs be extended to three-year-olds and that there must be "follow-through" in the early grades of school. But because you can't do everything, would you do nothing? I don't think Pancho would agree.

Pancho, thank you for coming to the White House to see a movie called "Pancho." To have a movie named for you is quite an honor even for a movie star, you know. I

have never heard of a movie called "Spencer," or "Marlon," or "Kirk." But I think you especially deserve the honor for, as a star, you cast a bright light of promise for us all.

EXCERPTS FROM THE REMARKS OF SARGENT SHERVER, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, HEADSTART CEREMONIES, THE WHITE HOUSE, MARCH 13, 1967

We are gathered here this morning for two reasons:—to celebrate a significant victory in the "war against poverty" and to launch a new campaign for America's children.

The significant victory we celebrate is, of course, "Head Start." The new campaign is to extend the benefits of "Head Start" to all poor children and to their parents:—three million poor children of whom 50% probably have never even heard of "Head Start."

The task is formidable. But our past victories give us every reason to hope for future success.

It was only two years and two months ago that we launched "Head Start" in this same room under the inspirational guidance and sponsorship of our gracious hostess, Mrs. Johnson. We had big ideas. We hoped to enroll 100,000 children in an unprecedented summer program.

Most of the "experts" on children said it couldn't be done. There was too little time, too few teachers, too little space, too few books and teaching materials, and too few doctors, too few nurses.

The "experts" advised us to try for 10,000, not 100,000 children.

And you all know what happened—We ended up with 561,000 Head Start children that first summer. And since then 1,438,000 children have joined "Head Start."

Why? How could this have happened—so fast? No one was forced into "Head Start"—No one drafted.

There was, of course, Dr. Julius Richmond's brilliant direction of the program. There was Mrs. Johnson's energetic, far-sighted leadership as Honorary National Chairman. And there were hundreds of skillful administrators and managers. But, are these unique? Is Head Start the only program so favored? Obviously not. Then what is the answer?

I suggest the answer is simple: We let the American people do it themselves.

Washington paid for it—but the people ran it. And I don't mean educators, doctors, lawyers, merchants or chiefs—I mean the people, plain, ordinary American citizens.

Today, for example, 70% of all Head Start children are attending classes in private, non-profit institutions. They are not in public or parochial schools.

The American Optometric Association—Luci Baines Nugent's "Volunteers for Vision," gave more than 100,000 free optical exams.

The American Academy of Pediatrics supplied more than 200 pediatricians as Consultants.

The American Dental Association mobilized its members, helped to write the guidelines and prepare special materials for dentists.

More than 250,000 private citizens worked for "Head Start" free-of-charge.

And the accomplishments are breathtaking: 98,000 children with eye defects discovered and treated; 90,000 children with bone and joint disorders discovered and treated; 7,400 children mentally retarded discovered and referred for special handling; 2,200 active cases of TB discovered and treated; 900,000 dental cases discovered with an average of 5 cavities per child; 740,000 children discovered without vaccinations against polio and then immunized by "Head Start"; more than 1,000,000 not vaccinated against measles, and then immunized by "Head Start".

Forty per cent of these children are white, English-speaking—20% are white Spanish-speaking—40% are Negro. Which proves another significant point:

Poverty is color blind—a lesson of special meaning in the Deep South.

In Mississippi we shall have 33,000 children in "Head Start" come June 30th—all of them in biracial programs—the first biracial activities in Mississippi history. The "experts" said that, too, could not be achieved. But Mississippi leaders, white and black, have done it—working together, through new, private, not-for-profit groups.

What's the point of it all? To take care of a million or two million children? Yes—but much more than that.

The point is to prove once again to the American people that they can accomplish miracles—if they work together—poor and rich—educated and unlettered—amateurs and professionals.

That's what we mean by local Community Action—the national program of which "Head Start" is a part.

500,000 parents have participated in "Head Start" along with their children—right in the classrooms. That may be the largest adult education program in the country. At the very least it's a new PTA—the PPTA—the "Poor Parents" teachers' association.

And as a further result of this newly awakened community interest we have new recruits in the "war against poverty." The University of Louisville has 154 students studying child development this year as against 17 last year! A New York State university has 1,200 applicants for 200 openings. Even four states have inaugurated kindergarten for all.

Where is all this activity leading us? It is taking us toward an America where no one will see what I saw last summer in Colorado Springs in the basement of the Congregational Church.

A birthday party for a new 5-year-old Head Start recruit—where the teachers baked the cake and the little child couldn't eat it . . . because his teeth hurt so much he couldn't bite.

Is it too much to ask the richest nation in history to make sure that every child can eat his own birthday cake?

I think not. You think not. But our job is to convince all Americans, or at least 51% of them.

This wonderful movie "Pancho" will help us tell our story. But you—every one of you in this room—must work to get this movie distributed and shown. We need to reach at least 10,000,000 people with Pancho's message.

We are pleased that four or five states will soon start kindergarten. But there are still twenty-three states with no kindergarten classes.

We are pleased that our new Neighborhood Health Centers will soon be bringing medical care to thousands of poor people heretofore unreached. But still millions of American women will bear children this year without any prenatal or postnatal care—their children will receive no visits from pediatricians. America's infant mortality rate will continue higher and deadlier than Sweden's or England's or Belgium's, or Switzerland's, or Germany's. Why should "they" be ahead of us?

By the year 2000—ten thousand or more astronauts may well fly through outer space—but 30 billion human beings will make the 9-month inner voyage through the womb. Yet we spend more on the technology of space than on the technology of birth. We know more about outer space than inner space. Over the years we have spent more research money on pregnant cows than on pregnant women. So, as a nation we have no grounds for complacency. We have lots still to do. But we can do it—as long as we work not as specialists but as humanists, not as professionals but as amateurs—lovers, that is, of mankind.

### WILL THE REAL ROBERT McNAMARA PLEASE STAND UP?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the March 5, 1967, edition of Parade magazine carried a feature article in some depth on Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. I believe that Mr. Lloyd Shearer's article on the Secretary of Defense gives the American people a better insight and sounder understanding of the enormous responsibilities and pressures that the Secretary must face continuously. No one with feet of clay or faint heart would ever be able to perform in the arena in which Secretary McNamara has over the past 6 years, the longest period for any of our Secretaries of Defense since the Department of Defense was established two decades ago. In order that more Americans can read this excellent article, I include it today as part of my remarks.

The aforementioned article follows:

#### WILL THE REAL ROBERT McNAMARA PLEASE STAND UP?

(By Lloyd Shearer)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—"Bob McNamara is the greatest Secretary of Defense this country has ever had."—Lyndon Johnson.

"He [McNamara] is a one-man disaster who threatens disaster for us all. The list of charges that may be brought against him is as long as his term in office and as current as the morning's headlines."—Barry Goldwater.

"I used to go out with Bob McNamara when we both attended Piedmont High School. Later, when he was at Cal, he used to drive down to Stanford in his Ford convertible to see me. He was one of the most gay, fun-loving, adventurous, intelligent young men I have ever dated. And what a dancer!"—Mrs. Clifton Fadiman.

"There's something about Mr. McNamara. Maybe it's those rimless eyeglasses he wears. But whenever I was called into his office for dictation, I used to shake. My knees actually rattled. It got so bad, they had to transfer me out."—A Pentagon secretary.

At age 50 Robert Strange McNamara has become one of America's most publicized and controversial figures. Since the Defense Department was founded in 1947, there have been eight secretaries, only one of whom, Charles Wilson (1953-57), lasted as long as four years, McNamara, a man of incredible stamina, has already survived six.

In that time he has won the high praise and unflinching support of two shrewd, demanding, pragmatic U.S. Presidents, Kennedy and Johnson, and the almost constant censure of some generals, admirals and congressmen, who are convinced that he is little more than a transplanted cost accountant whose approach to every problem is statistical and whose solutions are frequently wrong.

