have printed in the Record an article entitled "King Keys His Tactics to Response by Hill," written by Jean M. White and Robert C. Maynard, which was published in the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**King Keys His TACTICS to RESPONSE by Hill.**

(By Jean M. White and Robert C. Maynard)

The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., yesterday set the goal for his mass camp-in in Washington as a "bill of economic and social rights" for the poor, including guaranteed jobs and guaranteed minimum income.

At the same time, the Negro leader pledged that King's poor people's campaign will begin as a peaceful and law-abiding demonstration and will "escalate to disruptive protest" only if Congress doesn't help the poor.

"Our aim is not to tie up the city of Washington," Dr. King emphasized, "Our protests will center on the Government, Congress, and not the city at large."

The head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference also hinted he may carry his campaign into the national political conventions in this election year, "If things don't happen here and Congress does not act.

He also talked about simultaneous demonstrations in this election year that his April poor people's campaign will center on the Government, Congress, and the city at large.

The civil rights leader was holding a meeting with two different groups last night, the Washington Negro coalition and SNCC and SNCO staff members—including Chair-H. Rap Brown—at the Pitts Motor Motel, and the Vermont Avenue Baptist Church, 1630 Vermont Avenue, Nw., with about 1000 persons attending.

Dr. King, speaking after the meeting with SNCC leaders that it was simply one of several he is holding "in a number of cities with a number of groups" to explain his spring campaign.

Brown, under a bond restriction to remain in the nine counties of the jurisdiction of the Southern District of New York, shrugged his shoulders when asked if his presence in Washington might not arouse the ire of that court.

At a press conference yesterday, Dr. King said it is long past time for Congress to do something about the economic and social plight.

As to the tactics of his spring campaign, Dr. King said, "It is necessary to tie up traffic, however inconvenient, the result is not as inconvenient as the conditions poor people live in."

He also underlined the political leverage of the poor people's power and predicted that the presidential candidate "who responds to our program will get the Negro vote.

From then on, he said the tactics will depend on the response of Congress.

He said he didn't think building shantytowns—one tactic mentioned—was necessarily breaking the law since "people have built tent towns around Washington and not a court has come out and said that "people own private property and private land," with the hint that the tents and shanties could go up on these without breaking the law.

**ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.**

**MONDAY NEXT**

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 12, 1968, at 10 a.m.

**CONFIRMATION**

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 8, 1968.

**POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT**

Frederick E. Battrus, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

---

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—**

*February 8, 1968*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

*Be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you.*—11 Corinthians 3:1-2.

Eternal Father, strong to save and gallant in our desire for honor, gentle in our dedication to good will, and genuine in our decision to seek peace and to pursue it until we possess it;

Bless these leaders of our Nation that they may walk with Thee as they make decisions looking forward to a better day;

Grant that, as our leaders move forward, they may find themselves by doing Thy will, and by living together in peace, usher in a new day of peace for our world. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

**THE JOURNAL**

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

**MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT**

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

**MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE**

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment which was to the House bill, entitled "An act to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Pattil, Mr. C. W. Matthews, Mr. McConnel, and Mr. Hickenlooper to be the Conference on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

*S. 2511. An act to maintain and improve the income of producers of crude pine gum, to stabilize production of crude pine gum, and for other purposes.***
ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION FOR VICTIMS OF THE EARTHQUAKE IN SICILY

Mr. FEIGHAN. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, in light of the great suffering and hardship caused to more than 40,000 Sicilians by the earthquake disaster last month, I would like to announce that the Sub-committee on Immigration and Nationality, Committee on the Judiciary, will hold a hearing Wednesday, February 21, beginning at 11:15 A.M., in the Longworth House Office Building, on bills which have been introduced to permit the immediate admission into the United States of victims of this catastrophe.

It is my intention to expedite consideration of legislation by holding hearings to 1 day only, and to silent testimony only from those most vitally involved in this crisis.

Our Government moved quickly to the aid of those uprooted, as have the voluntary agencies, many organizations, and private individuals.

More than 45 of my colleagues have joined in voicing their concern through the introduction of bills. Many Italian societies and organizations have also voiced concern. Many thousands of people in Sicily are without homes, or livelihood, even without their land. Their plight is our plight, and our tradition of offering a haven to the distressed and suffering, to the victims and refugees from disaster or tyranny, calls for expeditious action on our part.

CIVIL AIR PATROL

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleague, the gentleman from New York, Colonel WOLFF, in advising you that the Civil Air Patrol has now formed a congressional squadron and ask that those of you who might have an interest, whether you be pilots or simply notifying enthusiasts of aviation, consider joining this squadron.

Mr. Speaker, the Civil Air Patrol, as may the Members of the House I am sure are aware, has a threefold mission: Search and rescue; the advancement of education in aerospace; and the Cadet Corps which is made up of the young people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am personally indebted to the Civil Air Patrol for their rescue of me in 1964 when I was forced down in the mountains of Arizona and was located for some 36 hours by the Arizona squadron of the Civil Air Patrol.

I can tell the Members of the House that there may be feelings of emotion which one will recall throughout one's life, but I can only assure you that there is nothing quite as significant in one's life under these circumstances as the arrival of the Civil Air Patrol, when one is in such a situation as I was.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of the Congress to consider joining the squadron to which reference has been made and that the Members urge the members of their staffs to also join.

SHOCKING STATEMENTS OF YURI MASHIN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCLOARY. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked but not too surprised to read the statements of Yuri Mashin, president of the Central Committee on Soviet Sports Federations, made at a recent press conference in Grenoble, France, site of the 1968 Winter Olympics. Mashin, head of the Soviet delegation of the Olympics, called a press conference Monday for the purpose of denouncing so-called "American aggression" in Vietnam. Speaking before 100 press reporters from around the world, Mashin stated:

The Soviet sportsmen are profoundly disgusted by the American aggression in Vietnam.

To say the least, such wildly inflammatory pronouncements are hardly conducive to the spirit of international friendship—not to mention sportsmanship—which the Olympic games are intended to foster. Indeed, coming from the representative of a totalitarian state which has instigated for 20 years of Eastern Europe, and which finds the Berlin Wall a necessary adjunct of foreign policy, Mr. Mashin's self-righteous statements describing peace, friendship, and mutual understanding between peoples as the "cornerstone" of Soviet foreign policy sound hollow and ludicrous.

The Russian Government's use of the Olympic games as a platform for fomenting international discord recalls a similar attack by another totalitarian regime at the 1936 Olympics in Berlin, Germany.

I am sure that no one has to remind Mr. Mashin of the outcome of those games nor of the far less peaceful and tragic competition that followed. Let
the Soviet sportsmen speak for themselves through their athletic prowess in open competition, rather than by the meaningless rhetoric of their delegation head. It seems to me that Mr. Mashin's energies might be better spent developing a figure skater of Miss Peggy Fleming's calibre, instead of expounding on subjects about which he obviously has little knowledge or understanding.

Mr. Mashin's statements should be roundly denounced.

PRESIDENT'S CONSUMER MESSAGE PROPOSES BOAT SAFETY ACT FOR SAFE RECREATION

Mr. DOWNING. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, the President's consumer message properly notes the Nation's concern over the growing incidence of injuries and fatalities occurring to boaters and users. It proposes remedies.

Eight million boats are being operated on our inland waterways—with a 5-percent increase expected in their number this year. While Americans are increasingly taking to the water, far too many are finding unexpected tragedy. Last year alone say 1,400 people were killed in boating accidents. I hope President Johnson's Recreational Safety Act of 1968 will provide needed protection for the boating public.

It will help States establish and improve their boat safety programs to include removal of hazardous debris, boat operator education, safety patrols, and boat inspections. Also, the Secretary of Transportation will be empowered to establish and enforce safety standards for boat design and equipment. And boat inspections. Also, the Secretary of Transportation will be empowered to establish and enforce safety standards for boat design and equipment.

By beginning a comprehensive water safety program today we can avoid an epic accident toll such as we find on our Nation's highways. Early action is needed now. I fear this program becomes more difficult to control tomorrow.

Safe recreation for all boaters and their families must be our goal in 1968.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON CRIME

Mr. ALBERT. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to applaud the President's timely crime message. The message clearly and forthrightly describes the continuing threat of crime, and the energetic and vigorous efforts now being undertaken by many departments and agencies of the Federal Government to stem this rising tide of lawlessness. The "Strike Force" units created within the Department of Justice are a case in point. This utilization of the skills and personnel of many related Federal Government agencies has been especially effective in fighting the hidden, yet malignant, disease plaguing our society in the form of organized crime.

To continue the struggle against this often invisible menace, it is necessary to penetrate a wall of silence which often prevents law enforcement officials to obtain witnesses in organized crime cases. This is especially true in cases of corruption of Government officials. To break through this wall of silence and to compel the giving of testimony regarding activities linked closely with organized crime, the President has wisely called for an extension of special immunity provisions to four laws invoked in the prosecution of organized crime—statutes relating to travel in racketeering enterprises, bankruptcy frauds, bribery, graft, conflict of interest, and the obstruction of justice. The Senate passed this legislation in the first session. I hope that the House will now move expeditiously toward its consideration.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 19

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader about the program for the week of February 18, that is, following next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, as previously announced, when we adjourn on the completion of business of this week, we will go over until Monday and thence over to Thursday and thence over until Monday again, with no legislative program scheduled for next week pursuant to the agreement that we made earlier last week.

The program for the week of February 19 is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day. As of today we have two suspensions. Of course, the Speaker of the House has authority to add suspensions. This announcement is tentative because we will meet on Monday and Thursday next week. If suspensions are added we will try to give notice in the Record. We will also try to give notice of any other additions to the legislative program.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day.

On Tuesday we also have scheduled H.R. 11308, amending the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, under an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week:

H.R. 14743, to eliminate the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890. This is subject to a rule being granted.

S. 989, Jury Selection and Service Act of 1967, also subject to a rule being granted.

Pursuant to the usual tradition and custom of the House, George Washington's Farewell Address will be read on Thursday, February 21.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

As I have advised, there may well be additions to or changes in the program.

DISPENDING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON FEBRUARY 14, AND FEBRUARY 21

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rules be dispensed with on Wednesday next and the following Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BRITISH SUPPLIES FOR THE VIETCONG

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CHAMBERLAIN) called attention to the fact that the perfidious British are still running their flagships into Hanoi with supplies for the Vietcong, the Communists of North Vietnam, and thus collecting their blood money. The gentleman from Michigan said that he is sending a letter to the President of the United States to use his influence upon Prime Minister Wilson, who is now in this country, to put a stop to this business. I hope the gentleman from Michigan does not hold his breath until Lyndon Johnson answers his telegram in the affirmative.

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

Mr. GROSS. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio if I have the time.

Mr. HAYS. If the British are bringing their ships into Hanoi, as the gentleman said, they are not only perfidious but also malicious.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about the port of Haiphong, and the gentleman well knows it. He is one of those who stood on the floor of the House last year, and I recall the tears coming from every pore, insisted that if my amendment to the foreign aid bill was adopted to stop all trade with those supplying North Vietnam, we would lose a contract to sell—

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman yielded to me; I had not finished.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is that the gentleman from Iowa has 10 seconds of his 1 minute remaining.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman bled at every pore because, he said, we would lose a contract to sell some $700 million worth of F-111 military planes to the British. The British took pretty good care of the situation, and the gentleman from Ohio well knows it, by simply repudiating the agreement to buy the planes, and left us holding the bag while they, the British, got our dollars, their dollars, and their ships continuing to bilk the United States and helping supply those who are killing Americans.

THE WAR AGAINST CRIME

Mr. EDMONDSON. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I think the people in this House were highly pleased yesterday to hear presented to the Congress a series of far-reaching Presidential recommendations for the conduct of an aggressive war against drugs on the streets and in the communities of the country. I hope that we can proceed without further delay in the committees that have jurisdiction over the various measures to consider these proposals that have been advanced by the President and to advance them expeditiously. An annual cost of $4 billion in property loss alone through the ravages of crime is cause enough for expeditious action. When we add to it the impact upon human lives of the mounting cost of crime in the United States, I certainly believe all of us have reason to agree that this should be a top-priority field for legislative action.

I believe this is a matter that should be nonpartisan in character and I hope our Republican friends will not permit partisan politics in an election year to block or delay needed legislation.

As one of those who sponsored a bill to make it a felony to cross a State line with intent to incite a riot and thereafter participate in such disturbance, I was highly pleased to see the President put his personal stamp of approval on this particular proposal. I hope there will be no further delay over in the other body in enacting this measure into law and making it a part of our arsenal against crime.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House considered and passed a bill extending the life of the Export-Import Bank.

I was present for the debate, participated in the teller and voice votes, and voted against the motion to recommit the bill. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I was called off the floor at the time the measure was up for final passage. Had I been present on the floor, I would have cast my vote with the other 376 Members of the House who voted for passage.

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

Mr. HANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I would just like to say in reply to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross), who accused me of having tears running down my face, that I do not cry very easily. In fact, I do not ever remember crying on this floor except a couple of times when I cried about the misinformation in a couple of speeches that the gentleman from Iowa made.

A PROGRAM FOR NARCOTIC ADDICTS AND ALCOHOLICS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the President is to be commended for his program for the prevention, treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts and alcoholics.

I rise to support the inclusion of programs for the prevention and treatment of narcotic addiction and alcoholism in the Community Mental Health Centers program. Treatment services for addicts and alcoholics must be provided by the same type of personnel who are staffing our community mental health centers. There are already more than 250 such facilities in operation or now developing throughout our Nation.

Not only do these centers incorporate a broad range of direct treatment services, they also have another very important element of service—a service especially important to programs for narcotic addiction and alcoholism—and that is consultation and education for other community helping agencies.

This service is important because it permits the centers to move toward prevention and the nature and magnitude of addiction and alcoholism makes prevention especially important. The consultation and education staff of the community mental health centers are admirably qualified to work with police, probationers, health departments, and other community-helping agencies on preventive programs.

I urge the Congress to give prompt and favorable consideration to this legislation.

THE FIGHT AGAINST CRIME

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, it was good to hear the comments of my colleague from Oklahoma in speaking about the President's message against crime. I, too, am pleased that the President has sent a message against crime to the Congress. I also want to say, for the record, that a number of us have been concerned in the war against crime for a long, long time.