His public image is equally cloudy and controversial. As regards Vietnam, people don't know whether he's a hawk or a dove. On one hand they hear it was he who talked President Johnson into the first prolonged bombing halt in Vietnam in 1965 and the subsequent worldwide peace offensive. On the other they are told, "This is McNamara's war," and it is his policy which is killing noncombatants in North Vietnam.

Ask the man on the street (as Parade has in a random sampling) what impression he has of Robert McNamara, and you get such adjectives and answers as: "Cold and remote. . . . He looks like a square to me. . . . Stiff and self-righteous. . . . His hair is laid out like a public park. . . . A walking computer. . . . He gives the impression of listening faster than one can talk to him. . . . There's something very unyielding about that man. . . . I'm convinced he's the most brilliant, erudite man in the government today. . . . In front of those senators he's always so well-prepared. But tell me, does he have a heart? . . . I'm a woman, and my womanly intuition tells me that he's the kind of man who's never cried. . . . I get the feeling that he's never enjoyed the exquisite luxury of wasting a few spare minutes. . . . He gives the impression of strength, decisiveness and cold steel. But I don't know what the hell our objective is in Vietnam, and, frankly, I wonder if he does either."

#### THE TRUTH

What is the truth about Robert McNamara, Defense Secretary, and Robert McNamara, man?

Surely this tall, lean, 165-pound southpaw is the strongest, most effective, most forceful and possibly the most brilliant Defense Secretary we've ever had. Many reporters who have covered the regimes of his Pentagon predecessors—James Forrestal, Louis Johnson, Gen. George Marshall, Robert Lovett, Charles Wilson, Neil McElroy, Thomas Gates—generally agree on that.

A few resent his personal manner, which they equate with a posture of kingly omnipotence, his didactic briefings, the air of certitude and overwhelming confidence he generates, "the way he comes on like gangbusters," but even they concede: "He works like a Trojan. . . . He's the first Secretary to run the service chiefs instead of vice versa. . . . He's the first guy with the know-how to establish control over Pentagon money and communications. . . . He doesn't mind revealing facts and figures, telling the nation how many nuclear bombs we've got and how we stand vis-a-vis Russia and China. . . . He doesn't wait for problems to develop. He believes in taking an active role in heading them off. . . . Most people who manage and administer well are not particularly profound men. McNamara is both a manager and a philosopher."

What McNamara has done as Defense Secretary among other things is to apply the best management techniques of industry to a sprawling department long characterized by permissiveness, autonomy and now charged with the awesome responsibility of spending \$73 billion of the nation's money in one year.

"The principles of administration here," he says, "are not really very much different than anywhere else. I've often thought the administration of any large organization—whether it be the Catholic Church or Harvard University or the Ford Motor Company—has very, very much in common."

McNamara declares that he acts primarily on one principle: "And that's to advance the national interest, and I have no hesitancy in sweeping out of my way ideas that don't appear to support that objective or people that get in the way. That's the single principle I follow, and I would submit to you that I have met with some success in following that principle in six years."

What have the past six years done to McNamara? Is he, as Washington rumor recurrently has it, on the verge of resigning?

A little more than a year ago he was soundered out on taking over the presidency of the Ford Foundation but quickly negated the suggestion. According to a friend, "Bob is not about to quit the Defense job until he sees this Vietnamese war through or is replaced as Secretary by another person. He simply is not the type of man who walks away when the going gets tough." The Ford

Foundation position was subsequently offered to McGeorge Bundy, who resigned his White House job to accept it.

McNamara describes his tenure in Washington thus far as "an exciting and stimulating and on the whole a very satisfying experience." When asked, however, "Would you do it again?", he laughingly replied, "Not immediately." And when the reporter inquired if the job was wearing him thin, he laughed again, conceded, "Well, it's not a job that one would continue for life."

The Defense Secretary has long had the reputation of suffering fools badly. Asked if his tolerance quotient had increased over the years, he replied quickly, "I hope not. I don't believe suffering fools is a desirable quality."

And yet even those senators who still are suspect of the McNamara emphasis on "methodology" believe time and environment have made him more diplomatic, gentle and tolerant.

Last year McNamara testified before the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee that a particular South American country possessed a certain number of tanks. This number, he pointed out, was "80 percent of the total tank strength of Bulgaria." Next day one of the senators asked him what was relevant about the number of tanks in Bulgaria.

"In the old days," the senator says, "Mac would have gotten sore or at least peevish at the question. This time he merely smiled and shrugged. I've gotten to like him as an individual because he seems to have grown more patient with us, but whenever he's trying to sell us something, he's always got his chart and pointer. The kind of case he and the White House have got to make—I'd prefer if they'd make it without a chart and pointer. He gives me the feeling that his commitment to methodology is total; that if you would just give him enough time with computers and statistics, he'd be able to come up with the right answer on anything. And that, of course, hasn't been the case, especially with Vietnam."

"But as regards McNamara personally," the senator continues, "He's a sincere man, an honest man. He doesn't have a mean bone in his body. He hasn't become velvet-gloved over the years, not by any means. He just seems a little more mild, a little more mortal. You must remember, of course, that this poor guy has one of the most thankless jobs in the world."

One person who rarely loses sight of McNamara's almost impossible job is his secretary, Peggy Stroud. "When Mr. McNamara first came to the Pentagon," she recalls, "he had that very appealing boyish look, so much of that boyish laughter which reflects his true personality. But you can't work around the clock the way he does, from 7 or 7:30 in the morning until late at night, you can't face all the pressures he does, those very difficult decisions he has to make, and still come out looking boyish."

"The job has aged him. No doubt about it. He's so preoccupied most of the time. They've thrown so many projects at him over the years that I really can't understand how he maintains his composure. He is the most polite and patient man I've ever worked for. I don't know how he does it. And he hasn't lost his sense of humor, either. It doesn't take very much to make him laugh. But this isn't the kind of job, let's face it, where there's very much to laugh about unless you think beating Orville Freeman in a game of squash is laughable."

#### RESPECT AND ADMIRATION

Another McNamara supporter—there are few people who having worked with the Defense Secretary do not respect and admire him—points out that the public image of the Defense Secretary—cold, positive, automatonlike—has no basis in fact but has become reinforced "because McNamara is in-

volved in what is probably the most unpopular war the U.S. has fought in modern times, the mess in Vietnam."

"People don't understand this war," one pro-McNamara informant explains. "They're frustrated by it. 'How did we ever get into this mess? . . . Why are we there? . . . Are the Vietnamese worth fighting for? . . . Why can't the mightiest nation on earth wipe those pesky little guys off the map?' These are some of the questions they ask. They've heard that McNamara is a big brain. Many people are convinced that he's more knowledgeable, more cultured, better informed, better educated than the President. 'Why doesn't he set old Lyndon on the right path? . . . Why doesn't he solve this mess?' They need some target for their resentment, for their frustration, and in many cases they've chosen McNamara."

"But this isn't McNamara's war. He doesn't make foreign policy, and he didn't get us into it. His main job is combat readiness, and I submit to you that he's done one helluva job. We've put close to 500,000 men in Southeast Asia in a very short period of time, and we've supplied them, and their morale is excellent. And we've got enough left of everything to take care of both Russia and China if we have to."

"To my way of thinking, Bob McNamara is a godsend. Sure, he's made mistakes. Who hasn't? But I'd hate to think what position this country would now be in if we had some other people I could mention—but won't—in his job. Take my word for it, the adjectives which best describe him are superior, dedicated, honest. The best thing Jack Kennedy ever did was to get Bob McNamara as his Defense Secretary."

McNamara declares that he's neither interested nor worried about his image. "I'm concerned about the national interest and about acting in accordance with it, and that's enough for one to worry about. But I might say in passing that I have a most advantageous position and almost a unique position in respect to many others here. By the grace of good fortune I don't have to worry about what I'm doing when I leave. And, therefore, what my image is (is frankly of no consequence to me, because the image would only affect what I do hereafter, and I'm not concerned about what I do hereafter. I'm just concerned about the present."

#### HIS VIEW ON VIETNAM

His present major concern, of course, is Vietnam, and his view on that war can possibly best be gleaned from the following dialogue:

Reporter: "You've been a great systems-analysis man, a great cost-effectiveness man, a great innovator and introducer of management techniques into government. But the sum total of all this at the moment is that we are now involved in a war which seems without system. . . . It seems that we are now playing it by ear, so here is Bob McNamara on one side, the great systems man, and here is the war that he's fighting on the other side, which seems to be almost systemless. . . . The feeling of the public is that we don't know where we're going, and that no one else does. Would you comment on that?"

McNamara: "Oh, I think we know where we're going. The first thing that people misunderstand is the objective. We have a very, very limited objective."

Reporter: "What would that be?"

McNamara: "It's not to destroy the country of North Vietnam. It's not to destroy the government of North Vietnam. It's certainly not to find a base for subsequent military operations against Red China. It isn't even to tie the South Vietnamese to a western military alliance."

"In contrast to any of those, our objective is limited to preserving for the South Vietnamese the right to shape their own destiny and choose general and political and eco-

nomie institutions as an independent sovereign power."

"Now, there's a great failure to understand that. Some of our own people don't understand it, and many of our allies don't understand it. But if you start with this as the objective, then you ask what kind of military strategy should be adopted, and it becomes quite clear that an element of that strategy need not be the destruction by air bombardment, for example, of North Vietnam. That's not part of our objective."

"Our objective is to achieve this limited objective and, I should have added, to achieve it at the lowest possible cost in human life to ourselves and in human life to our enemies. And therefore, it's inconsistent with that objective to carry out an unlimited bombing campaign in North Vietnam."

"Achievement of the objective requires that we show North Vietnam that its aggression against the south cannot be won, that they cannot subvert and destroy the political institutions of the south. Now that must be shown by action in the south primarily, and the campaign against the north is to increase the cost to their effort to subvert and destroy the institutions of the south, thereby putting additional pressure on them to terminate those efforts."

"But it was never thought, for example, that the campaign of air bombardment in the north would by itself terminate aggression in the south. We never thought it would be a substitute for effective action in the south to prevent the success of the guerrilla and main-force units in the south. So understanding what we're doing starts with understanding what the objective is, and from that develops an understanding of the military strategy and the tactics of day-to-day operations."

Robert Strange McNamara was born in San Francisco on June 9, 1916. His mother, the former Clara Nell Strange, was a delightfully loquacious Billie Burkeish type of character, of Protestant Scottish-English ancestry. His father, Robert James McNamara, 25 years older than Mrs. McNamara, was a nonpracticing Catholic of Irish ancestry, in charge of sales for Buckingham & Hecht, a wholesale shoe company.

According to people who worked with him, the elder McNamara was endowed with a sharp intelligence, an outstanding memory and an innate sense of dignity, three characteristics he passed on to his son.

In addition to Robert, the McNamaras were blessed with a daughter, Margaret, three years younger than her brother. Today she is Mrs. Arthur Slaymore of Stamford, Conn., the wife of a vice-president of the American Bank Note Company. She states, "Bob and I came from a very normal, middle-class California home, and we both enjoyed a very normal youth. Stories that there was a generation gap between us and our father, that he didn't understand us, are nonsense. We had a very happy homelife. The only thing nontypical about it was Bob. Even as a little boy my brother was terrific. He was something special. All of us knew he'd grow up to be something special, and I believe he has."

Bob McNamara was raised in Oakland, Calif., then in Piedmont, a nearby suburb, where at the local high school he consistently earned A's, became editor of the school annual, president of the French Club, sang off key in the glee club, was head of the student government, still found time to date local belles like Hallie Booth and Annalee Whitmore.

"Good grades were terribly important to him and his parents," says one old schoolmate, "and he never disappointed them. His folks bought him a black Ford convertible with green wire wheels in his senior year, and he learned to drive it well and carefully. Even as a youngster his judgment was sound and mature."

#### HE LOATHES PHONIES

Annalee Whitmore, a former Time-Life correspondent in the Pacific who coauthored *Thunder out of China* with Theodore White many years ago and is now Mrs. Clifton Fadiman of Los Angeles, remembers McNamara as "one of the best dancers in Piedmont. He has natural rhythm, a ready sense of humor, high standards, a great intelligence—he was real fun with spontaneous wit and gaiety. He and Vernon Goodin, now a lawyer in San Francisco, used to drive down to Palo Alto to visit me in Stanford. They were always broke and used to come by some circuitous route through Alviso to avoid the 25-cent toll bridge—and I must say we had nothing but fun. People who think Bob McNamara's stuffy or self-righteous just don't know him. He loathes phonies, stuffed shirts, status symbols, gladhanders."

"He's a very secure person, and if you're secure, you don't have to spend your life getting people to like you or improving your image. What Bob has is integrity, intelligence, industry and great self-discipline. His virtues are so numerous that people can't identify with him. I'll tell you this: If I had the choice of one public servant to decide the future of this country, I'd choose Bob McNamara, because he makes decisions on the basis of knowledge and humanity."

In the course of researching McNamara for this article, I interviewed at least a dozen persons who'd gone to school with him at Piedmont High, the University of California and the Harvard School of Business Administration, where he did his graduate work. Each pointed out to me that the image the public holds of Robert McNamara is completely wrong, that he is warm, friendly, informal, polite, responsive, compassionate, loving, understanding, humorous but with a strong sense of what is right. Three women used the adjective "romantic" to describe him. When I asked an old buddy of his to comment on that, he said, "It doesn't surprise me one bit. When Bob and I were at Berkeley, we would wonder like most college boys do, what the future held in store for us. Bob used to say that, if through some streak of great luck he could amass a fortune of \$10,000, he would spend the rest of his days in Tahiti just fishing, fooling around with the girls and living on the interest. That's the kind of dreams we used to dream."

"Bob was never interested in money, and I honestly think that the only reason he joined the Ford Motor Company along with the other so-called 'whiz kids' was that at the end of World War II, his wife, Margey, came down with polio. They both did, but his wasn't a serious case, and he recovered quickly. Not Margey. It looked like a long siege of illness for her, and Bob didn't want her being looked after by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. He wanted to pay for it himself. And who had any money after being in the service? He didn't. I think he was in debt. But if it hadn't been for Margey's polio, I'm inclined to believe he would have returned to teaching at Harvard. Money is not what motivates McNamara."

Margaret Carter, 25, the McNamaras' oldest daughter—they have two other children: Kathleen, 24, studying anthropology in Greece, and Robert Craig, 16, at St. Paul's—believes, "Service is what drives both my parents. They believe very strongly that in a democracy people must take an active part in government, or the government is going to be in trouble."

"Before my father accepted the Defense job, he phoned me. I was away in school at the time [Stanford], and he asked my opinion. He's very considerate. If he took the job it meant giving up our house in Ann Arbor, a change of environment, a certain loss of privacy."

"I said, 'Whatever you and mother decide

will be right.' I knew he'd take the job, because he's a man who likes to serve, to use himself up, to broaden himself. He doesn't consider government service a sacrifice, not for him, maybe for his family, but not for him.

"They tried to keep him out of the service in World War II because of his eyesight, but he got in anyway. I couldn't ask for a better father, or mother either. The relationship Kathy and I and Craig have with them, well, it's just marvelous. We love and respect them, and that's the way they feel about us."

The Defense Secretary has been married 26 years to the former Margaret Craig of Alameda, Calif. They were classmates at the University of California but never dated until McNamara returned from his graduate stint at the Harvard School of Business Administration. They were married in 1940, sailed through the Panama Canal on their honeymoon (McNamara was by then an experienced seaman, having worked on passenger ships during summer vacations) and started married life in Cambridge on very little money.

They have had a full, rich, eventful, exciting, successful marriage, largely because they are both intelligent, active, tolerant, athletic (skiing, tennis, mountain climbing), sensitive, loving, artistic, children-blessed, literate people with similar or complementary value judgments.