Within the next day or two I shall have something to say of the battles we have won in that war and of the legislation that we, in the House, have introduced, where it now rests, and the reasons therefore. I hope much of that legislation will soon become law.

PREVENTION AND CONTROL OF CRIME

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the administration's program for the prevention and control of crime should be enacted promptly by the Congress. The crime program includes safe streets, im-
The following message from the President of the United States was read and, without objection, referred by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Albert) to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

**To the Congress of the United States:**

Peace will never be secure so long as:
- Seven out of ten people on earth cannot read or write;
- Tens of millions of people each day—most of them children—are malnourished and stunted by malnutrition;
- Diseases long conquered by science still ravage cities and villages around the world.

If most men can look forward to nothing more than a lifetime of backbreaking toil which only preserves their misery, violence will always beckon, freedom will ever be under siege.

It is only when peace offers hope for a better life that it attracts the hundreds of millions around the world who live in the shadow of despair.

Twenty years ago America resolved to lead the world against the destructive policies of many to slave the nations. We declared war on the hunger, the ignorance, the disease, and the hopelessness which breed violence in human affairs.

We knew then that the job would take many years. We knew then that many trials and many disappointments would test our will.

But we also knew, that in the long run, a single ray of hope—a school, a road, a hybrid seed, a vaccination—can do more to build the peace and guard America from harm than guns and bombs.

This is the great truth upon which all our foreign aid programs are founded. It was valid in 1948 when we helped Greece and Turkey maintain their independence. It was valid in the early fifties when the Marshall Plan helped rebuild a ruined Western Europe into a showcase of freedom. It was valid in the sixties when we helped Taiwan and Iran and Israel take their places in the ranks of free nations able to defend their own independence and moving toward prosperity on their own.

The programs I propose today are as important and as essential to the security of this nation as our military defenses. Victory on the battlefield must be matched by victory in the peaceful struggles which shape men's minds.

In these fateful years, we must not falter. In these decisive times, we dare not fail.

---

**NO RETREAT, NO WASTE**

The foreign aid program for fiscal 1969 is designed to foster our fundamental American purpose: To help root out the causes of conflict and thus ensure our own security in a peaceful community of nations.

For Fiscal 1969, I propose:
- An economic aid appropriation of $3.5 billion.
- A military grant aid appropriation of $150 million.
- New and separate legislation for foreign military sales.

- A five-year program to develop and...
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manufacture low-cost protein additives from fish, to help avoid the tragic brain damage now inflicted on many young children because of malnutrition in their early years.

That the United States join with other nations to expand the International Development Association, the development-lending affiliate of the World Bank. For every two dollars the United States contributes, other nations will contribute three dollars.

That the Congress authorize a continuation to new Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank.

Prompt appropriation of the annual contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Further authorization and appropriation of callable funds for the Inter-American Development Bank to stand behind the Bank's borrowing in private money markets.

COMMON EFFORT FOR COMMON GOOD

I urge Congress and the people of America, that these programs will be carried out with strict attention to the six basic principles of foreign aid administration we announced last year.

1. Self-Help

Self-help is the fundamental condition for all American aid. We will continue to insist on several dollars of local investment for every dollar of American investment. We will help those—and only those—help themselves. We will not tolerate waste and mismanagement.

2. Multilateralism

This year, 90 percent of our AID loans will be made as part of international arrangements in which donors and recipients alike carry their fair shares of the common burden. America now ranks fifth among donor countries in terms of the share of its national product devoted to official foreign aid. Japan increased her aid from $12 billion this last year. Germany has increased her aid budget despite fiscal restraints which have curtailed domestic welfare programs. Great Britain is maintaining aid levels despite severe budgetary restrictions. With the signing of the International Grains Agreement, other wealthy nations will for the first time be obligated to contribute food and money to the world-wide war on hunger.

This year we must take another important step to sustain those international institutions which build the peace.

The International Development Association, the World Bank's concessional lending agency, is almost without funds. Discussions to provide the needed capital and balance of payments safeguards are now underway. We hope that these talks will soon result in agreements among the wealth of nations and the world to continue the critical work of the Association in the developing countries. The administration will transmit specific legislation promptly upon completion of these discussions. I urge the Congress to give it full support.

3. Regionalism

Last year I joined with the Latin American Presidents to renew, reaffirm and redirect the Alliance for Progress.

The nations of free Asia began a general survey of their joint transportation and economic development to proceed on projects to bring power, water and the other tools of progress to all.

The African Development Bank, financed entirely by Africans, opened its doors and business this year. The coming year will present three major opportunities for the United States to add new momentum to these regional efforts:

A. The Inter-American Development Bank.

This Bank stands at the center of the Alliance for Progress. Last year, the Congress authorized three annual contributions of $300 million each to the Bank's Fund for Special Operations. The second of these contributions should be appropriated this year.

The Ordinary Capital of the Bank, which comes mainly from sales of its bonds, must now be expanded. Since 1960, we have appropriated $612 million which is kept in the U.S. Treasury to guarantee these bonds. Not one dollar of this money has ever been spent, but this guarantee has enabled the bank to raise $12 million from private sources for worthy projects. We must extend this proud record. I urge the Congress to authorize $412 million in callable funds, of which $206 million will be needed this year.


This Bank has asked the United States, Japan, and other donors to help establish Special Funds for projects of regional significance in agriculture, education, transportation and other fields. Last October I requested that the Congress authorize a United States contribution of up to $200 million. This would be paid over a four year period only if it were a majority share of the total fund, and if it did not adversely affect our balance of payments. I urge the Congress to authorize $412 million in callable funds, of which $206 million will be needed this year.


This Bank has also asked for our help to establish a small Special Fund for projects which cannot or should not be financed through the Bank's Ordinary Capital. We must stand ready to provide our fair share, with full safeguards for our balance of payments.

4. Priority for Agriculture and Population Planning

Victory in the war on hunger is as important to every human being as any achievement in the history of mankind.

The report of 100 experts assembled last summer by the President's Science Advisory Committee on the World Food Supply rings with grim clarity. Their message is clear: The world has entered a food-population crisis. Unless the rich and the poor nations join in a long-range, coordinated effort unprecedented in human affairs, this crisis will reach disastrous proportions by the mid-1980's.

That Report also reminded us that more food production is not enough. People must also eat the food. They must have jobs and homes and schools and rising incomes. Agricultural development must go hand-in-hand with general economic growth.

AID programs are designed both to stimulate general economic development and to give first priority to agriculture. In India, for instance, about half of all AID-financed imports this year will consist of fertilizer and other agricultural supplies.

We have made a good start:

- India is harvesting the largest grain crop in her history. Fertilizer use has doubled in the past two years. Last year five million acres were planted with new high yield wheat seeds. By 1976 this will increase to 32 million acres.

- Brazil, with AID help, has developed a new grass which has already added 400,000 acres of new pastureland and increased her annual output of beef by 20,000 metric tons.

- The Philippines is expecting a record rice crop this year which will enable her to reduce import rice.

In the year ahead, AID will increase its investment in agriculture to about $800 million—50 percent of its total development aid. In addition, I will shortly propose an extension of the Food for Freedom program to provide emergency food assistance to stave off disaster while hungry countries build their own food production.

We must also tap the vast storehouse of food in the oceans which cover three-fourths of the earth's surface. I have directed the Administrator of the Agency for International Development and the Secretary of the Interior to launch a 5-year program to:

- Perfect low-cost commercial processes for the production of Fish Protein Concentrate.

- Develop new protein-rich products that will fit in a variety of local diets.

- Encourage private investment in Fish Protein Concentrate production and marketing, as well as better fish management.

- Use this new product in our Food for Freedom program to fortify the diets of children and nursing mothers.

Family planning will be only one side of the equation. If populations continue to grow at the present rate, we are only postponing disaster not preventing it.

In 1961 only two developing countries had programs to reduce birth rates. In 1967 there were 26.

As late as 1963, this government was spending less than $2 million to help family planning efforts abroad. In 1968, we will commit $35 million and additional amounts of local currency will be committed. In 1969 we expect to do even more.

Family planning is a family matter. The United States will not undertake to sell government programs to other countries, but we will be willing to share our experience and to what extent population must be limited.

But neither we nor our friends in the developing world can ignore the stark fact that the success of development efforts depends upon the balance between population and food and other resources. No government can escape this truth. The
United States stands ready to help those governments that recognize it and move to deal with it.

5. Balance of Payments Protection. Our ability to pursue our responsibilities at home and abroad rests on the strength of the dollar. Economic aid now helps—not hurts—our balance of payments.

In 1963, the dollar outflow from foreign aid expenditures was over $600 million. Last year it was down to $270 million. I have already directed that even this figure be reduced by 1968 to less than $170 million. More than nine dollars of every ten dollars AID spends will buy American goods and services. And the repayments of prior loans will more than offset the small outflow from new loans.

Moreover, our AID programs have a favorable long range impact on our balance of payments by building new markets for our exports.

6. Efficient Administration. Over the past years AID has reduced by twenty percent the number of U.S. employees serving overseas in posts other than Vietnam. Last month I directed a ten percent reduction in the number employed overseas in all civilian agencies. In addition, AID is further improving and streamlining its over-all operations.

A CREATIVE PARTNERSHIP WITH FREE ENTERPRISE

Foreign aid must be much more than government aid. Private enterprise has a critical role. Last year—

All 50 states exported American products financed by AID.

The International Executive Service Corporation operated 300 projects in which experienced American businessmen committed their personal resources.

Nearly 3,000 American scientists and engineers shared their know-how with developing countries under the auspices of VITA Corporation, a new joint-venture organization.

More than 120 American colleges and universities contributed to AID technical assistance programs.

Thirty-three American states supplied technical assistance to 64 Latin American countries under AID’s Partners of the Alliance program.

All of these efforts will be sustained and expanded in the coming year. We are committed to maximum encouragement of private investment in an assistance to the developing countries. We shall remain so.

A YEAR OF OPPORTUNITY, A YEAR OF RISK

LATIN AMERICA

I propose appropriations of $625 million for the Alliance for Progress.

The United States President met at Punta del Este last spring to reaffirm a partnership which has already produced six years of accomplishment:

—The Nations of Latin America have invested more than $115 billion, compared with $7.7 billion in American aid.

—Their tax revenues have increased by 30 percent.

—Their gross national product has risen by 30 percent.

A new course was charted for that partnership in the years ahead. At Punta del Este, the American nations agreed to move toward economic integration. They set new targets for improvements in agriculture, health, and in education. They moved to bring the benefits of modern technology to all the citizens of our Hemisphere.

Now we must do our part. Some nations, such as Venezuela, have progressed to the point where they no longer require AID loans. More than two-thirds of our aid will be concentrated in Brazil, Chile, Colombia and Central America. Each has done much to deserve our help:—Brazil reduced its public deficit by 10% in 1967 and achieved an overall real growth rate of 5%. Inflation was cut from 40% in 1966 to 25% in 1967.

—Chile, under President Frei’s Revolution in Freedom, has launched a strong program of agricultural and land reforms, while maintaining an overall growth rate of about 5%.

—Colombia has also averaged 5% growth while undertaking difficult financial and social reforms.

—Central America leads the way toward the economic integration so important to the future of Latin America. In these countries has grown by 450% in the six years of the Alliance—from $30 million in 1961 to $172 million in 1967.

This peaceful Alliance holds the hopes of a Hemisphere. We have a clear responsibility to do our share. Our partners have an equally clear responsibility to theirs. We must press forward together toward mutual security and economic development for all our people.

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

I recommend $766 million for the Near East and South Asia

Half the people we seek to help live in India, Pakistan and Turkey. The fate of freedom in the world rests heavily on the fortunes of these three countries. Each is engaged in a powerful effort to fight poverty, to grow more and better food, and to control population. If they succeed, and if doing so prove the effectiveness of free institutions, the lesson will be heard and heeded around the world.

This is a year of special importance for all three countries.

INDIA

India has survived two successive years of the worst drought of this century. Even as she fought to save her people from starvation, she prepared for the day when the monsoon rains would return to normal. That day has come. India is now harvesting the greatest grain crop in her history. With this crop, India can begin its organic recovery which could lay the groundwork for sustained growth.

India must have the foreign exchange to take advantage of this year of opportunity. A farmer cannot use the miracle seed unless he can get twice as much fertilizer as he used for the old seeds. A fertilizer distributor cannot sell that much more fertilizer unless it can be imported. An importer cannot buy it unless he can get foreign exchange from the Government. India will not have that foreign exchange unless the wealthy countries of the world are willing to lend it in sufficient quantities at reasonable terms.

This is the crux of the matter. If we and other wealthy countries can provide the loans, we have much to look forward to. If we cannot, history will rightly label us penny-wise and pound-foolish.

PAKISTAN

Pakistan, though also plagued by drought, has continued its excellent progress of the past several years. Her development budget has been increased. Her military budget has been reduced. Agricultural production is growing faster than population. Private investment has exceeded expectations.

Now the Government of Pakistan has undertaken further steps to reform its economic policies—to free up its economy and give more play to the market. These reforms are acts of wisdom and courage, but they require foreign exchange to back them up. Pakistan deserves our help.

TURKEY

Turkey’s economic record is outstanding. Her gross national product has grown an average of six percent annually since 1962. Industrial output has grown 9 percent per year. Food production is growing much faster than population growth.

Turkey’s own savings now finance some 90 percent of her gross investment. Difficult problems remain, but we may now realistically look forward to the day—in the early 1970’s—when Turkey will no longer require AID’s help.

AFRICA

I recommend $179 million for Africa.

Just 1 year ago, I informed the Congress of a shift in emphasis in our aid policy for Africa. We moved promptly to put it into effect:

—There will be 21 U.S. bilateral programs in Africa in Fiscal 1969, compared to 35 last year.

—Most of our bilateral programs will be phased out over 8 more countries in the following years.

—Expanded regional and international projects will meet the development needs of the countries where bilateral aid is ended.

The past year has provided further evidence that this support for regional economic institutions and projects is a sensible approach to Africa’s problems. It expands markets. It encourages economies of scale. It gives meaningful evidence of our concern and interest in African development.

This is not a policy of withdrawal from Africa. It is a policy of concentration and of maximum encouragement of regional cooperation. A continent of 350 million people has set out with determination on the long road to development. We intend to help them.

VIETNAM

I recommend a program of $430 million to carry forward our economic assistance effort in Vietnam. This effort will fulfill the need to restore and reconstruct the cities and towns attacked in recent days.

Defense of Vietnam requires more than success on the battlefield. The peo-
ple of Vietnam are building the economic and social base to preserve the independence we are helping them to defend.

For twenty years resistance to attack and subversion has been current and the foundation laid for a thriving economy, despite the enormous stresses of war. But still the innocent victims of war and terrorism must be cared for; persistent inflationary pressures must continue to be controlled; and the many problems faced by a new government under wartime conditions must be overcome. The framework for economic and social progress has been established. We must help the Vietnamese people to build the institutions needed to make it work.

To this end:

- Improve our assistance to refugees and civilian casualties. The wages of aggression are always paid in the blood and misery of the innocent. Our determination to resist aggression must be matched by our compassion for its helpless victims.

- Intensify agricultural programs aimed at increasing rice production by 50% in the next four years.

- Cooperate internationally toward the Government's goal of virtually universal elementary education by 1971.

- Stress, in our import programs, the key commodities needed for agricultural and industrial growth.

The rapid program expansion of the past two years—in dollars, people and diversity of activities—is ended. The emphasis in the next year will be on concentration of resources on the most important current programs.

We will pursue these constructive programs in Vietnam with the same energy and determination with which we resist aggression. They are just as vital to our interests as the capacity for self-support grows. Despite recent pressure from the North, the momentum and self-confidence of this gallant nation must be—and will—maintained.

Indonesia has stepped away from the brink of communist domination and economic chaos. She has undertaken the hard course of stabilization and realistic development toward progress. She needs help from the U.S. and other donors, who are working together with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. It is a dramatically in our interest to provide it.

**MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS**

I recommend $420 million for grant Military Assistance Programs under the Foreign Assistance Act.

- More than three-quarters of our grant military assistance will support the military efforts of the Government of the communist world and those nations where the U.S. maintains defense installations important to our own national security. These programs are a vital link in our own defense effort and an integral part of the collective security.

Elsewhere our programs focus on building the internal security necessary for lasting development progress. Our aid—economic as well as military—must not reward nations which divert scarce resources to unnecessary military expenditures. Most less-developed countries have experienced a large expansion of military expenditures. Their military budgets have remained a small portion of national income. Their leaders have made politically difficult decisions to resist pressure to acquire large amounts of new and expensive weapons. We must help them maintain this record and improve it. We will give great weight to efforts to keep military expenditures at minimum essential levels when considering a country's requests for economic aid.

In the coming year, we will work directly with the less-developed nations and examine our own programs, country-by-country, to deal more effectively with countries which are exploiting other approaches toward reducing the danger of arms races among less-developed countries.

Over the past several years, we have significantly reduced our grant military aid wherever possible. Where new equipment is essential, we have provided it more and more through craft, ammunition and other supplies.

We will pursue these constructive programs in Vietnam with the same energy and determination with which we resist aggression. They are just as vital to our interests as the capacity for self-support grows. Despite recent pressure from the North, the momentum and self-confidence of this gallant nation must be—and will—maintained.

Indonesia has stepped away from the brink of communist domination and economic chaos. She has undertaken the hard course of stabilization and realistic development toward progress. She needs help from the U.S. and other donors, who are working together with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. It is a dramatically in our interest to provide it.

**MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS**

I recommend $420 million for grant Military Assistance Programs under the Foreign Assistance Act.

- More than three-quarters of our grant military assistance will support the military efforts of the Government of the communist world and those nations where the U.S. maintains defense installations important to our own national security. These programs are a vital link in our own defense effort and an integral part of the collective security.

Elsewhere our programs focus on building the internal security necessary for lasting development progress. Our aid—economic as well as military—must not reward nations which divert scarce resources to unnecessary military expenditures. Most less-developed countries have experienced a large expansion of military expenditures. Their military budgets have remained a small portion of national income. Their leaders have made politically difficult decisions to resist pressure to acquire large amounts of new and expensive weapons. We must help them maintain this record and improve it. We will give great weight to efforts to keep military expenditures at minimum essential levels when considering a country's requests for economic aid.

In the coming year, we will work directly with the less-developed nations and examine our own programs, country-by-country, to deal more effectively with countries which are exploiting other approaches toward reducing the danger of arms races among less-developed countries.

Over the past several years, we have significantly reduced our grant military aid wherever possible. Where new equipment is essential, we have provided it more and more through craft, ammunition and other supplies. I will submit separate legislation to provide for credit term equipment with less stringent terms.

Our military assistance programs will provide only what is needed for legitimate defense and internal security needs. We will do no more. We can afford to do less.
the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today the President has sent to Congress his proposed foreign aid program for fiscal year 1969.

It is a modest program requesting $2.9 billion for economic assistance, $400 million for military assistance.

As the richest nation in the world, it represents the minimum that we can do in cooperation with the developed free world powers to fight the conditions of poverty, malnutrition, ignorance, and disease upon which communism breeds in the less developed world.

The AID request together with other foreign aid activities and military assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act, represents 0.5 percent of the gross national product.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the obvious frugality of this effort is more than proved by the fact that it represents only one-quarter of the contribution of our gross national product as was devoted to the same field of activity by the United States in 1949.

The following analysis of the President's foreign aid program points out that it is a thrifty and cautious proposal:

AID PROPOSED PROGRAM AND LEGISLATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1969 (FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1968)

1. SIZE OF PROGRAM

$3.9 billion is requested for economic and military assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act. A.I.D.—$2.5 billion. Military Assistance—$0.4 billion.

The appropriation requested for A.I.D., together with other available funds will finance a program of $2.7 billion (see attached table).

The $2.5 billion requested for A.I.D. is about $130 million less than the President requested for FY 1968. The Congress appropriated $2.6 billion in 1967. The A.I.D. request, together with other foreign aid activities such as PL 480 food aid, contributions to multilateral institutions such as IDA, IDB, and the Asian Bank, and our funding of the Peace Corps, represents about 0.5 percent of the gross national product.

We can increase the aid programs, Britain is increasing their aid programs, Japan, Canada, Netherlands, West Germany are increasing their aid programs. It is a modest program requesting $2.9 billion.

The President today, pointedly makes the President's message on foreign aid, and the 1968 message on foreign aid, received from the President today, pointedly makes clear that world peace can never be attained while millions of our fellow human beings live in disease and squalor, ignorance and despair.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the President's full request in 1968 is $3.9 billion. It is the smallest amount ever requested since the initiation of the program in 1948.

If the President's full request is granted, it would still be the smallest percentage of our nation's gross national product ever expended in foreign aid.

Surely, this is a small amount to promote peace and security.

Then too, in terms of world population, it would be the smallest amount ever allocated on a per capita basis of the needy abroad.

If past history is any indication, the final authorization figure recommended by the House Foreign Affairs Committee will be even lower than the President's request.

And yet we may expect that when the bill reaches the floor of the House, Members of Congress—many of whom have been voting against foreign aid for years—will vote against it once again.

Mr. BOOGS. Mr. Speaker, it is clear from the President's message on foreign aid that current restraints on private investment in other countries does not extend to the poor nations carrying on the fight against hunger, ignorance, and disease.

The President effectively stresses that the United States is committed to maximum encouragement of private investment in the assistance to the developing countries.

One of the first things we have discovered about economic progress is that the countries developing most rapidly are those in which the creative forces of private enterprise are allowed full play.
equally careful study of the line-item presentation book when it is made available to all Members.

It is my hope that they will restore all of this in the light of the great needs of our fellow men all over the world but more importantly from the standpoint of our own national interest and security.

The President tells us of the rich man, Dives, who threw the scraps from his table to his dogs, while the beggar Lazarus, starved outside.

Not one of us here, I know, would turn our generous hand away from the sight of Lazarus. Yet outside these warm and comfortable halls, across the seas which surround our bountiful land, there are millions like Lazarus who need our help.

Can we—the richest nation in the entire history of the world—turn away from them?

Let us not be mistaken. As we sow in this world, so shall we reap.

It behooves all of us, therefore, to search our consciences, on both sides of the aisle, and to give the President's foreign aid request a fair hearing.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to single out two items in the President's foreign aid message for additional comment.

First, the President wisely has proposed a 5-year program for the research and manufacture of fish protein additives to help combat the brain damage which scientists now know is caused by malnutrition in small children.

This program would complement present efforts to raise the nutrition level of children through the use of fortified foods. The most widely used of these is CSM, a mix of corn, soybeans, and milk with vitamin that already may well have saved thousands of starving children in India and elsewhere from blinded minds.

Is there any cause more worthy of our attention and concern? Dare we ignore the irreparable damage which a lack of protein during the formative years can cause?

Of course, we cannot. That is why the President's forward-looking proposal to extract life-giving protein from fish deserves our commendation.

Second, I want to comment on the request for $200 million for the new special fund of the Asian Development Bank.

Since its inception, I have closely observed the operation of this international financial institution. It holds great hope for mutual cooperation among the countries of Asia toward the economic and social progress of the region.

The $200 million requested would provide long-term, low-interest loans to member countries for agriculture, transportation, communication, and other vital projects of regional significance.

The funds would be given to the Bank over a 4-year period and only on the condition that the U.S. contribution to the fund be a minority one. Further, the funds would have to be used in a manner not injurious to our balance of payments. There is no assurance that we cannot spend billions on war and defense in Asia and not be willing, at the same time, to spend even a fraction of those amounts on projects designed to build and further the cause of peaceful development in that area.

As President Johnson has said, we know that the hope of progress does more to build the peace and security of the world than guns and bombs.

The foreign aid message read today contains great potential for worldwide progress. Let us all give it the attention it deserves—and let our consciences be our guide.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it may often seem to us that the nations of the world are growing more and more apart from one another. Nationalism, lack of contact, lack of experience, lack of imagination, lack of mutual confidence, often stand in the way of cooperation.

Yet, among the developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America we can see solid progress toward regional cooperation, bolstered by U.S. economic assistance.

I welcome what the President calls in his message on foreign aid "opportunities for the United States to add new momentum to these regional efforts..." For, as he has said previously, resources know no national boundaries. Rivers flow through many countries, transportation and communications networks serve different peoples, sources of electric power must be shared by neighbors.

In addition to other organizations of Asian or Southeast Asian nations, the Asian Development Bank has given great promise as a force for regional cooperation. As the message points out, work is proceeding on regional power and water projects. Based on a survey of transportation and education needs, the Bank has asked for contributions for a special fund for joint development projects of regional significance in these fields as well as others. Another regional effort in the area is the development of the Mekong River, which flows through Thailand, Laos, Vietnam and Cambodias.

The Inter-American Development Bank, a kingpin of the Alliance for Progress, requires expansion of its capital and additional contributions to add new momentum to this regional economic cooperation.

In Africa, regional economic cooperation is increasingly centered in the African Development Bank, which has opened its doors and, financed entirely by Africans, has made its first loan.

With reduced bilateral U.S. programs for the African nations, I urge the Congress to support the President's call for assistance to the African Bank in financing special projects.

We must grasp every opportunity to encourage and assist in bringing advances in regional cooperation.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the President's latest foreign aid message emphatically reminds us that economic assistance is by no means an obligation gift for developing nations. It is provided only to those countries willing to help themselves and prepared to demonstrate that they are able to do so. Advocates of foreign aid wholeheartedly support President Johnson's statement that—

We will not tolerate waste and mismanagement. We will continue to insist on several dollars of local investment for every dollar of American investment.

Let me add that this self-help requirement is one that the Agency for International Development will continue to enforce as stringently in the future as it has done in the past.

There is proof in the fact that developing countries invest an average of 80 cents for every dollar received in U.S. aid. Some contribute even more.

Colombia, for example, invested $880 million in fiscal 1966 on development operations. This amounted to 16 percent of its gross national product. Compare Colombia's share of the $87 million provided to it by AID and you see that it contributed 11 times as much to its welfare as did the United States. India is another example. That same year it spent $7.3 billion on development projects—about 24 times the $310 million provided by AID.

Whether or not a country receives any assistance at all often hinges on its commitment to save its own. Afghanistan, for instance, had to create a highway maintenance department before we would provide it a $7.7 million highway loan. A loan to the Bolivian Mining Corporation had to be made subject to that country completed reforms in mining policies.

The history of this country's aid program is filled with similar examples. Each one is further proof of the soundness of the self-help principle, so well stated by the President.

We will help those—and only those—who help themselves.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, for more than 20 years Congress has accepted the foreign aid programs of both Republican and Democratic administrations as essential to our free world leadership. Again President Johnson has reminded us that this is it.

I am particularly struck by the importance of the President's recognition of the need to move forward in our commitments to regional economic development projects to support those international institutions which he says "build the peace."

The growth of common markets and regional associations in Africa, Asia, and Latin America are a major force for world peace.

The President has presented us with what he calls "three major opportunities" to add new momentum to this regional development.

First, we must appropriate the President's request of $206 million as a contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank. The nations of free Asia will need full fiscal support for a variety of economic projects that will mean a better life for all in that area of the world.

Second, we must authorize a contribution of $206 million as our share to the Asian Development Bank. The nations of free Asia will need full fiscal support for a variety of economic projects that will mean a better life for all in that area of the world.

So we should provide a modest share of the funds needed by the African
Development Bank to begin its very important work in that great continent.

The notion that individual countries have a real stake in mutual development of means the story held with other is not new, of course. But active pursuit of effective regional arrangements of a formal character has only recently emerged as a firm policy of American aid officials to be consciously encouraged by this Congress, for national rivalry no less than of poverty and ignorance is a classical cause of violence that benefits no one.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's admonition that this Government will continue to insist that self-help be a fundamental condition for all American assistance has been well put. The record speaks for itself. Most of our aid recipients have been moving toward their economic goals with leadership, energy, and determination. In fact, most countries now contribute an average of $5 for every dollar received from aid programs.

Outstanding examples of how self-help pays off can be cited in the cases of Iran and the Republic of China—Taiwan—countries that have graduated from the intensive self-help programs are now on their own. The Republic of Korea is in the midst of a tremendous economic expansion which can be traced largely to its own self-help measures.