They are both avid readers of fiction, non-fiction and poetry. I counted 14 books on their night tables plus copies of the *New York Review of Books*, the *Sunday Times of London* and the *New Yorker*. On the Defense Secretary's desk I spotted two poetry anthologies; *The Arrogance of Power* by Senator Fulbright; *Markings* by Dag Hammarskjöld; *Hell Is a Small Place* by Bernard Fall; *Report to Greco* by Kazantzakis, and Pike's book on the Viet Cong.

#### SOPHISTICATED TASTE

The McNamara home, on a side street off "Embassy Row" in Washington, D.C., is quietly and sedately decorated. The art, abstract and expressionistic, except for a 1962 portrait of President Kennedy by C. J. Fox, reflects a sophisticated taste. McNamara's gift to his wife this past Christmas was an exquisite piece of sculpture. She, in turn, has gifted him with a Giacometti and other works of art.

How much longer the McNamaras can afford financially to live in Washington, D.C., is a subject frequently hushed about in government circles. In 1960 when McNamara relinquished the presidency of the Ford Motor Company to become Defense Secretary at \$25,000 per year, he relinquished 24,250 shares of Ford stock, all his stock in the Scott Paper Company of whose board he was a member, some \$350,000 in salary and an option on 30,000 additional shares of Ford stock which would have earned him an estimated \$3½ million. He placed some of his Ford shares in a family foundation and the proceeds from the sale of his other stock in a trust fund invested in nondefense corporations. He also had in his deferred payment account at Ford \$618,730 in bonuses earned between 1957 and 1960. It is on this deferred money the McNamaras have been living these past six years.

As Defense Secretary, Robert McNamara was sailing full speed ahead until he ran into the Vietnamese storm. Since then he has been condemned, criticized, belittled, damned, lampooned, mocked, denounced, denigrated, castigated and vilified. He has become the target of Viet Cong assassins, the object of contumely by both hawks and doves, the disappointment of academicians, who feel that, along with his phenomenal memory and wizardlike calculating ability, he somehow in his 50 years should have acquired enough wisdom in international affairs to end the war quickly.

Instead the war has dragged on, and Robert McNamara has become part of the American dilemma. Is he a hero or a "heavy"? Is he a hawk or a dove—or both? Is he a Republican or a Democrat? A Secretary or a statesman? Are his great contributions to the country to be obscured by his failure to find a quick answer to Vietnam?

"All I can tell you," one senator bravely risked when I asked his opinion, "is that Robert McNamara is either the rightest or wrongest Defense Secretary we've ever had. He is no halfway guy. If he can get us out of Vietnam this year, and of late there have been peace feelers, someone is sure to suggest that he'd make a great President or a great running mate for Bobby Kennedy—you know, the Bobsey twins. If he doesn't, then they'll say he belongs back at Ford turning out Edsels."

#### A TALL TEXAN

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, although I do not know this from having been here at the time, I am reliably informed that 30 years ago Tex Easley came to Washington from his native Texas to cover Congress for the Associated Press.

I do not doubt that this happened. I only find cause for wonder that the Tex Easley we see every day in the Press Gallery and our offices and the corridors of the Capitol should have been able to sit up to a typewriter three decades ago. However, it must be true.

For 30 years, then, our friend Tex has been building his reputation as an outstanding reporter—an accurate, fair, and painstaking newsman who does credit to the great organization he serves. And he is not alone a good reporter; he is a wonderful human being as well, a man who attracts friendship because he is himself friendly.

I am proud to join in saluting Tex on this anniversary of his entrance on the Washington scene, and I heartily wish him well as he starts on his second 30 years of covering the Congress.

#### DEATH OF A WARRIOR—THE LATE HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks, I include a splendid editorial, "Death of a Warrior" appearing in the March 1967 issue of the *American Journal of Psychiatry*, the official publication of the American Psychiatric Association, in relation to our late beloved friend and colleague, John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island.

The editorial well presents the dedication of our late friend to the advancement of knowledge about people's health and welfare, and "the respect and affection which scientists in all medical disciplines had for him was earned by his dedication, firm purpose, vision, and courage."

As the editorial further says, "Dr. John," as he was called affectionately, "will be sadly missed." Also, "He was a warrior for the common good, and fearless in the performance of his duties. We mark his passing with the greatest regret and realize that sick people and those charged with their care are the better for his having lived."

#### DEATH OF A WARRIOR

It was always an interesting and exciting experience to testify before John Fogarty, Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such testimony required careful preparation, for he stood for no cant; one realized that he was interested, knowledgeable, and alert and had a prodigious memory. Representatives of the American Psychiatric Association appeared before him annually in support of the NIMH budget after officials of NIMH had testified and the problems had been fairly set forth. Of late years, in a show of desirable symbiosis, the APA spokesman and the executive director of the National Committee Against Mental Illness appeared together. The latter was major-domo of the occasion and both defended the same "citizens' budget," which was usually higher than that presented by NIMH because representatives of that government agency were hemmed in by Presidential dict.

Some of our colleagues may not realize the contributions to medical science in general and psychiatry in particular that have been made by Chairman Fogarty and his delightful and distinguished colleague, Senator Lister Hill, because they do not recall how things were before these congressmen took up the cudgels in our behalf. Psychiatry was the stepchild as far as government support was concerned and, except for a few foundations, as far as most people and physicians were concerned. We have said before, and repeat now, that were it not for the NIMH support of research and training over the past two decades, our discipline would now be in chaos. Training in the Veterans Administration hospitals and the few other institutions that could afford it helped, but they could not have carried the entire burden.

There is no need for us to enumerate in detail the advances made under their aegis and sometimes under their prodding—the advances are too numerous and too all-encompassing to evaluate here. The interesting thing was to see John Fogarty "build up the record." He knew after listening to various experts what was lacking and what was needed; he sought further informed opinion before he made up his own mind; then he would drive toward the accomplishment of his purpose. The last thing we recall was his insistence that the NIMH pay particular attention to alcoholism and its ravages.

While the hearings were on, the Chairman listened intently and untiringly to representatives of all the medical specialties, day after day for weeks at a time. Sometimes a whispered word to a clerk brought documents from previous years, and it was apparent that everything was checked carefully. Witnesses were sometimes brought up short as testimony from previous years was recalled to them.

The advancement of knowledge about people's health and welfare was—next to his family—his whole life, and he defended his

budget against all opponents, the Bureau of the Budget and, to our knowledge, four Presidents. He curried no favors; the respect and affection which scientists in all medical disciplines had for him was earned by his dedication, firm purpose, vision, and courage.

This man, who carried a Bricklayers' union card, made an immeasurable contribution to the welfare of people. He was honored by many scientific groups and was an honorary member of our own Association. He had been in Congress for 26 years. Had he desired, he could have been a governor, senator, or a member of any large committee, but he chose to stay in his subcommittee post and take care of his friends—sick people—and to give medical men the wherewithal to work for them.

"Dr. John," as his friends called him affectionately, will be sadly missed. The House hearings won't be the same without him. Perhaps a new champion will arise—hopefully one will—but one goes about preparation for this year's testimony with a heavy heart.

Dedicated legislator, far-sighted gentleman, he was embattled when it came to health legislation. He was a warrior for the common good and fearless in the performance of his duties. We mark his passing with the greatest regret and realize that sick people and those charged with their care are the better for his having lived.

F.J.B.

**THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE**

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, March 12 marked the 20th anniversary of the now famous Truman doctrine, whereby the Congress, responding to the President's request, made available \$400 million in military and economic assistance to help Greece and Turkey combat Communist aggression.

It may be recalled, Mr. Speaker, that the President in his momentous address to the Congress declared that "America could not, and should not, let these free countries stand unaided." For, as he pointed out, the alternative would be "the loss of Greece, and the extension of the Iron Curtain across the eastern Mediterranean."