In these countries private investment, both domestic and foreign, has been and is still being encouraged. They have upgraded their agricultural, health, and educational institutions. Tax collection has been improved and land tenure arrangements are being changed for the better.

In India, Pakistan, and 'Turkey, our aid is merely an adjunct to their own intensive self-help programs.

Self-help calls for leadership, energy, and determination on the part of country leaders. In Tunisia we can point to tremendous growth in agriculture, where this country has become an exporter of food for freedom. The country's investment in agriculture and has proposed a 3-year extension of the food-for-freedom program.

Also, in light of recent evidence that malnutrition in the early years can set the stage for physical capacities, he has called for a 5-year program for the research and manufacture of protein additives from fish to fortify the food consumed in the developing countries.

I am in full accord with these proposals, because I believe there is no greater threat to world stability than that of widespread hunger. We have the resources and knowledge to avert this threat, and we must employ them now before the war on hunger becomes, not a foreign aid program, but one of self-preservation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the strength and good sense which is evident in the President's message, "To Build the Peace," which was submitted to the Congress today.

Often I am asked by the voters of my district: "What are the basic principles of our foreign policy?" Our critics at home and abroad have claimed that we have no foreign aid policy worth the name. I would invite them to study the eloquent statement which President Johnson made today on the subject of foreign aid.

Our President made clear that in the field of foreign aid our policy must be based on principles, not on expediency. He outlined six basic principles which I believe mean our close adherence to the principles of our foreign aid effort.

Events of recent weeks show that America must be flexible in our relations with other nations. Flexibility demands that we understand our commitments and recognize that our policy in one part of the globe is consistent with our commitments in all parts of the globe. In this respect, our foreign aid program cannot be based on the shifting sands and shallow waters of momentary impulse.

When we talk of needed flexibility in foreign aid we mean the ability to react to change as it occurs. Yet flexibility must also be based on a clear understanding and delineation of our own goals. Today the President spoke of these goals—six important ones for American foreign aid: self-help, multilateralism, regionalism, priority for agriculture and population planning, protection of a favorable balance of payments, and efficient administration of the aid program. These represent the principles of our foreign aid effort.

By directing our attention to such principles, and by developing specific legislative programs to give life to these principles, we will achieve the kind of commitment to flexibility which characterizes our foreign policy at its best. I think that this is an important message and a good one.

I have consistently supported our foreign aid program, as I believe that it has done much to stimulate and develop stronger economies in many nations. In turn, their strength contributes to our economy, well-being through trade and our militarily strong position against Communist aggression or subversion.

Some countries, however, have turned their backs on us, and have formed or joined alliances contrary to our interest. The President was favored cessation of financial or military assistance.

In many non-Communist nations there are acute shortages of food and other vital commodities which endanger the lives of their people as well as the political stability and security of their nation.

Our shipments of surplus grain to the grain-starved nations in India, certainly, from a humanitarian standpoint, should not be cut off simply because we disagree with some specific action of the Indian Government this month, or next month. I am in favor of our present policy of annual examination of our foreign aid commitments, particularly our military assistance commitments. In a few instances these arms have been diverted from maintenance of national security to aggressive use against neighboring countries.

While it is difficult to see the importance of foreign aid at a time when there are so many needs at home, we should keep in mind the fact that more than 80 percent of appropriated foreign aid dollars are spent right here in the United States for the products of our factories and fields. We must keep the foreign aid program as strong and as important as the free world. All of us as Americans can be proud of this position of leadership.

The rebulding of Europe after the Second World War is a good example of the success of our foreign aid program. It stopped the spread of communism and provided markets for American goods. The French have maintained a strong military alliance with the United States. However, none of us doubt the anti-Communist position of the present French Government.
I will continue to review carefully our foreign aid commitments. Our foreign policy must be flexible and must meantime recognize that our national security or position of leadership if we cut off foreign aid completely at this time. We do live in a dangerous world, and world problems are inevitable, and that we have to live with or worse or our destiny as a free nation.

Our foreign policy should be conducted first and foremost in our own interest. We do not believe that there is any substitute for our national security or position of leadership if we cut off foreign aid completely at this time. We do live in a dangerous world, and world problems are inevitable, and that we have to live with or worse or our destiny as a free nation.

Mr. Speaker, every taxpayer wants to feel that foreign aid tax dollars are spent wisely. We all want to know that our money spent for foreign aid is going where its effects will be felt.

President Johnson has just delivered his foreign aid message for 1968 in which he assures us that he will insist on six basic principles of foreign aid administration to insure an efficient and effective aid program:

First, self-help: This is the overriding principle of foreign aid. U.S. assistance will supplement development programs, but the major effort must come from the countries themselves.

Second, multilateralism: Every advanced nation must share the burden and coordinate its efforts. Neighboring nations must cooperate to develop shared resources.

Fourth, priority for agriculture, health and education: The critical areas of water, food, and education must be developed in order to achieve development.

Fifth, balance of payments: We cannot help others grow unless the American dollar is stable. AID operations will be a positive contribution to the balance of payments.

Sixth, efficient administration: Every American citizen is entitled to know that his tax dollar is spent wisely.

In short, we have believed in the principle of self-help, in the growth of the US and the world in order to achieve development.

I, for one, will continue to support this respect for and use of international institutions which, in the President’s words, “build the peace and provide the framework for peace.”

Mr. Speaker, in his aid message, the President has rightly emphasized that no economic and social development effort can succeed unless population is brought into balance with food and other resources.

It has become obvious that the rapid increase in population—now averaging 2 percent a year worldwide—is dragging at the heels of hard-won progress, not only in food production, but also in housing, education, employment and stabilizing Hardest hit by the ever-growing number of mouths to feed are the less developed areas of Asia, Latin America, and Africa, where two thirds of humanity lives.

Therefore it is most gratifying to me to know that along with food production the highest priority has been given to encouraging, support and strengthening of voluntary family planning programs in the developing countries.

AID has long been supporting population studies and voluntary family planning programs in some 30 countries, and is expected to obligate $35 million for this work during this fiscal year, and even more next year.

But we must keep in mind that efforts to reduce the population explosion, though urgently needed, must be treated delicately. The family planning programs we assist must be host nation programs—note to the aid donor, who should assist only when the developing nation agrees to assist itself to that need. The major portion of family planning programs should be self-help that involves the basic principles of foreign aid administration.

For these reasons, I would urge the Congress not to try to dictate the amount of money for the AID programs overseas, or otherwise to legislate specific means in this area. For it is plain that AID efforts on population growth problems are increasingly effective and are meeting requirements of developing countries as those countries themselves report their needs.

Mr. Speaker, the President has set before us a bare-bones request for $706 million for Agency for International Development programs in the Near East and South Asia, India, Pakistan, Turkey, and their neighbors are determined to move ahead. We must remain determined to help them.

We may point to real achievements. For example, because of the AID program and the self-help that AID encourages, we have no longer needs aid, and the AID program there ended November 30, 1967. In addition, the people at the Agency for International Development and the Turkish beneficiaries see a time in the early 1970’s when Turkey, too, will be economically self-maintaining.

Nations and their leaders press forward. Farmers on the edge of survival have begun to leave their old ways and embrace the technological advances in agriculture. Pakistan has fought off the ill effects of drought and India is lifting herself out of the recession of the last few years.

But these accomplishments can be reversed if the world’s food, whether rapidly, Indian agriculture, for example, is still the puppet of dependable rain. Therefore, because we are men of conscience and because we are Americans concerned with the fate of the planet we share, we must act favorably upon the President’s request to us today. The nations of the Near East and South Asia, the nations of the other regions of the underdeveloped world, the good people we represent all are watching us.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter in the Record immediately following the President’s message, “To Build the Peace.”

Mr. Speaker, I pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.
The report offers abundant proof that the Endowment has made good use of its resources. With the advice and recommendations of the members of the National Council on the Arts, the Endowment:

—Opened new opportunities for creative writers, art students, and visual and performing artists;
—Created three Laboratory Theatres—in Los Angeles, New Orleans, and Providence—for the presentation of professional theatre to secondary school students and the adult community;
—Assisted 17 resident professional theatres across the Nation;
—Initiated the first American Literary Anthology, representing the finest work appearing in literary magazines;
—Helped major museums expand their audiences and provide more services to their communities;
—Launched a program to encourage appreciation and support of the arts, and urging the Congress to act promptly to extend the authorization for the National Endowment for the Arts.
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Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.
Mr. GROSS. I believe the gentleman referred to fire loss figures for the past year; is that correct?
Mr. MATSUNAGA. For the year 1965 the figure is $1.75 billion.
Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. Speaker, I refer myself to 5 minutes.
Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.
Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 926, as the gentleman from Hawaii has explained, is an open rule providing for an hour of debate for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 11284, a bill to set up a fire research program within the Department of Commerce to be administered by the National Bureau of Standards.

According to the report, the primary purposes of this bill are as follows:

The investigations of fires as to their causes; frequency of occurrence, and severity; research into causes and nature of fires, and the development of improved methods and techniques for fire prevention and control; Public education on fire hazards and safety.

Fire information reference service; and

Education and training programs for professional firefighters.

In conclusion, it also proposes that grants be established for colleges and universities that will agree to promote causes in the fields of firefighting, and in the science of fire.

This bill, the fire program could have more properly been presented to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House rather than to the Committee on Science and Astronautics. But, nevertheless, that is what the bill purports to do under its present provision.

The Bureau of Standards, as I have stated, would be authorized to carry out this program. Their appropriation—and mark this—their appropriation has been increased this year.

This bill authorizes to be appropriated $10 million, Mr. Speaker, an increase of 50 times in the amount of money appropriated to the National Bureau of Standards this year.

In addition, a second portion of the bill will set up a National Commission on Fire Prevention composed of 20 members, $100-a-day specialists and, according to the Department of Commerce, the establishment of this Commission for the next 2 years is $865,000.

This is nothing new. We have fire research going on not only in the Federal Government but also in private industry. Again, according to the report, nine different departments of the Federal Government last year received funds in a total of about $11 million to conduct research in the area of fire.

Let me read to you the departments of the United States Government that so participated: The Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Defense, the Office of Civil Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Federal Aviation Agency, the National Science Foundation, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior, the National Bureau of Standards. The report shows that nine different departments in the Federal Government received approximately $11 million last year in the same area for which we would set up a new program. Your fire equipment companies are constantly striving to improve the efficiency of their equipment with which to put out fires and to control fires, and they are spending large sums in the area of research. Building material companies—and they are referred to in the report—are spending huge sums of money to develop and research fireproof building materials.

I have something about this at firsthand because I am in the retail lumber business and have been all of my life. I have attended some demonstrations put on by the building material companies. I refer particularly to the Johns-Manville Co. I was at their plant in Waukegan, Ill. Johns-Manville have developed many fine products that are fireproof. They constructed a little building utilizing these new products that they had developed. They had fire. No fire department was called and no water was used. They let it burn. In a short time it burned itself out. But the entire building was not destroyed because the J-M-V which had developed stopped the spread of the fire.

Many other companies in the building material industry—Ruberole, United States Gypsum, Philip Carey, and many, many others—are constantly working in this field, in private enterprise, using their own funds, their own money, to develop fireproof materials. Also working in that field are trade associations, commercial laboratories, nonprofit organizations, universities, and last, but not least, the insurance companies.

Who has a greater stake in the prevention of fire than do fire insurance companies? They are the ones who have to pay out cold hard cash for losses from fire. They are spending probably more money for fire research than any other single industry in the United States today. Yes, we are spending millions of dollars in the Federal Government and private industry. I think this sort of legislation at this time should be postponed.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, in view of the serious fiscal situation in which this country finds itself today, I feel this program should be deferred. The Congress, last year, took action forcing cuts in the nondefense area of spending.

We are facing a $20 billion deficit in the current fiscal year. We are also faced with a demand from President Johnson for a 10-percent increase in income taxes. In the budget message of the President received last week, he predicted another sizable budget deficit for fiscal year 1969. It is the responsibility of the Congress to curtail expenditures, and this bill provides an excellent opportunity for a start in the right direction in the second session of the 90th Congress and in the next session, in 1969.

Let me quote to you the words of the distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], from remarks given on the floor of the House recently:

"The time has come to close our eyes to each and every increase requested over the present level. We ought to show minus signs all up and down the fiscal line. Either cut the present level--make do with what we have. Reject the unnecessary. Defer the desirable. Minimize the essential. All of these are old fashioned will-ands--and majority votes."

Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity in the second session of this Congress for the House to announce to the country in no uncertain terms that we mean what we say when we talk about reductions in Federal expenditures. The bill is new, but the program, I urge the Members to follow the admonition of the distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and defer action on new spending programs and new increased expenditures—not tomorrow—is the time to get on the right road.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.
Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I note from the report filed with this legislation, that one of the purposes of the bill is as follows:

This bill will allow the Bureau to undertake new areas of responsibility which are not being covered adequately by any private or governmental organization at the present time.

Can the gentleman tell us what, if any, new areas of responsibility he knows are indicated for investigation?
Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I know of no areas to be covered by this legislation that are not already being covered either by the Federal Government in nine different departments of the Federal Government or by private industry.

Mr. CAHILL. So it is the gentleman's observation, then, that the Commission would really be an organization to compile information that is already available?
Mr. MARTIN. Is the gentleman speaking about the Commission of 20 members to be appointed by the President?
Mr. CAHILL. Yes.
Mr. MARTIN. This Commission would make a study of this entire matter and report back within 2 years' time, and then it would be dissolved 30 days after that. I cannot see where it will come up with any new information than what the Federal Government or private industry are already providing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].
Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

As the gentleman from Nebraska has pointed out, this is a new program we are entering into, with a tight fiscal situation and
background which makes me feel more inclined to oppose the rule.

In the 1964 budget we had an item, in the Bureau of Standards, known as the Holloman plan for fire research, which was identical to the same plan. The so-called Holloman plan was the fire re­search plan.

I am sorry I do not have them with me on the floor, but I can produce a file of letters, many of them opposing the Holloman plan, from fire departments, insurance companies, research labora­atories and colleges—opposing the plan because it was overlapping, because dual work was being done, and because it was not feasible.