As the world knows, Congress responded to the President's request, and the great Greek people, accepting our hand of friendship, worked vigorously to rebuild their ports, highways, farms, and industries. More importantly, this timely support by the United States revitalized the Greek National Army, permitting it to defeat the once powerful Communist guerrilla force. As a result of this joint effort, the tide of Soviet influence at the Greek and Turkish borders was repulsed, and both countries resumed their places as independent states in the community of nations.

It is important to note, too, Mr. Speaker, that Greece has never forgotten this crucial assistance by the United States. She has long been our staunch ally in the NATO alliance, and the Greek

battalion was one of the most outstanding fighting units allied with us in the Korean war.

The Truman doctrine was the starting point for a dramatic new foreign policy of the United States which, as Mr. Truman later wrote, "declared that wherever aggression direct or indirect, threatened the peace, the security of the United States was involved." Pointing up the relativity of the Truman doctrine today, the distinguished New York Times correspondent, Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, observed on March 10 in that paper:

Twenty years after, it is easy to understand the lessons of the audacious Truman Doctrine in Greece; twenty years hence it may be similarly interesting to learn what really was taking place right now in Vietnam.

**MAN, EARTH, AND WATER**

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, although it is natural and logical that the problem which looms the largest in our minds these days is the conflict in Vietnam, there are other basic issues which we must, nevertheless, still face.

Our distinguished colleague, the Honorable JIM WRIGHT, of Fort Worth, has stated these basic problems succinctly in addressing the Texas Water Conservation Association in Austin, Tex., on Monday, March 13.

My colleagues, I wish to share Congressman WRIGHT's remarks on "Man, Earth, and Water" and invite your close attention to them, as follows:

**MAN, EARTH AND WATER**

(Remarks of Congressman JIM WRIGHT before the Texas Water Conservation Association, Austin, Tex., Mar. 13, 1967)

Our most impelling problem in the final one-third of the Twentieth Century may not be the atom bomb after all, but something much older and equally as devastating. The problem may be famine, and how to avoid it. The central question may be whether man is wise enough to husband the earth's resources and coax from them enough continuing sustenance for the world's growing population.

If widespread famine is to be avoided, we must cultivate an entirely new and enlightened relationship to the earth and its provender.

Through all the countless centuries of our mortal struggle from the dust to the stars, earth has been to man provider and sustainer, bounteous and presumably inexhaustible. In our time, man must be to earth not only exploiter but protector. This is the new imperative in the interest of both earth and man.

**PEOPLE, LAND AND FOOD**

Already the stark statistics of population growth contain in their overtones a prophecy of world famine. Already, in spite of our pockets of affluence, we see a preview of this prophecy on the subcontinent of India. At the beginning of the Christian era, there were only some 250 million people on the entire earth. Within our generation, we shall have more than that right here in the U.S.—

on about seven percent of the world's land area.

It took mankind 3,000 years to achieve a population of three billion people. Demographers forecast that we shall double this in 30 years. In three decades, if the present trend continues, we shall add to the living total as many as our progenitors added in three millennia.

The same amount of land and air and water and mineral resources, then, must be made to serve more and ever more people. In our own country, where every year we have a population growth equivalent to a new state of Maryland, we must think entirely anew.

No longer will agricultural surpluses be our problem. Instead, we approach the time when we shall need millions of additional acres in production if we are merely to feed our own people—let alone the famine-bent billions of a hungry world.

Every drop of water that can be conserved, every inch of top soil that can be saved, every field and forest we can renew, every ore and mineral we can develop and conserve, and every stream we can cleanse of pollution will be our greatest possible gifts to future generations. This is why the work of your association is so extremely important.

**BELATED AWAKENING**

As a nation we have become aware of this age old problem and its approaching crisis only in the present generation. Until our time there were always new frontiers. Land was cheap. The fertile valleys and billowing prairies stretched like a never-ending sea before the path of the westward migration. There was water enough, and the rivers cleansed themselves.

Then, almost suddenly, it began to dawn upon us that we had been living in a fool's paradise. The frontier was gone. The rapacious hand of man had despoiled countless thousands of acres of our most precious heritage. Land was no longer cheap. Our search for minerals had devastated great hunks of earth. Lumbering had laid waste the hillsides. Overgrazing had denuded the prairies. Billions of tons of life-giving top soil had been forever and irretrievably lost. Our streams were befouled.

Here in our country, the past generation has witnessed a prodigious effort at reclamation. Deserts have blossomed to the flow of irrigation ditches. In 1909, the West had a mere 8,000 acres of irrigated cotton. Today, it is almost three million acres. Irrigation today is our most voracious consumer of water. Its product, of course, is the food and fibre that keeps us going.

But the subterranean water tables are falling precipitately in many areas, as we regularly withdraw more than nature supplies. An outstanding example can be seen on the South Plains of Texas. And as the irrigation waters reclaim much of the hitherto forgotten land of America, traditional farmlands in areas where the rainfall once was relied upon to produce the crops are turning to pasture, and pastures unwatered and overgrazed, have historically turned to desert.

During the past thirty years, 14 million acres of badlands have been claimed for cultivating, but in the process 48 million acres which formerly grew crops for the nation have been retired from the cultivator's blade. This represents a withdrawal from crop harvesting of some 75 thousand square miles, a total area larger than the State of Oklahoma.

**HISTORIC CYCLE**

Much of this withdrawn land now is in pasture. Presumably we are wise enough to prevent its progression in the historic cycle from pasture to overgrazing to desert. Let us hope so. But today a motorist traveling along highways of our southwestern states can witness, in countless square miles of mesquite groves, a tragic modern reenact-

ment of an often performed drama. Many of the mesquite groves stand on land which was cultivated by the Pueblo and Hohokam Indian civilizations before a 23 year drought utterly destroyed their form of society. Only two generations ago the land provided lush pasture. Today these miles of mesquite pronounce a silent indictment upon the folly of overgrazing.

History holds stark lessons of other civilizations which found—too late—that they could not halt the cycle which plagued the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates, killed off the great Maya civilization that reached its cultural stride about 1000 A.D., spelled eventual doom to the Egyptians and Babylonians and the Pueblo Indians of the American Southwest.

Shelley tells of the statue of the tyrant Ozymandias, which stands crumbling in the desert, with its boastful inscription: "Look on my works, ye mighty, and despair." Even for Ozymandias, the water ran out:

"Round the decay  
"Of that colossal wreck, boundless and bare,  
"The lone and level sands stretch far away."

#### OUR MOST INDISPENSABLE COMMODITY

The United States of America, the richest and most powerful nation in the world, is running out of its most indispensable commodity—clear, usable water.

This nation used about 40 billion gallons of water a day in 1900. We will use almost 400 billion gallons daily in 1967. The rate of consumption will continue to go up steadily. Increased uses for industry and irrigation couple with the shiny appurtenances of our affluent society. Automatic dishwashers, lawn sprinklers, the instant carwash, the laundromat, backyard swimming pools and massive household demands for electric energy all represent new and growing uses. This is our way of life. We sweat to pay for it. We've not about to give it up.

There is no more water on the earth today than there was in the time of Adam. And despite the fact that our demands on the supply are infinitely greater than they ever have been, the amount is sufficient to sustain us—if we can learn to use it and reuse it properly. On an average day in the United States a volume of almost five trillion gallons of water splashes on our land in the form of rain, hail, dew, snow or sleet. Three-fourths of this rises again by evaporation, unused, into the heavens whence it came. The rest either settles into the earth or runs with our rivers.

#### POLLUTION'S TOLL

At least 20 billion gallons of water a day are being wasted in this country by pollution. This is water that could be used and reused, if treated properly. Ravaged water, a menace to the health of everyone who has contact with it, this 20 billion gallon volume flows uselessly past water-hungry communities on its way to an indifferent sea.

This wasted water amounts to only about six percent of the total needs of the nation. It is a very significant six percent, however, since it constitutes better than one-fourth of the country's pure water needs, and its loss adversely affects the lives, the economy, the health and the pleasure of far more than half of our population.