There was a million-dollar plan.

So, in the judgment of the Subcommittee on State, Justice, and Commerce, we did not appropriate the money, and it was not put in the bill on the floor of the House, and the plan was dropped. It was not necessary.

Now, what has happened? They come along now with a plan not for $1 million but, as I understand it, for $10 million. In 1964, for $1 million, there were some grants here provided, grants to colleges and grants to fire de­partments. And some of the same people who opposed the spending of a mil­lion, duplicates in the work they were doing and they said it was not necessary, now, since there is an opportunity to reach out and get their hands in the Federal Treasury with grants, have changed some of their opin­ions.

I suggest that if a million-dollar pro­gram was not good there is certainly no reason why we should embark today on a $10 million program, an entirely new program.

Many of us have said time and time again there should be no new programs started during this period of time.

Certainly this one looks real bad to me, when $1 million was too much in 1964, but because of the support they can get for grants, for handouts, they are beginning to get some support for $10 million.

I say to the Members, you and I both know that once we adopt this approach, once we start it—it may be cut to $2.5 million today, or it may be cut to $5 million—believe you me, once we start a program of this kind, I can see it going up and up and up to where the $10 million program will eventually be a $100 million program.

I urge my colleagues that this is a good time to serve notice on the country that we are not going to start new programs, that we are going to try to do something about this budget, today. A good time to do it is by adopting this rule.

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11284, a bill amending the organic act of the National Bureau of Standards, to author­ize a fire research and safety program, and the operational Fire Prevention Commission on Fire Prevention and Control.

In my view, this legislation is long overdue. There are many groups throughout the country, large and small, public and private, national and local, which have been trying for years to cope with various aspects of the fire problem in this Nation. The National Bureau of Standards’ efforts, for example, go back many years. It is the peak of our capi­tal loss rate, whether measured in lives, Injuries, or property damage, con­tinues to go up. In 1965, fire damage to­taled $1.75 billion, and over 12,000 people lost their lives in fires alone. To face a national prob­lem which requires a national solution.

The Fire Research and Safety Act is the implementing of the policy for a nation­al solution.

The basic premise of this legislation is that we are not starting from scratch with a vast and unlimited bureaucratic mechanism. The clear intent of H.R. 11284 is to strengthen and support exist­ing programs in the field of fire research and safety. This objective will be accom­plished by grants to State and local gov­ernments, and other public and nonprofit organizations, and support for in-house activities of the National Bureau of Standards.

The bill would authorize information gathering and laboratory research on the causes, frequency, and severity of fires, detection, fire prevention and detec­tion and control. The public would be taught about safety techniques and fire hazards. Fireman would benefit from im­proved training courses and materials. Information services would give out the latest knowledge on fire research and safety. Model projects demonstrating new and improved fire services and new methods for fighting fires would be au­thorized.

To provide a broad, long-term view of the problem and potential solutions, the Commission would make a compre­hensive study of all aspects of the prob­lem.

At the present time, 70 percent of the people in America live on 1 percent of the land. This rapidly increasing trend toward urbanization could greatly in­crease hazards in the future. Fire and explosion are the greatest hazards. The fire research and safety bill is a sound response to the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this bill.

Might I ask the chairman of the sub­committee, my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], sev­eral questions?

On page 11, line 20, there is a provision that—

Any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, hold hearings, take testimony, and administer oaths or affirma­tions to witnesses appearing

My objection to that language is over the fact that an individual member has a right to set up hearings and we are not just limit it to the subcommittee?

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that this is a matter we discussed dur­ing the subcommittee hearings and in a meeting of the full committee. This is a simple procedural mat­ter which is contained in most commit­tees of this kind. They can set up their organization in order to function in the most efficient way with the least amount of problems. For that reason they are allowed to work. So we do not wish to put any hindering language on them in the legislation but allow them to set up their own rules and regulations within the greatest latitude possible. It may be nec­essary for them from time to time to send members on an individual basis to other places and this is the cheapest and most effective way to do it.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Does that word “member” include the advisory members, which are the two Senators and the two Members of the House?

Mr. DADDARIO. I would say in an­swer to that it only includes the mem­bers. It makes clear that the Members of the House and the Senate are advisory members and could not act in that capacity. This discussion is helpful in that respect and we make sure they work with Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I agree with my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman Bow, that this is the time for fiscal responsibility and for econ­omy. On page 7, from lines 1 to 7, we see the authorization of appropriations. It is clear that the $10 million is for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. If we look at that amount, you can see there are just the months of February, March, April, May and June remaining. This is $10 million to be spent over a period of 5 months. This would be a pretty high rate of expenditure for a new program, would it not? Could they spend it in that time?

Mr. DADDARIO. May I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for bringing this particular question up. As the gentleman will recall, in our deliberations in the committee, our friend from Florida [Mr. Rous­sers], submitted an amendment to this effect in the full committee so that it would be cut down to a 2-year program. There will be an amendment applying to this so that it will adhere to Mr. Rous­sers’ amendment. This will be a 2-year program and will be terminated at that time unless Congress determines that it be supported further. As presently written and unless changed during the course of this, it will be $10 million for 1 year and general authorization for 1 add­itional year.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Then, there would be a change, in line with the gentleman’s statement, in the succeed­ing fiscal year, 1969. It is now indefinite under the terms of the bill that such sums as may be necessary for the follow­ing year, April, May, June, July, August, would be given. Is there an indefinite authorization. Would this be made definite in that case?

Mr. DADDARIO. Yes. It will definitely be demonstrated here that this will be a 2-year program and will be terminated at that time unless Congress determines that it be supported further. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. On page 12 you will notice in subsection (c) that there is the waiving of title 5 of the
United States Code governing appointments in the civil service with regard to the Powers of the Commission That is to be set up under title 2.

Likewise, under line 10, there is an exception made to the provisions of chapter 51, subchapter 3 of chapter 55, which grants the Commissioner the rules made for the general classification service pay raise. Why is that?

Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. Speaker, if I may reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the reason is that this being a 2-year program and because we wish it to get underway as quickly as possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania 1 additional minute.

Mr. DADDARIO. It is in order that there will not be a delay as the result of obtaining the people under the classified system, and have such delay require, I would judge, some 6 to 9 months. With the expiration of this Commission ending at the end of the 2-year period, the civil service people involved would then be necessary on our hands to apply for activities in the other agencies of the Government; there would be an obligation. It would then represent a much cleaner operation to follow this procedure in order to avoid these handicaps; that is, to give the Commission the authority to act promptly in the employment of these people when the work of this Commission begins.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. It is in order that there will not be a delay as the result of obtaining the people under the classified system, and have such delay require, I would judge, some 6 to 9 months. With the expiration of this Commission ending at the end of the 2-year period, the civil service people involved would then be necessary on our hands to apply for activities in the other agencies of the Government; there would be an obligation. It would then represent a much cleaner operation to follow this procedure in order to avoid these handicaps; that is, to give the Commission the authority to act promptly in the employment of these people when the work of this Commission begins.
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Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. It is in order that there will not be a delay as the result of obtaining the people under the classified system, and have such delay require, I would judge, some 6 to 9 months. With the expiration of this Commission ending at the end of the 2-year period, the civil service people involved would then be necessary on our hands to apply for activities in the other agencies of the Government; there would be an obligation. It would then represent a much cleaner operation to follow this procedure in order to avoid these handicaps; that is, to give the Commission the authority to act promptly in the employment of these people when the work of this Commission begins.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. It is in order that there will not be a delay as the result of obtaining the people under the classified system, and have such delay require, I would judge, some 6 to 9 months. With the expiration of this Commission ending at the end of the 2-year period, the civil service people involved would then be necessary on our hands to apply for activities in the other agencies of the Government; there would be an obligation. It would then represent a much cleaner operation to follow this procedure in order to avoid these handicaps; that is, to give the Commission the authority to act promptly in the employment of these people when the work of this Commission begins.
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Mr. Devine with Mr. Hansen of Idaho. Mr. Fraser with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Andrews of North Dakota with Mr. Biester.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRUTH IN LENDING ACT OF 1967

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table the bill (S. 5) to assist in the promotion of economic stabiliza­tion by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with ex­tension of credit, with a House amend­ment thereto, insist on the House amend­ment and, agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and approves the following conferees: Messrs. Moorer, Arrington, one its clerks, announced that the amendment a joint resolution of the House Resolution follows:

H.J. Res. 947. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period February 11 thru 17, 1968, as “LULAC Week”.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 25, ESTUARINE AREAS

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 1058 providing an open rule with 1 hour of debate for consideration of H.R. 25, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the States, to conduct an inventory and study of the Nation's estuaries and their natural re­sources. The rule further provides that it shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries now printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be con­sidered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill.

The purpose of H.R. 25 is to provide a means for protecting and conserving our Nation's estuarine areas and the waters of the Great Lakes.

The Secretary of the Interior, in con­sultation and in cooperation with the States, the Secretary of the Army, and other Federal agencies, is authorized and directed to conduct a study and in­ventory of the Nation's estuaries, including coastal marshlands, bays, sounds, sea­ward areas, lagoons, and land and waters of the Great Lakes.

With respect to certain publicly owned lands on Long Island, N.Y., which were studied in 1961 and 1965, the Secretary would be authorized to enter into an agreement with the State of New York, or any political subdivision or agency thereof, for the permanent management, development, and administration of such areas.

The Secretary would also be authorized and directed to study publicly owned areas in other States with a view toward recommending the desirability of au­thorizing the Secretary to enter into sim­ilar agreements for the administration, management, and development of those areas.

The Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Congress, not later than January 30, 1970, a report of the study conducted, together with any legislative recommendations.

No lands could be acquired unless au­thorized by a subsequent act of Congress.

The study is authorized over a 2-year period; $750,000 is authorized for fiscal year 1969 and $250,000 for fiscal year 1970.

There is no direct authorization for the projected agreement between the In­terior Department and the State of New York concerning the management and development of estuarine lands on Long Island. The bill requires an “equitable division of costs” but the report estimates that over a 5-year period, assum­ing a 50-50 split in total costs, the Federal Government’s share would be $510,500.

After general debate which shall be con­cluded not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be considered under the five­minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substi­tute recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries now printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amend­ment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 min­utes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee so that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1058 provides an open rule with 1 hour of debate for consideration of H.R. 25, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the States, to conduct an inventory and study of the Nation's estuaries and their natural re­sources. The rule further provides that it shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries now printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be con­sidered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill.

The purpose of H.R. 25 is to provide a means for protecting and conserving our Nation's estuarine areas and the waters of the Great Lakes.

The Secretary of the Interior, in con­sultation and in cooperation with the States, the Secretary of the Army, and other Federal agencies, is authorized and directed to conduct a study and in­ventory of the Nation's estuaries, including coastal marshlands, bays, sounds, sea­ward areas, lagoons, and land and waters of the Great Lakes.

With respect to certain publicly owned lands on Long Island, N.Y., which were studied in 1961 and 1965, the Secretary would be authorized to enter into an agreement with the State of New York, or any political subdivision or agency thereof, for the permanent management, development, and administration of such areas.

The Secretary would also be authorized and directed to study publicly owned areas in other States with a view toward recommending the desirability of au­thorizing the Secretary to enter into sim­ilar agreements for the administration, management, and development of those areas.

The Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Congress, not later than January 30, 1970, a report of the study conducted, together with any legislative recommendations.

No lands could be acquired unless au­thorized by a subsequent act of Congress.

The study is authorized over a 2-year period; $750,000 is authorized for fiscal year 1969 and $250,000 for fiscal year 1970. There is no direct authorization for the projected agreement between the In­terior Department and the State of New York concerning the management and development of estuarine lands on Long Island. The bill requires an “equitable division of costs” but the report estimates that over a 5-year period, assum­ing a 50-50 split in total costs, the Federal Government’s share would be $510,500.

There is no direct authorization for the projected agreement between the In­terior Department and the State of New York concerning the management and development of estuarine lands on Long Island. The bill requires an “equitable division of costs” but the report estimates that over a 5-year period, assum­ing a 50-50 split in total costs, the Federal Government’s share would be $510,500.

The environmental views are favorable to the bill as reported, and there are no minority views.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the rule be adopted, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, does the gen­tleman from Tennessee [Mr. Quillen] have any further requests for time?

Mr. QUILLEN. I have no further re­quests for time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous ques­tion on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRE RESEARCH AND SAFETY ACT OF 1967

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the
Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11284) to amend the organizational framework of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, to establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control, and for other purposes.

Mr. Chairman. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11284, with Mr. Brooks in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. D'Ansino] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Bell] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bell] have control of the time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. Bell] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the fire research and safety bill which is now before you is that bill which the President referred to in his consumer message to Congress a year ago, and which he again requested the House to pass his state of the Union message just this past month.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is important for us first of all to turn our eyes back to the decade from 1955 to 1965, in that period it was reported that losses were $2 billion a year, and it was reported that more than 115,000 people died as a result of fires.

Based on the loss of life and the property damage in the past, and considering our growing population, it is estimated that each year the loss of life will be over 12,000 people and the loss in property damages, will be something in the order of $2 billion a year, or better.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself these statistics because I believe that it does fit into the context of the remarks made by the President regarding this matter a year ago, when he described our fire losses as "shameful." This is particularly so when we consider that the per capita death rate in the United States from fires was four times as high in 1965 as the rate in Great Britain, six times as high as the rate in Japan, and twice as high as the rate in Canada.

The destruction caused by fires is six times as high as the rate in Canada.

The question is on the motion that we might, in fact, develop a capability to know more about the causes of this destruction and then to put that particular knowledge to use.

While we have a national fire problem, we offer here hope that we may be able to find a solution for that problem. The principles that authorize a comprehensive fire research and safety program within the National Bureau of Standards, which for the last 60 years has been doing some research work on many aspects of the problem, and the people who are doing that work now will be the corps around which the work will be performed in the future.

Title II creates a National Commission on Fire Prevention Control which will develop recommendations on which to base the future direction of our efforts to solve the fire problem. Title II was offered as a separate bill by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Barry]. It fitted properly within the legislation that we were contemplating in committee and was incorporated both in the House bill and the Senate bill.