How dangerous is a contaminated stream? Recently a cupful of water taken at random from the Connecticut River near Hartford was found to contain 26 different infectious bacteria, including typhoid, paratyphoid, cholera, salmonellosis, tuberculosis, anthrax, tetanus and all the known viruses, including polio.

The broad Hudson River, which runs sluggishly through New York City, could have saved the Northeast from the 1965 drought. But it could not be used. Its waters were too foul to drink. Every major stream in

America is contaminated to an alarming degree.

Even underground water tables are subject to pollution. Largely unknown to the public, an epidemic in Riverside, California, in the summer of 1965 afflicted 18,000 citizens with violent attacks of vomiting and extremely high temperatures. At least a few died as a result. Ultimately, bacteriologists traced the source to the city's water supply, which for 75 years had been safe and pure since it comes from 30 deep wells. Suddenly, due to a subterranean contamination, death and debilitating disease lurked in the water taps of the city.

#### OUR COUNTERATTACK

Belatedly, we've made an assault upon this problem. During the first eight years of our national Anti-Pollution Program, it had directly encouraged the building of 5,994 modern purification plants in communities throughout the country. Approximately \$500 million in Federal grants had stimulated local investments of more than \$3 billion in water purity.

Impressive as this is, it still isn't enough. The rapid proliferation of increasing spoliation of our streams has been halted, but, from the standpoint of the pollution level, we are just about standing still. The infection has ceased to spread dangerously throughout the body of our nation's rivers, but the degree of infection is just about the same. While we were eradicating old sources of pollution, new sources were springing up through the growth of industry and population density. We may have begun to hold our own. Until now, we have not been making appreciable headway on a national basis.

Last year, the Congress enacted the most massive pollution abatement program in the history of any nation. The federal authorization for matching grants to control the contamination of our water will accelerate from their present level of \$150 million annually to a figure of \$1.25 billion in 1971—or exactly 25 times as much money as was provided for the pilot program ten years ago. That it is an idea whose time has fully come is seen in the fact that not a single member of either House or Senate voted against the 1966 bill.

#### URBAN TRANSFORMATION

A real part of our problem is the transformation that has taken place in our country since World War II. We now are predominantly a nation of city dwellers. The Bureau of the Census tells us that two-thirds of all Americans today live in "urban" areas. While the remaining one-third still reside in "rural" areas, even this does not mean that they are "down on the farm." Almost two-thirds of these are living in towns too small to be listed as "urban." Today only about 15 million people, or less than 8 percent of our population, actually live "on the land."

As the farm population decreases, the amount of arable land also decreases. On the outskirts of every city in the United States, trees are being felled and meadows are being leveled to accommodate new housing developments, new industrial complexes, new shopping centers. With each new development, the water balance of the nation shifts a little.

There is no turning back. The civilization we have set in motion rolls over the land at an ever-accelerating pace. There are, altogether, 1,903,800,000 acres in the United States. Already a full one-tenth—194 million acres—strains under the weight of cities, towns and highways. This figure is increasing daily. Nearly 2 million more acres annually are absorbed into urban uses as the concrete and blacktop invasion pours across America. In the next forty years, an additional 80 million acres will be cut from woodland and pasture to make way for homes and

factories to serve our mushrooming population.

#### SEDIMENTATION

Not the least of the problems of this urban transformation is the growing problem of sedimentation. Around our sprawling cities literally millions of tons of silt run off the scraped-clean countryside, where the sound of building-project hammers never cease, into our rivers and reservoirs.

Each year more than 380 million cubic yards of sediment—eroded earth—must be dredged out of our nation's harbors and waterways simply to keep them from choking to death. This is more earth than was excavated to build the Panama Canal.

Even though it costs about \$125 million a year to dredge out the sediment, this represents only part of the financial loss. Every cubic yard that is dug up was usable elsewhere upstream; it is soil that was torn from its original location by flood waters and then sent careening on its downhill course, causing damage every foot of the way to its ultimate destination.

The long-range effects of sedimentation on precious storage space in our reservoirs was too long overlooked. We are becoming increasingly dependent on these reservoirs for hydroelectric power, and for our agricultural, municipal and industrial water supply. This dependency is growing so swiftly that the nation shall need an estimated additional 228 million acre-feet of water storage in reservoirs to meet our ordinary requirements in 1980.

#### SHRINKING RESERVOIRS

We don't know exactly how much our total reservoir capacity is being robbed by sediment each year, but the most conservative estimates place that loss in the neighborhood of 1½ billion cubic yards. If we put the average cost of developing reservoir storage at a hundred dollars per acre-foot (a not excessive estimate), the cost of this largely preventable depreciation comes to \$100 million a year.

This, in turn, poses a still thornier problem. All the best sites for our major reservoirs already are being utilized. If these reservoirs continue to fill up with silt until they become useless, we shall have to build new ones. Where will we build the new dams?

#### UPSTREAM WATERSHEDS

The pity of it is that most of this could be prevented. But we must attack the problem at the source—in the upstream watersheds, where 70 percent of the sediment damage occurs and an even higher percentage of the flood damage.

The problem is urgent. The next fifteen years could be decisive. Our population is growing at an accelerating pace and our rate of urban expansion is approaching fantastic proportions. The cost of construction is growing with each passing year.

We should attack the upstream watershed problem boldly and with vision now, before it is too late. If we do this, we shall be able to preserve enough water to keep many areas of the country secure from drought, and we shall be able to save billions of dollars in unnecessary waste throughout the country.

#### WHAT WE MUST DO

Can America solve its water crisis before it becomes a widespread irreversible famine? Yes—if we act with bold imagination, determined resolution and a sufficient sense of urgency.

The very first requisite of an adequate national water policy will be a change in the public attitude. The problem in its full dimensions needs to be recognized and understood. No longer is it good enough simply to know the cost of water-resource developments, unless we have a real appreciation for their value.

The old, cynical tongue-in-cheek attitude

which looks upon land and water development programs as so much boondoggling will have to go. It has long since outlived its time—if it ever had a time.

There are certain tired or unimaginative journalists in our country who never can refer to the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors development bills of Congress—or to the annual Public Works appropriations—without trotting out again that weary, old, shopworn cliché, "pork barrel." The term is both inappropriate and misleading.

Water developments pay for themselves many times over. The first \$3.5 billion worth of Congressionally sanctioned flood-control works, performed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, already have saved calculable damages of more than \$11 billion which would have occurred had they not been in place. An equally dramatic ratio will apply to the upstream work of the Soil Conservation Service.

A new reservoir above Denver remained largely unfilled during two years of sparse rainfall. The critics hooted in glee. "Look what a waste the stupid government has committed with our tax dollars!" they scoffed. But *one rain* filled it up, bequeathing the city a store of water whose worth, at the going residential rates, comes to more than the cost of the dam. And from that one rain, the dam prevented measurable property damages far in excess of its costs.

Then, too, we need a *greater sense of administrative urgency* than has heretofore characterized the slow, gradual development of our rivers and streams. On our Corps of Engineers projects, the *average* time lapse between the passage of the survey resolution by Congress and the actual turning of the first spade of dirt, is an almost insufferable ten years and eight months.

The White House needs to recognize that the *Upstream Watershed Program* as practiced for the past twelve years, is a veritable model in smoothly efficient legislative-executive cooperation. In no remote sense whatever does it constitute an infringement on the executive power, as recently claimed by some in the Bureau of the Budget. The program needs to be expanded, not hampered by specious argument.

*Navigation*, one of the earliest recognized goals of the American government, must not be sacrificed to the pagan god of false economy. In 1848, Abraham Lincoln delivered on the floor of the U. S. House of Representatives a homiletic proving that a waterway in Illinois was an economic benefit to both New Orleans and Buffalo, New York. Last year some 300 new industries sprang up on the banks of our nation's navigable streams. If we are to have a growing economy and provide the 3 million new jobs every year which are required to avoid unemployment, this nation must not slack in the development of its navigable waterways.