An important aspect of the commission's work would be the study of those people who are most concerned with the causes and nature of fires—people who represent the building material industry, people who build firefighting apparatus, firemen, and the like. It would be the groups from which we would seek to get the members on this particular Commission.

There was also offered in committee by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Mozer], a bill providing for congressional representation and that is included in the legislation.

Title I of the bill which refers to the fire research and safety program will be performed by the National Bureau of Standards. It would look into and investigate the causes, frequency, and severity of fires. It would research into the causes of major fires and on better ways to prevent and control fires; education of the public on fire hazards and safety techniques; and education and training of those who fight fires. It would disseminate information on fire prevention and control, and would support demonstration projects. The demonstration projects approved by the Commission, they will encourage and make possible the testing of new ideas in actual use.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this legislation will in fact turn us in the direction of coming up with solutions to some of these particular problems.

I note that during the course of debate on the rule, it was said that we are performing some $11 million worth of fire research work in certain agencies of the Government. The report of the subcommittee also included that information in our report because we felt it was of particular importance to call to the attention of the Members. We are spending money in other places for fire research. But the important point which was not stated in the course of that debate was that in each of these instances, the fire research activity is mission oriented—that is, as to airplane fires, ship fires, forest fires, and so on. By our consumer message to Congress on February 16, 1967, we described our fire losses as "shameful," and the facts clearly support this assessment of the situation.

In 1965, more than 12,000 people lost their lives as a result of fire, and property losses totaled $1.75 billion. In 1966, property losses rose to $1.86 billion. Looking at the last 10 years, the total property losses reported were $16.7 billion and more than 115,000 people died as a result of fires.

Mr. Chairman, I believe these statistics take on more significance when translated to a per capita basis, and compared with figures for other industrialized countries like ourselves. The per capita death rate from fires in America for 1965 was four times as high as the rate in Great Britain. Our rate was six times as great as Japan's and twice as high as Canada's.

To find out if we are making progress, we need only look at the per capita death rate from fire, the per capita number of fires, and the per capita losses. We have had no success in reducing the death rate from fires. The number of fires has gone up, and property damage has also risen. This lack of progress must be shown, against the efforts of the public and private groups throughout the country, going back in some cases for decades, efforts aimed at solving one aspect or another of the fire problem. These groups are to be commended for their work. At the same time, we must recognize that a major task lies before us.

The discussion focused by fire is a problem in every section of this country, in cities and in rural areas, a threat to rich and poor alike, and a hazard in almost every area of modern life. Many people assume that the problem is under control, and that fire prevention and control organizations and institutions addressing themselves effectively to the problem.

I believe the facts clearly show, however, that the situation is not well in hand. If we proceed on the assumption that the problem can turn away from the problem of fires, we do so at the risk of great peril to the lives and the property of our citizens. We have a national fire problem, and the time has come to seek a national solution.

Mr. Chairman, during May and June of this year the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development held hearings on the administration's fire research and safety bill. Although the subcommittee also considered House Joint Resolution 498, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Barry] to establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control, fourteen days were set aside for the hearings, and 18 additional statements were received for the record. Virtually all of the witnesses were in agreement that considerable work must be done to reverse our loss. The President's legislation is a realistic method of accomplishing this objective.

The two primary conclusions which emerged from the hearings were that we need to know more, and we need to put...
that new knowledge to work. I believe H.R. 11234 seeks to meet these two needs.

Title I of H.R. 11234 authorizes a comprehensive fire research and safety program, within the Department of Housing and Urban Development, as authorized by the National Bureau of Standards. The Bureau has been engaged in fire research and safety work for more than 60 years, and its experienced research staff will make up the core of professionals necessary to perform the functions under this bill. Title II of the bill creates a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control which will develop the knowledge and recommendations on which to base the future direction of our efforts to solve the fire problem.

The fire research and safety program authorized under title I contains several elements:

First, investigation of the causes, frequency, and severity of fires;

Second, research on the causes and nature of fires, and on better ways to prevent them;

Third, education of the public on fire hazards and safety techniques;

Fourth, education and training for those who must fight fires;

Fifth, information disseminating services on fire prevention and control; and

Sixth, support for demonstration projects in fire prevention and control.

The demonstration projects program will encourage and make possible the testing of new ideas in actual use, and proved methods and techniques will come from many sources, and will be tried out under real conditions.

Some of the activities authorized by this bill will be carried out within the National Bureau of Standards, but the greatest proportion will be carried out by grants and contracts with other public and private organizations. The Bureau expects to build upon existing resources, and to support those organizations which have demonstrated a competence and which have for many years played key roles in the Nation's efforts to meet the fire problem. I would like to point out that the research contemplated in this bill is research aimed at meeting the real needs of the Nation's cities, the firefighters in the country, and the building and construction industry, as well as the needs of those whose job it is to understand the fundamental nature of fires.

The National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control authorized under title II has for its mission a broad mandate, including:

First, a study of how fires can be prevented through technological advances, better construction techniques, and improved inspection procedures;

Second, the standardization of fire equipment;

Third, an analysis of administrative problems affecting the efficiency or capabilities of local fire departments; and

Fourth, an assessment of local, State, and Federal responsibilities for fire prevention.

The Commission will be composed of the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and 18 members appointed by the President. The appointed members of the Commission will represent Federal, State, and local governments, and the many organizations and individuals who have a long-term responsibility or interest in some facet of the fire problem. In addition, the Commission would have four advisory members, two of which would be appointed from the Senate Representatives and two from the Senate.

Within 2 years after its establishment, the Commission will report its findings and recommendations to the President and to the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, the Commission is an important element of this bill because it will bring together the people most concerned—people representing State and local governments, the building industry, insurance companies, equipment manufacturers—for a long-term look at the whole fire question. Matters such as building codes, construction techniques, and equipment requirements are essentially interrelated, which means that they should not, and should not be dictated by the Federal Government. Yet, it is in these areas that we may be able to make some of our greatest advances in reducing the hazards of fire.

As originally written, Mr. Chairman, the administration's fire research bill would have authorized a 5-year program estimated to cost $10 million a year. In its deliberation on the Science and Astronautics Committee reduced the program from a 5-year to a 2-year program on an amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Roussel).

Mr. Chairman, 3 weeks ago President Johnson in his state of the Union message specifically requested that the House pass the fire safety bill. The bill has the support of almost all of the organizations concerned with fire research and safety, and I believe its enactment is necessary if we are to reduce the destructive effects of fire in this country.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize that if the bill is passed it will have been virtually unanimous.

The fire chiefs, the firefighters, and fire marshals throughout the United States are solidly in favor of this legislation and have so testified before our committee. The fire equipment manufacturers are strongly in support of the bill and have so testified. The insurance companies and the underwriters are solidly in favor of the legislation and have so testified. Those already in the fire research field such as the Fire Research Advisory Division of the National Research Council, as well as the few educators and representatives of curricula at the university level, are unanimous in recommending passage of this legislation.

The only organization which has expressed a reservation on this legislation is the American Fire Protection Association, a trade organization whose principal function is the dissemination of information conducive to fire safety. A report of this organization testified before our committee, and, while expressing dissatisfaction with title I of the bill, indicated that if the bill contained title II—which it now does—this would largely overcome the objections of the AFPA. The association has since sent letters to every Member of Congress putting its views on record in opposition, and I would say that these communications are consistent with the testimony provided to us and to the Senate committee.

Regardless of this latter situation, however, I believe it is pertinent to point out that the AFPA is not itself a research organization nor is there any conclusive evidence that it supports any educational efforts insofar as training or academic preparation in the country is concerned. I do not, therefore, consider that the AFPA's position on this bill should be given more than the usual weight of an interested trade group.

I urge, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that all Members support the bill.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. I would like to commend the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, for his leadership on this legislation and commend him for the remarks he has made. In the past year I had the privilege of being chairman of a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee and was investigating the tragic fire that took place at Brooks Air Force Base in Texas in connection with a special atmospheric demonstration being carried out there in an oxygen atmosphere. That fire took the lives of two Air Force men, one of whom was from my own district.

I know that the gentleman from Connecticut, as a member of the great Committee on Science and Astronautics, has also been following closely the tragic fire that claimed the lives of three astronauts. We found in our investigation, and I am sure the gentleman found in his, that actually when it comes to detailed research into questions of the flammability of fabrics, the generation of flash fires generally, and things of that kind that had a bearing on those two tragedies, there is still a great deal of work to be done.

We found evidence, for example, that there had been requests made for this kind of research within the Air Force. Had such research been undertaken, it might well have alerted us before we were faced to certain situations that could then have been prevented and might perhaps have saved those 5 lives.

Perhaps these two tragedies, tragic as they were, have alerted us now to the need for detailed research in this field, the very kind of research which, as I understand it, will be undertaken under the gentleman's legislation. The results of this research can then be made available not only to the agencies of the Government most directly concerned, but also to local fire coordinators, and fire agencies in local communities, so that all of them may benefit by knowing more of the behavior of materials, the behavior of fire-resistant materials, the nature of flammability itself, and so on.

For that reason this legislation is extremely important to the whole country, and I do want to concur with what the gentleman has said and lend my whole-hearted support to this legislation.
Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York has made some remarks which are extremely important to the debate we are having. I would like to make one comment in regard to that. When the gentleman from New York refers to the need of others, similarly situated, where the gentlement from New York refers us to show that when we deal with materials, and we have information in separate bits and pieces on them, we really have no idea about how they would work in a three-dimensional and in larger volume than in the research stage.

One of the things we are trying to do here is to incorporate that kind of capability into the Bureau of Standards. I think the gentleman will yield further, I think he is absolutely correct. We did some research, as the gentleman knows, but it was never really pulled together and extrapolated in the way in which the gentleman suggests. So I think this is very important legislation.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the chairman of this committee and all his colleagues for bringing this bill up for consideration of the House.

Mr. MILLER of California. I wish to thank the gentleman from New York for his remarks. I would like to cite as an example of what we are trying to do this for years fires at sea were generally fought by trying to isolate the compartment in which the fire was located and then turning super-heated steam into it. Research has shown that this is the thing you do not do, possibly because that steam contains quantities of gaseous oxygen that help to stimulate the fire. And yet that was the accepted way of fighting fire for many years. Today they either use foam or fog or hermetically seal it, if that is possible, and let the fire burn the oxygen out.

There is a great deal we must learn in this field. Having learned it, we must provide better protection for our firefighting establishments throughout the country.

I, too, wish to compliment the gentleman who headed the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL], and all members of the committee for having done an outstanding job in this bit of research.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I wish, too, to rise and compliment the chairman of this committee for the comprehensive and successful subcommittee of the House, and to say that when the gentleman from New York referred to the fire at Brooks Air Force Base, he was touching on a base which is in my district and was pointing to an area of need. More importantly, the creation of an urban center is the result of the passage of this bill, of a centralized research center will be one of the biggest contributions that can be made in this regard.

I know, speaking for an area such as the city of San Antonio, I speak for, and perhaps represent and symbolize the needs of others, similarly situated, where the basic services offered by the municipality in police and fire protection are strained. In fact, the municipalities are strained just to administer the payment of salaries and the like. Therefore, they have had no moneys for research in this desperately needed area.

Therefore, I compliment the chairman of this committee and all his colleagues for bringing this bill up for consideration of the House.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from Connecticut for his pioneering work on this subject. I am particularly reminded by the Coast Guard, and the explosion prevention, and it was one of my prime legislative goals when I was in my State legislature. Therefore, I was deeply concerned when a high official of the Coast Guard warned recently that our Houston ship channel is like a great wick which could set aflame the entire industrial area in my district through which the channel runs.

The Houston ship channel has had its share of fires. Amoco Grandchamp, which was loading ammonium nitrate, 576 persons were killed, 4,000 injured, and $87 million of property damage occurred. At the time, the handling of ammonium nitrate was not considered dangerous nor the substance particularly flammable.

On March 27, 1947, when a tug ignited oil floating on the surface of the channel, flames hit the tanker Amoco Virginia, causing an explosion on that vessel. Seven men died, including a fireman fighting the fire, and $9½ million worth of property damage resulted.

More recently, on January 16, 1968, the Liberian freighter Christiane collided with a string of barges pushed by a tug. The lead barge had contained gasoline and a concentration of gasoline vapor which exploded. Debris fell on another gasoline barge in the train and set it afire. Fortunately, no one was killed.

I feel that this bill is well suited to develop means of lessening the hazard of fire and explosion in such areas. These hazards in a concentrated industrial complex present problems that are sometimes beyond the competency of a single industry’s fire and safety program. They are frequently far beyond the competency of local governmental subdivisions. Therefore, a Federal program of this type is called for.

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

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

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Connecticut and all the members on the subcommittee on both sides for bringing forth this legislation which is opportune and timely. I think it represents a great step forward. In terms of the security of all our people.

The acknowledged move toward urbanization, which has been the characteristic of the middle of the 20th century, has in a sense made more dangerous and more perilous many conditions of life for persons who live in the cities.

I think it is fair to state that even though today it is something of a storybook situation, we cannot say that Chicago was once a fire, and how the city was devastated when Mrs. O’Leary’s cow kicked over the lantern. In truth, we are still using many of the firefighting techniques used in that fire, for the very reason pointed out by the gentleman from Texas, that we have not improved on our techniques. Actually, some of the buildings standing at the time of the Chicago fire are still standing in the city of New York and are not improved or reevaluated for fire retardation. As a result, in recent years and months, more than a dozen firemen lost their lives in one fire, one holocaust in this great, supposedly modern city. In only the last 2 weeks we have had the greatest loss in 20 years of lives in a fire in a residence in New York City, where a family was living in总算 conditions, and they lost their lives in a fire.

We can do better. We can bring the best minds we can find, in and out of government, to bear on this, to see how we can avoid this dreadful loss of life among inhabitants through fires in our great cities.

This bill is well supported—by the United Firemen’s Association, by Mr. Robert Lowery, the fire commissioner of New York City, by the International Association of Fire Chiefs, and by others who indicate themselves in support of this bill and indicate this is a crying need to save lives.

I commend the gentleman for his work on this bill.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York has skillfully pointed out the problems in the cities. I would like, because of this emphasis and because of the work of the gentleman from Nebraska, to point out that in Nebraska in 1966, there were 62 people killed as a result of fires, and a fire loss of $10,398,000, at a cost of over $500,000 per person. This is, therefore, a problem limited by city boundaries.

It involves every State in the Union.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I, too, should like to commend my subcommittee chairman for the work which has been done on this particular legislation.

I rise in support of H.R. 11248, the fire prevention and safety bill designed to establish a national fire research and safety program.

Legislation along these lines has been recommended by the President as a part of his 1967 consumer protection message and in his 1968 state of the Union address.

The need for the comprehensive research and investigation into the causes of fires as well as methods of fire prevention and safety has become even more urgent in fact that nationwide we seem unable to diminish the costs and the damages of fire. Yet we are the leading nation in the world in advanced technology. Obviously this has not been applied to the prob-
lem of fire, nor do we know how to do so at this time. For this reason the fire research and safety bill is important; it is necessary for the better protection of the American people.

The National Fire Protection Association reports that in 1966 there was a 24-per cent increase over 1965 in fires in the United States and Canada killing three or more persons; and that the number of fires involving more than $250,000 in property damage increased 12 percent. These must be approximations, yet they indicate that we are not making progress in combating this national problem. There were 91 fires in the United States in 1966 that cost $750,000 or more in property damage. We cannot, then, not provide for better education programs on fire and safety for the public, and for firefighters, as also provided by this legislation; nor can we hesitate to create the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control that this act would establish to undertake a complete study of methods of reducing destruction of life and property by fire.

Mr. Chairman, for the second year the Federal Fire Council has issued a condensed report on Federal fire experience, on the loss to the Federal Government of property and lives, by fire. Last year's report, the fire loss of $225 million, 323 deaths, and 1,452 injuries. This includes the loss experience of 58 Federal departments and agencies, controlling approximately $9.8 percent of the total Federal property valuation of over $347 billion.

The conclusion of the Council is that:

The continuing toll of lives and property losses due to unwanted fire definitely points out the need for all Federal agencies to review and evaluate their own programs for prevention and control; we must analyze and determine the means to deal with the problem is the evidence that among the major nations of the world, the United States has the highest per capita death rate from fires; twice that of Japan, four times that of the United Kingdom, and, remarkably, six and one-half times that of Japan.

While our much higher per capita death rate may reflect the hazards that accompany our higher standard of living, this merely indicates that we must strive for far greater safety efforts as our living standards rise, if we are to eliminate excessive loss of life due to fire.

There are a number of public and private institutions that are active in this field, the National Fire Protection Association of Fire Chiefs, the National Fire Protection Association, and others have endeavored to combat the problem. Without their efforts, the situation today would doubtless be far worse than it is. Working with such limited resources, however, it has been impossible to establish a national fire safety program and the training of personnel is still inadequate. Only a few industries in the country offer substantial programs in fire prevention and administration.

Aside from amending the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards, H.R. 11284 proposes the establishment of a commission to study in depth the many aspects of this great problem and to make recommendations for sensible, well-balanced action. The Commission is to be appointed by the President and is to be composed of outstanding members drawn from the groups who are in the midst of this problem and who can provide firsthand and expert services.

As was pointed out in the committee report, accident deaths and loss of property caused by fire in the United States today is second only to the damage and injuries caused by automobile accidents.

Unfortunately there is no comprehensive fire research and safety program in the United States today. Fire prevention and firefighting is conducted at the local level. Standards in training of personnel, lack of property protection and expertise vary to such an extent from one area to another that advances in research are difficult to communicate throughout all communities in the country.

Even more unfortunate than the lack of the means to deal with the problem is the general apathy and attitude of the average citizen toward the staggering loss of life and property.

The Wingspread Conference on Fire Service Administration Education and Research which was held in Memphis last March noted this lack of concern stating:

"Society in general in the United States seems to establish tolerable fire loss limits which we are willing to accept."

The hearings on H.R. 11284 clearly demonstrated the inadequacy of present efforts to protect the American public from the ravages of fire. The best efforts of 1967, fire in the United States caused 12,200 deaths and property damage amounting to $2.07 billion—or about $9 for every man, woman, and child. Particularly disturbing is the evidence that among the major nations of the world, the United States has the highest per capita death rate from fires; twice that of Canada, four times that of the United Kingdom, and, remarkable, six and one-half times that of Japan.

Some of the Federal departments and agencies use certain fireproofing materials for resisting fires. We must do more than this, we must do all we can, as rapidly as possible, to reduce the present shameful loss of life and property resulting from fires. We cannot diminish the cost of fire protection and safety and repair of the safety and efficient national fire service. We can not afford to neglect fire protection and safety, and support demonstrations of improved and experimental fire protection and safety and establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control.

I think that same conclusion relevant not only to Federal property and lives, but also to the lives and property of all the American people. We must reexamine our role in fire control, prevention, and control; we must analyze and research the causes and nature of fires; we must demonstrate more effective materials for resisting fires. We must do these things and many more, and I believe the legislation before us will help to accomplish just these informational needs. Without this we cannot improve; we cannot diminish the cost and the tragedies associated with fire. This is a national waste, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot afford.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11284, the Fire Research and Development Act.

This measure represents a conviction that a major national effort is required to reduce the present shameful loss of life and property resulting from fires.

The legislation before us would amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a comprehensive fire research and safety program to gather detailed fire data, conduct intensive National research, educate and train fire protection and safety, and support demonstrations of improved and experimental fire protection and safety and establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control.

Only last week in my district in Brooklyn a mother and her 4-year-old son perished in a fire in their third-floor apartment. Fireman Robert Surrey was critically injured by smoke inhalation and three other firemen sustained lesser injuries. I was glad to learn that Fireman Surrey's recovery, which had appeared doubtful, now seems assured.

By the year 2000 the number of buildings in our cities will have doubled and with this expansion will come an intensification of the fire problem unless we act to protect ourselves and our future investment, and the life and security of inhabitants and firefighters.

In my opinion, the problem of fire safety is a perfect example of one which can best be resolved through the cooperative efforts of public and private organizations, and through a working partnership of governments at all levels—Federal, State, and local.

I conclude by wishing to acknowledge the help and support for this legislation which we have received from fire organization leaders all over the country.

From New York City in particular, Fire Chief William Ryan, President of the Uniform Firemen Association, and John Cashin, on behalf of the fire officers group, have been most helpful.

I think that same conclusion relevant not only to Federal property and lives, but also to the lives and property of all the American people. We must reexamine our role in fire control, prevention, and control; we must analyze and research the causes and nature of fires; we must demonstrate more effective materials for resisting fires. We must do these things and many more, and I believe the legislation before us will help to accomplish just these informational needs. Without this we cannot improve; we cannot diminish the cost and the tragedies associated with fire. This is a national waste, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot afford.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I certainly support this legislation, I believe it is desirable. But I believe we must look at the National Bureau of Standards and what they do, because in my opinion they are completely squandering a lot of the taxpayers' money in many of their other endeavors.

In the fiscal year 1967 hearings of the Appropriation Subcommittee on State, Justice, and Commerce, I asked Dr. Astin, who is the head of that organization, some questions. He said that they conduct research for several hundred blue chip companies. When I asked him what he meant by that, he said they were the largest companies, petroleum companies, most of the chemical manufacturing companies, and General Motors. He later said they do research for private power companies, for RCA, and for the apparel industry.

I can understand subsidies being given to marginal people, but this is an agency of the U.S. Government which does research that should be done by the private companies.

I asked Dr. Astin this question:

If this is the case and you are dealing with blue chip industry, why should not this be paid for by their share holders rather than the taxpayers of the United States?
Dr. Astin's answer was:

This is a good question, sir.

I do not know that this agency gets a lot of scrutiny, but I do know it gets a lot of money. Any private industry can come in and have research done for it. The reason the industry gets considerable research done. The glass industry gets considerable research done.

I would like to point out that there is no way the National Bureau of Standards can obligate the companies for which it does research to utilize such products.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to pay my tribute to the distinguished chairman of the full committee for the excellent work he has done in coordinating this effort, and to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DADDARIO), for his very effective leadership, and to our ranking minority member, the gentleman from California (Mr. FULTON), for the excellent effort he has made throughout the space program and his leadership in helping to shape this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11284, the Fire Research and Safety Act.

This bill would give to the American people and industry, Labor, protection against the threat of fire which they do not now enjoy.

You will note that it provides for a 2-year authorization which would probably total $230 million.

In view of our Nation's critical economic posture, it is my intention at the appropriate time to offer an amendment to reduce the authorization by 75 percent--to $5 million for the 2 years.

This figure is well within the bounds of the President's budget.

I want to stress, however, that my amendment will reflect only a necessary concern for economy and should in no way be interpreted as a lack of confidence in the merits of the legislation.

Annual cost of direct fire losses in our country exceeds $9 per man, woman, and child.

We are talking about spending approximately 2 1/2 cents per person to reduce that amount--a most attractive cost-benefit ratio.

Statistics over the last 20 years show a mathematical relationship between gross national product and fire losses.

As the gross national product increases by a hundred billion dollars, fire losses increase by $230 million.

If with this legislation we can just keep the current $1.8 billion loss rate constant for the next 10 years, we would save $5 billion in direct losses alone and as much as $15 or $20 billion including indirect losses.

Our Nation's fire death rate is more than twice as great as that of Canada--and our does that of England against the threat of fire which they do not now enjoy.

Yet in terms of percentage of GNP, the total U.S. Government budget for fire research, including forest fires, civil defense, and military applications, is only about half as great as that of a single laboratory in England.

Throughout the testimony on this legislation, two words emerged again and again: "coordination" and "standardization."

Efforts in the private sector, while in many cases very worthy, are also scattered, tending to concentrate in the direction of their immediate economic interests.

Attempts even to obtain a uniform system of reporting fires have failed.

There is no central clearinghouse where information learned by one organization is made available to others facing the same problems.

Even in light of increased awareness of the crisis of urban congestion, there is no program within the Federal Government that deals with fires in the cities.

What is learned by the Department of Defense, what is learned by fighting forest fires, and must be coordinated to combat the destruction of lives and property in our urban areas.

Accidental death, injury, and loss of property caused by fire in the United States today is second only to the damage caused by automobile accidents.

This is a crisis of national import. And it must be dealt with by serious national effort.

The Fire Research and Safety Act would build upon existing resources.

Efforts already underway in the private sector would not be duplicated. Rather, the Government would utilize private knowledge, coordinate research and fill in gaps which become evident.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not a haphazard response to an emotional appeal. It is a reaction-a result of legislation designed to meet a critical national problem—a problem which cannot be solved by the uncoordinated, scattered efforts of groups at different levels working independently of one another.

The dangers of fire are clear and present.

The attack on fires outlined in this bill can be effective.

What is required is that we accept our responsibility to legislate when the need for action is as clear as it is in the matter before us now.

Mr. Chairman of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from California on his very excellent statement. Further, I wish to compliment him for his study and the magnificent job that Commission has been functioning over the life of the Commission expires?

Mr. BELL. The life of the Commission will continue for 2 years, and that life ends. The National Bureau of Standards, which under this legislation will do fire research, will continue the program of research in the fire area.

The part of the legislation dealing with the Commission involves a separate title. Title II—what is connected with the center. The center would operate under title I of this legislation. The National Bureau of Standards would direct its research.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The center is established under the aegis of the Bureau of Standards, separate and apart from the Commission, is it not?

Mr. BELL. That is right.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. And, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman further, certain present employees of the Bureau of Standards will be used at that particular center, and a number of them will continue to perform their normal duties. Likewise, there will be other employees hired.

I believe that H.R. 11284 can be materially improved. This can be done by requiring in section 204, paragraph (c), the employment of civil service personnel by the Commission. I further would recommend an even more austere approach over the next 2 years of the Commission operations. However, for the present I will withhold any criticism on my part until a later time when the Commission has been functioning over a reasonable period.

Mr. BELL. The Commission, I say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, however, is a separate project that has no connection with the center. In other words, a report is made by the President of the United States to the Congress of the United States and the Commission.
Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, then 30 days after that report is made on the part of the Commission, it goes out of existence?

Mr. BELL. That is correct.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I arise in wholehearted support of H.R. 11284 and would ask the distinguished gentleman from California upon his very fine statement.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that we cannot measure this type of legislation against the question of dollars and cents.

Mr. Chairman, in the city of Philadelphia we have the finest fire department in the United States of America. This fire department has been given an award as being one of the finest fire departments in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the fire commissioner, Mr. Carey, has won the national award, which award was also won in 1966.

I would like to say again, Mr. Chairman, I measure the loss of lives and property involved in fires on the basis of dollars and cents. I say this, because we had over 4,000 homes destroyed by fires. This is to be taken into consideration along the fact of the efficiency of the fire department of the city of Philadelphia. Yet, 98 lives were lost and only a total of $6 million damage as a result of these fires.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Science and Astronautics is to be commended for its work on this legislation which is vitally needed to advance our knowledge of how to cope with the danger and destruction of fires. Every day disastrous fires strike our homes, offices, factories, and stores, exacting a staggering toll in property loss and much more importantly thousand of lives every year.

This bill is a key part of the drive in Congress to provide consumer protection in a number of fields. The testimony on this bill indicates that in spite of America's technological and scientific leadership, there has been all too little research into the causes and nature of fire hazards and the best ways to guard against them. Certainly a nation which is on the verge of putting a man on the moon cannot be complacent about daily headlines of deadly fires in slum housing, homes for the aged, public places such as restaurants, or brush fires that destroy entire subdivisions. The intensified study that will result from this legislation will serve to help protect all of us.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly pleased that the bill includes as title II, the resolution which I introduced last year, before the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control. I am also pleased to see that this provision is incorporated in the Senate-passed companion bill, S. 1124. This Commission, to be appointed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Commerce, and 18 other members to be appointed by the President, will study problems and proposals in this field and pave the way for future intensive research. When our Subcommittee on Housing held hearings on this resolution last year, I was impressed with the widespread public support and particularly with the intense interest and support of Members of Congress. It is clear that every American knows the tragedy of fire in his own district and each of us feels sympathy for disasters which strike elsewhere.