We need an extra head of steam behind the *desalination* program and intensified inquiry into the scientific possibilities of *weather modification* as a means of tapping the oceans of usable water which float above us, and past us, in the form of clouds. And we need to be giving far more attention to *oceanography*.

Lastly, it is time to start planning in earnest on the best ways to facilitate *long distance water transport*. We have the clear water in cascading volumes going to waste. With just a little foresight we can be ready for the time when necessity will require us to move it by aqueducts and pipelines from the sections of chronic overabundance to the areas of scarcity where, within a few years, it will be desperately needed. The NAWAPA plan, ambitious as it seems, merits sympathetic consideration.

#### NATURE'S ENDOWMENT AND MAN'S CHOICE

The amount of water in the world is constant—unvarying and abundant. The total quantity has been precisely the same since

the very beginning when, as the book of Genesis relates: "... God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters."

An unending cosmic rotation steadily moves man's life-giving liquid by gravity through the gentle and incessant flow of streams to the great reservoirs of our oceans, then draws it skyward by the sun's attraction to be purified anew, conveys it by cloud and wind, and returns it by rain to refresh the thirsty earth and renew man's lease on life... *ad infinitum*. It is an ever-recurring miracle, the most wondrous natural marvel of a wondrous universe.

Science can comprehend it, but never quite duplicate it. Man cannot change it. He can locally and temporarily befool the process, and bring death. Or he can form a sort of divine partnership with nature, help it along—and preserve life. This is his choice.

Twentieth-century America, like the prodigal son, has drawn heavily upon the bank account of its native endowment and squandered the substance in riotous misuse. More bountifully endowed than any nation in history, we've adopted the rather casual assumption that Providence protects America. We've extracted the riches of our natural legacy, exploited them to build a shining society, and wasted them in copious quantities.

Wasted! How this word runs like a refrain through the course of our national history—just a few seconds in the day of mankind, mere inches on the yardstick of Western civilization. In this brief span we've thrown away and destroyed more resources than most nations ever had. Most nations could live quite well on what we daily discard.

In the depth of New York City's water crisis in 1965, after four years of drought, it still could be reliably estimated that Gotham's eight million residents were *wasting*—through carelessness, leaking systems, and a legacy of irresponsible water management—almost as much of the vital fluid each day as London's seven million were *using*.

We recall that other civilizations, also blessed with a spark of greatness, have strutted across the stage of world eminence only to fade and wane, their brief, bright promise unfulfilled. In the uncomprehending sand and heat of arid desert waste, their monuments lie buried.

Let no future archaeologist tell the story for us. We have the knowledge to tell it ourselves—if we have the wisdom. There is *enough* water to serve our needs for future time, if we learn to use and reuse it well. And there is *enough* time to do what we must. But there's not much of either to spare.

#### ADMINISTRATION'S REDWOOD PLAN DISAPPOINTING

Mr. MONTGOMERY. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most important conservation issue before the 90th Congress is the proposal to establish a Redwood National Park.

There can be no question that the California coast redwood is one of our great and unique natural resources. There also can be little question that if we do not act promptly, during this Congress, there may never be a Redwood National Park.

Cast in this perspective, I believe the administration's plan for a Redwood National Park, sent to Congress this last weekend, is most disappointing. Yesterday I made a statement commenting on this plan and I include it in the RECORD at this point for the consideration of all Members.

The statement follows:

I am very disappointed in the Administration's proposal for a Redwood National Park. I believe it is far from the best park plan we could achieve even with limited resources. It certainly falls far short of what should be done if any truly meaningful stands of redwoods are to be preserved and displayed in a national park setting for the education and enjoyment of future generations of Americans.

I agree with the Secretary of the Interior that we must act now if there is ever going to be a Redwood National Park. In fact, I question whether there will ever be a Redwood National Park if we do not authorize one in this 90th Congress.

But it is just as important, in my judgment, to establish a great national park in the right place as it is to establish it at all.

Two weeks ago I made an inspection of the Mill Creek area, recommended as a park site by the Administration this weekend, and also the Redwood Creek area, which I have recommended along with more than 35 Members of the House and 20 Members of the Senate be the basis for a park.

I feel it would be desirable, in the general area recommended by the Administration, to add to the present Jeddiah Smith State Park the some five to seven thousand acres of privately owned superlative redwood stands that extend along its southern boundary. I would favor making a compensatory payment to the lumber company operating there in order to insure adequate watershed protection in the entire Mill Creek Drainage. I believe, taken together, that this would make a very desirable Northern Unit for a Redwood National Park.

But I do not see how we can virtually ignore, as the Administration does, the Redwood Creek and Lost Man Creek Drainages which the National Park Service itself, in its landmark 1964 report on the redwoods, declared contained the largest and most significant block of uncut virgin redwoods. Added to Skunk Cabbage Creek and the existing Prairie Creek Redwoods State Park, this would form the basis for a most impressive Southern Unit of a Redwood National Park. It definitely should be part of any national park plan.

The Administration has suggested that this latter area could be acquired by means of donated funds. But this is clearly not very hopeful or realistic. Neither is the Administration's proposal to establish a 1,600 acre unit around the Tall Trees in the heart of Redwood Creek Valley. For once the surrounding valley slopes are logged off, as they inevitably would be without protection, the tall trees would be exposed to the wind and flood and soil erosion that would quickly number their years.

If we are faced with the problem of limited financial resources, and the \$60 million figure included in the Administration's plan would indicate that we are, then our problem is one of priorities. The Administration is offering a plan which, in its present form, would put our resources to a second best use. It is not the best Redwood National Park that could be purchased for that amount of money.

I hope that as the House and Senate consider this proposal, a more equitable distribution of existing resources can be achieved and that significant parts of Redwood Creek Valley and the Lost Man Creek Drainages will be included in any final Redwood National Park plan passed by the Congress.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GATHINGS and to include extraneous material.

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

Mr. PUCINSKI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

Mr. DENNEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RUPPE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan.

Mr. ARENDS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. RARICK.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa.

## SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1177. An act to provide for the disposition of a judgment against the United States recovered by the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1191. An act to provide for the disposition of a judgment against the United States recovered by the Southern Ute Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S.J. Res. 18. Joint resolution to provide for the administration and development of Pennsylvania Avenue as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 15, 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:

527. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1966, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 85); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

528. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of certain aspects of social security benefit overpayments, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

529. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of all claims paid under the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, for the period January 1 to December 31, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-558; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

530. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 21, 1966, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a letter report on Tugaloo River, Savannah River Basin, Ga., and S.C., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted March 10 and August 14, 1959; to the Committee on Public Works.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2513. A bill relating to national observances and holidays, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2518. A bill to amend sections 337 and 338 of the Bankruptcy Act and to add new section 339 (Rept. No. 121). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2519. A bill to amend sections 334, 355, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act (Rept. No. 122). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2517. A bill to amend sections 64a, 238, 378, and 483 of the Bankruptcy Act and to repeal sections 354 and 459 of the act (Rept. No. 123). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5876. A bill to amend titles 5, 14, and 37, United States Code, to codify recent law, and to improve the Code; with amendments (Rept. No. 124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5357. A bill to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, to codify the provisions of Public Law 89-487 (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 384. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 6098, a bill to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 126). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7140. A bill to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 7141. A bill to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 7142. A bill to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 7143. A bill to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7144. A bill to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 7145. A bill to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 7146. A bill to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 7147. A bill to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 7148. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to classify as wilderness the national forest lands known as the Lincoln Back Country, and parts of the Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests, in Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 7149. A bill to amend chapter 39 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to the transportation of explosives and other dangerous articles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 7150. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 7151. A bill to amend part III of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for the recording of trust agreements and other evidences of equipment indebtedness of water carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 7152. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7153. A bill to provide certain free mailing privileges with respect to books, periodicals, and other reading matter mailed between libraries and other nonprofit organizations and persons confined by illness or disability to their places of abode; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7154. A bill to provide for the return of obscene mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7155. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 7156. A bill to authorize a special study by the Small Business Administration of ways in which small business concerns may best protect themselves against robbery, burglary, shoplifting, vandalism, and other criminal acts; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7157. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, to eliminate compensatory time in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7158. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide additional group life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment insurance for Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7159. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit States, under Federal-State agreements, to provide for coverage for hospital insurance benefits for the aged for certain State and local employees whose services are not otherwise covered by the insurance system established by such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 7160. A bill relating to the appointment of postmasters and rural carriers from civil service registers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 7161. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase (to \$100 a month in the case of a primary benefit) the minimum amount of all monthly insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7162. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a woman otherwise qualified may become entitled to receive widow's insurance benefits, specially reduced, at age 50, with full benefits at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7163. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an increase in the special monthly benefits which are payable to certain individuals (lacking regular insured status) who have attained age 72; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7164. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may elect to have any employment or self-employment performed by him after attaining age 65 excluded (for both tax and benefit purposes) from coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 7165. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to consolidate certain provisions assuring the safety and effectiveness of new animal drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 7166. A bill to amend section 501(c) (14) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income taxation certain non-profit corporations and associations organized to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 7167. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 20-percent, across-the-board benefit increase (with a minimum retirement annuity of \$70 a month) and subsequent increases based on rises in the cost of living, and to finance the cost of these changes out of the general revenues; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7168. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enlarge and improve the research facility near Bruceton, Pa., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7169. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7170. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide additional readjustment assistance for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7171. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to authorize on-the-job training programs, on-the-farm training programs, and guaranteed business loans for veterans of service after January 31, 1955; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 7172. A bill to designate the locks and dams on the Ohio River, in the States of Kentucky and Ohio, known as the Greenup locks and dam as the Paul G. Blazer locks and dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 7173. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7174. A bill to amend the National Firearms Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 7175. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 7176. A bill to provide appropriations for sharing of Federal taxes with States out of funds derived from a cutback in projected new expansion of grant-in-aid programs and as a substitute for portions of existing grant-in-aid expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MAY (by request):

H.R. 7177. A bill relating to the individual rights of members of tribal organizations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7178. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 968), providing for the preparation of a membership roll of the Indians of the Yakima Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 7179. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 7180. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide benefits for additional categories of individuals, to provide health insurance to the disabled, to improve the public assistance program and programs relating to the health of children, to revise the income tax treatment of the aged, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 7181. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 7182. A bill to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 7183. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 7184. A bill to amend section 9 of the Administrative Procedure Act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238), to clarify and protect the right of the public to fair and impartial agency practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 7185. A bill to authorize the disposal of bauxite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7186. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual American education programs, and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7187. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in order to establish a southwestern human development program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7188. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7189. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7190. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide a new system of overtime compensation for the postal field service employees, to eliminate compensatory time in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 7191. A bill to amend section 124 of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the financing of advance acquisition of rights-of-way for the Federal-aid highway systems; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 7192. A bill relating to rates of postage on certain matter for blind and other handicapped persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 7193. A bill to prohibit any State from levying income taxes on nonresidents of the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON (by request):

H.R. 7194. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the central Arizona project, Arizona-New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 7195. A bill to amend the act of October 24, 1951, in order to insure that the salaries of the police for the National Zoological Park shall equal those of members of the U.S. Park Police having comparable duties; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 7196. A bill to prohibit any State from levying income taxes on nonresidents of the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 7197. A bill to provide compensation in the case in which a law enforcement officer or firefighter is killed or disabled in the course of his duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7198. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 7199. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase to \$30,000 the maximum servicemen's group life insurance which may be provided members of the uniformed services on active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 7200. A bill to extend the U.S. Fishing Fleet Improvement Act and to increase the annual authorization for such act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 7201. A bill to establish and develop the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 7202. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from 13 to 16 the maximum age of a dependent child with respect to whom the deduction for child-care expenses may be allowed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 7203. A bill to prohibit any State from levying income taxes on nonresidents of the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR (by request):

H.R. 7204. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the central Arizona project, Arizona-New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 7205. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, in order to make unlawful, an unreasonable and unjust discrimination against, and an undue burden upon interstate commerce, certain property tax assessments of common carrier property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.J. Res. 430. 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 Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 431. Joint resolution designating the last Sunday in April of each year as "Shut-In's Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 432. Joint resolution to provide

for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.J. Res. 433. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last week in October of each year as "National Water Awareness Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H. Con. Res. 278. Concurrent resolution relative to the cutback order of the highway fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Con. Res. 279. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print entitled "Metropolitan America: Challenge to Federalism"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H. Con. Res. 280. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress on the occasion of the centennial of the confederation of Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. Res. 385. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to the resignation of the present Commissioner of Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 386. Resolution concerning an investigation in connection with development lending in Africa of those agencies in which the United States participates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 387. Resolution relating to the pay of certain clerical assistants; to the Committee on House Administration.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

66. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to the extension of the 12-mile limit of fishing control, which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 7206. A bill for the relief of Mehmet Adil Ozkaptan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 7207. A bill for the relief of Elvira Maria Bruno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 7208. A bill for the relief of Cathie Lee Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 7209. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Rocco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 7210. A bill for the relief of the Rochester Iron & Metal Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 7211. A bill for the relief of Dr. Muthu S. Udayamurthy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7212. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to reopen and continue case No. 66-55; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

**Nels Anton Pearson**

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1967

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the State of Kansas has produced many distinguished leaders in a variety of fields. Many Kansans have left the State to achieve prominence in the theater, art, journalism, and so forth. However, Nels Anton Pearson earned international distinction without leaving his beloved Kansas.

He was born on May 23, 1892, at Lund, Sweden, and arrived in the United States in 1912. He made his home in Lindsborg, Kans., in 1915. Mr. Pearson graduated from Bethany College in Lindsborg 3 years later. He served his country in World War I.

Nels Anton Pearson won international recognition as a woodcarver, stone-cutter, and painter. His particular field was miniature wood carvings. His studio and workshop became a popular tourist attraction in Lindsborg.

The talent and energy of Nels Anton Pearson have been stilled by death. He passed away on March 5, 1967, in the Veterans' Administration Hospital in

Kansas City, Mo., at age 74. Kansas and the Nation have lost an accomplished artist who contributed significantly to the beauty and appreciation of the world about us.

We express our heartfelt sympathy to his beloved wife, Grace, his daughter, Mrs. Norman Malm, and others in his family.

### WSU-O Represents Wisconsin at NAIA

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1967

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin State University at Oshkosh basketball team this week invades Kansas City representing Wisconsin in the annual NAIA basketball tournament. Oshkosh, the Sixth Congressional District, and Wisconsin are proud of this fine team made up of:

Coach Bob White, Assistant Coach Russ Tiedemann, players Tom Witasek, Dale Race, John Lallensack, Ron Hayek, Bruce Miller, Dick Bourbonnais, Mike Malone, Pat Simon, Mark Christensen, Ken Wyatt, Dan Buhr, Rick Rehm, Gary Van Cuyk, Ray Berhoefer, Steve Durtschl, and Manager Pat Simon.

I join Wisconsin residents in wishing our representatives at Kansas City the best of luck in their endeavor to capture the NAIA crown.

### Warrant Officer Dewey E. Jones

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON**

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 1967

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I take great honor and pride in announcing that one of my constituents, WO Dewey E. Jones, of Laramie, Wyo., has received the Navy Commendation Medal with Combat Distinguishing Device.

During ceremonies which were held on February 28, 1967, Warrant Officer Jones was awarded the Navy Commendation Medal for meritorious service while serving as communications chief of Howtar Battery, 1st Battalion, 12th Marines and as assistant combat intelligence officer with Headquarters, 3d Marine Division, from November 28, 1965, to November 20, 1966, in connection with operations against insurgent Communist forces in the Republic of Vietnam.