We were frankly appalled in that hearing at the statistics on fire loss in the United States every year. I will not repeat the figures here, which are now available to us from the excellent report of the Committee on Science and Astronautics and which were read by the able member of that committee. However, I want to mention one statement made to us by William D. Buck, president of the International Association of Fire Fighters, AFL-CIO. In addition to the sad statistics on the overall havoc wrought by fire, he called our attention to the frightening figures on injuries and death suffered by our gallant firefighters who day and night stand ready to protect us from fire. We owe it to these brave men as well as to the public at large to see to it that no effort is spared to make fire prevention as effective as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this bill will pass the House unanimously and I urge all of my colleagues to give it the support which it so richly deserves.

Mr. PETTIT. Mr. Chairman, you have heard the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. Bell) describe to you the intent of H.R. 11284. He has told you how much each year configuration in this country cost the American people.

It has described to you what to me is the obvious need to apply our resources in science and technology in order to reduce to the lowest possible minimum these losses.

Gentlemen, this is a sensible, and what is more important, practical piece of legislation. It involves a relatively small amount of money. The bill does not in any way cast any doubt on some of the potentially huge Government organization. It intends to utilize the already existing scientific and technological capabilities of the National Bureau of Standards. Its intention is to organize the talents and personnel available right now to determine the most efficient solution to the causes of all fires and the best methods to extinguish them.

Perhaps some of the Members present today are asking themselves what is so mysterious about the causes of fire and what we do not know right now about putting them out. After all, there are thousands of experienced fire fighters in our country. Certainly, the insurance underwriters have been most active in determining fire hazards and in producing methods to avoid them.

Let me remind the House that we are experiencing in this Nation a burgeoning population growth. We are moving toward new methods of construction and new community development. Therefore, there is a continuous movement of people from the rural areas into urban areas.

All these changes and growth by their own nature create new social hazards of a wide variety. A most important one of course, is the question of fire prevention. And that is the key word, "prevention." This is the area where our enormous resources in science and technology can be utilized to produce great benefits in the reduction of both the casualties and property loss, and that is the area we are concerned about in this legislation.

I think in H.R. 11284 is an excellent example of progressive action that can be taken by the House to overcome a number of existing problems that confront the welfare of thousands of Americans.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Mosinee).

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment very briefly in support of this bill, and perhaps emphasize one or two points which, it seems to me, have not been as clear as they might be.

The first point is that the bill does not set up an entirely new organization to do fire research. It merely expands a nucleus within the Bureau of Standards which already is engaged in this activity to some degree. This bill will permit the Bureau to carry on its studies of research and the kind of technical research which it is not presently doing, as well as permit the Bureau to contract for research into fire problems. It is anticipated that most of the money earmarked for research will be contracted outside the Bureau.

The second point I would like to emphasize is that we do not, in contrast to some allegations, always know the cause of fire or the nature of fire once started. It is the matter of record at this House that the 1966 fire statistics as carried in Fire Journal show that the largest dollar loss of 16 causes of fires in the United States are "unknown or undetermined." More than one-third of the losses sustained through fires are in this category—83 percent to be exact—in 1966, 90,000 fires costing $536,000,000 in damages. Moreover, it is common knowledge that some of the causes of fires listed in the statistics such as "incendiary devices and sparks" or "fireworks" do not always tell the complete story. Finally, it is quite clear from the testimony given to our committee that much is yet to be learned about handling and controlling fires.

The equipment we use today has been much improved in the past decades, but our methods are still essentially the same. We have, in fact, learned that some things that we have been doing, some things that we have considered the best way of handling fires have turned out, after a bit of research, to be quite wrong; in some cases they have even been aggravating factors—using superheated steam in closed spaces is an example.

The third and final point I wish to emphasize is that titles I and II of this bill are actually supplementary. They are not overlapping activities. Title I provides for an attack upon immediate problems which we have already identified. Title II, which sets up a study commission for a limited time, is designed not to study and analyze the causes of fires, but to develop recommendations concerning other phases of the overall problems, such as improving equipment, analyzing
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I have made that judgment in this instance, voting against what is undoubtedly a worthy objective but one in which the taxpayers will be saved the sum of $5 million at a time when, despite the massive size of the Federal budget, every dollar counts.

Just as we do in our own households, we have to take into account our ability to pay for all the wonderful things we find pleasure and usefulness in using in our daily lives. We delay our purchases in many instances, putting aside our desire for another day or another season when we will be able to better afford those things we seek.

So it must be with our Federal Government and so it was in my deciding to vote against the Fire Research and Safety Act. In my opinion there are many such programs which can be kept on the back burner until the burden of the war in Vietnam is no longer pressing us and until such a time that our fiscal house is in order. I felt in this instance, too, that the vast resources of the fire insurance underwriting industry is well able to assist our worthy firefighting departments in the present and the immediate circumstances of the moment we could get along for now without creating another Federal agency or bureau.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 11284, the Fire Research and Safety Act, will strengthen Federal participation in fire research and safety problems, especially for our cities and suburbs.

The establishment of a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control, as provided in the bill, will meet a long-existing need.

In my State of California where forest fire problems tend to merge with urban and community fire problems in fire emergency situations, the need is especially great.

The Bel Air and Malibu fires in southern California and the Napa fire in northern California are dramatic examples.

Basic authorities and sound programs of protection and research for forest areas have existed for many years.

I would like to take the role I have been able to play in the strengthening of these activities.

While additional research and protection financing is needed, I am satisfied that the basic structures and arrangements are sound.

The fire research activities of the Forest Service are developing the new technologies so badly needed in California where climate, terrain, and vegetation combine to create a terrifying potential for holocausts.

The fire protection capability of the Federal land-managing agencies has been strengthened.

The fire suppression strength within the Forest Service, for example, was amply demonstrated in the recent Idaho forest fire emergency. I would say with 271-278e) (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to--

the equivalent of an army division of firefighters was mobilized from throughout the Nation.

The National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control would study all aspects of the national fire problem. It would study the President and the Congress in 18 months on proposed legislation and other appropriate measures to establish the scope and course of a national fire research and safety program beyond the present effort, and final reports will be most important in shaping a long range program and thereby advancing national fire safety.

To justify the need for H.R. 11284, we need only call to mind such fires as the Penthouse Restaurant in Montgomery, Ala., and the Chicago Convention Center fire, and the resulting loss of lives and property. In light of these recollections, I am sure that my esteemed colleagues will join me in support of this bill.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

I hope the Clay Amendment being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Fire Research and Safety Act of 1967".

TITLE I—FIRE RESEARCH AND SAFETY ACT

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 101. The Congress finds that a comprehensive fire research and safety program in this country, where effective measures of protection against the hazards of death, injury, and damage to property. The Congress finds that it is desirable that the Federal Government, in carrying out the provisions of this title, to cooperate with and assist public and private agencies. The Congress declares that the purpose of this title is to amend the Act of March 3, 1901, as amended, to provide a national fire research and safety program including the gathering of the comprehensive fire data; a comprehensive fire research program; fire safety education and training programs, and demonstration of new approaches and improvements in fire prevention, safety and control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage. Additionally, it is the sense of Congress that the Secretary should establish a fire research and safety center for administering this title and carrying out its purposes, including appropriate fire safety research, information, and education.

AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM

Sec. 105. The Act entitled "An Act to establish the National Board of Standards for Fire Protection and Prevention", as amended (15 U.S.C. 271-276e), is further amended by adding the following sections:

"Sec. 16. The Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to--"

(a) Conduct directly or through contracts or grants--

(1) Investigations of fires to determine their causes, frequency of occurrence, severity; and other pertinent factors;

(2) Research into the causes and nature of fires, and the development of improved methods and techniques for fire prevention, control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage;

(3) Educational programs to--

(A) Inform the public of fire hazards and fire safety techniques;

(B) Encourage avoidance of such hazards and use of such techniques;

(4) Fire information reference services, including the collection and dissemination of data, research results, and other information, derived from this program or from other sources, applicable to fire control and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage;

(5) Educational and training programs to improve, among other things--

(A) The efficiency, operation, and organization of fire services, and

(B) Fire in controlling unusual fire-related hazards and fire disasters; and
(a) projects demonstrating—
(1) application of fire safety principles in construction, or
(2) cooperation in the development of educational programs of fire prevention, control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage.

(b) application of fire safety principles in construction, or
(1) improvement of the efficiency, operation, and maintenance of existing programs on fire prevention, control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage.

(2) Support by contracts or grants to the development, for use by educational and other nonprofit institutions, of—
(1) Safe and effective construction engineering or science curriculums; and
(2) Safe building code enforcement or science curriculums.

(3) construction engineering or science curriculums; and
(4) other appropriate curriculums or courses of instruction.

Sect. 17. With respect to the functions authorized under this Act—
(a) Grants may be made only to States and local governments, other non-Federal public agencies, and nonprofit institutions. Such a grant may be up to 100 per cent of the total cost of the project for which the grant is made. The Secretary shall require, whenever feasible, as a condition of approval of a grant, that the recipient contribute money, facilities, or services to carry out the purposes of the section to the extent consistent with the purposes of this section.

(b) The Secretary may arrange with and reimburse the heads of other Federal departments or agencies for the performance of any such functions, and, as necessary or appropriate, delegate any of his powers under this title to such heads or to the heads of departments or agencies of State or local governments.

(c) The Secretary may perform such functions without regard to section 2646 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 259).

(d) The Secretary is authorized to request any Federal department or agency to supply such statistics, data, program reports, and other materials as he deems necessary to carry out such functions. Each such department or agency shall cooperate with the Secretary and, to the extent permitted by law, furnish such materials to the Secretary, the heads of other departments and agencies, and the Secretary who may identify any need and provide representation of the views of individuals and organization of all areas of the United States concerned with fire control and prevention.

(e) The Secretary is authorized to establish such rules, standards, criteria, and procedures, and to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or appropriate to the administration of such functions or this section, including rules and regulations—
(1) which require that a grantee shall retain complete and accurate records and accounts of activities funded under section 16, and
(2) which provide for fiscal control, sound accounting procedures, and periodic reports by the Secretary regarding the application of funds paid under section 16.

NONTJERENCE WITH EXISTING FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Sect. 103. Nothing in this title shall be deemed to repeal, supersede, or diminish existing authority or responsibility of any agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sect. 104. There are authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this title, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the following four fiscal years, and such sums as may be necessary for or related to the purposes of this title, including such sums as may be necessary for technological advances, construction technical services, and inspection procedures; (2) an analysis of existing programs administered or supported by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government and of ways in which such programs could be strengthened so as to lessen the danger of destructive fires in Government-assisted and other structures in the Nation’s cities and communities; (3) an evaluation of existing fire suppression methods used in rural, suburban, and urban areas, including procedures for recruiting and soliciting the necessary personnel; (4) an evaluation of present and future needs for training and education for fire-service personnel; (5) a consideration of the adequacy of current fire communication techniques and suggestions for the standardization and improvement of the apparatus and equipment used in controlling fires; and (6) an analysis of the administrative problems affecting the efficiency or capabilities of local fire departments or organizations.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

Sect. 202. There is hereby established the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control (hereinafter referred to as the “Commission”) which shall be composed of twenty members as follows: the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and eighteen members appointed by the President. The individuals representing the Federal Government shall be personally and professionally qualified to provide representation of the views of individuals and organizations of all areas of the United States concerned with fire research, safety, control, or prevention, including representatives drawn from Federal State, and local governments, industry, labor, universities, labor-organization, trade associations, and other interested institutions or organizations. Not more than six members of the Commission shall be appointed from the Federal Government. The President shall designate the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Commission. The Secretary of Commerce shall have four advisory members composed of—
(1) two Members of the House of Representatives from the same political party and who shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and
(2) two Members of the Senate who shall not be members of the same political party and who shall be appointed by the President of the Senate.

The membership of the Commission shall not participate, except in an advisory capacity, in the formulation of the findings and recommendations of the Commission.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission or its advisory membership shall not affect the powers of the Commission, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

Sect. 203. (a) The Commission shall undertake a comprehensive, study and investigation to determine practicable and effective measures for reducing the destructive effects of fire in the Nation’s cities and communities. The Commission shall—
(1) Consideration of ways in which fires can be more有效地 prevented through

Open areas in Los Angeles, particularly in the district of Los Angeles which I represent, are ravaged each year by fires which might be prevented or minimized.

I believe this legislation in substance constitutes a good investment which will quickly begin paying for itself—not just where I live but everywhere in the Nation. And I believe this act is more apt to develop into a rewarding program of the Federal Government if we move in an orderly, efficient fashion.

It is my belief that the figure provided by my amendment would enable us to implement this program while recognizing the demands of a limited budget, and I urge its acceptance by my colleagues.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, taking into consideration what the gentleman from California has said about his amendment, I will accept it. I have no opposition to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DADDARIO

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DADDARIO: On page 4, line 25, strike out "the grant" and insert "such grant".

Mr. PELLY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, did we vote on the Bell amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The Bell amendment was adopted, after having been accepted by the acting chairman of the committee.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I heard the chairman accept it, but I did not hear anybody on our side, and I did not know if there had been a vote. I thank the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment was offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. HUNT. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that the amendment, accepted by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], cuts the figure from $10 million per annum to $2.5 million per annum?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment speaks for itself.

Mr. HUNT. There was a $20 million total for 2 years, which is now, by the amendment, reduced to a $5 million figure.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair, but the gentleman from California is here and might state it.

Mr. BELL. That is correct. The amendment provided for a cut down to a total of $5 million.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the clarification. At least we saved $15 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment reread?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk reread the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DADDARIO

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DADDARIO: On page 1, line 4, strike out "1967" and insert "1968".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, the consumer message, President Johnson drew attention to the frightening loss in lives, injuries, and property that is suffered in this country each year by fires. He said that we can do better.

I introduced at that time on behalf of the administration the bill which we have before us today, the Fire Research and Safety Act.

The committee hearings on this bill revealed that the problem of fires is, indeed, a national problem. Furthermore, it is a greater problem in the United States than it is in other industrialized nations. Our per capita death rate from fires, our per capita number of fires, and our per capita property damage from fires are not only higher than comparable countries, but the tragic figures are still going up, in spite of the best efforts of many private and public groups working for solutions to the problem.

The Fire Research and Safety Act has several important features. Study and research on the causes of fires will be conducted. The public will be educated on fire hazards and safety techniques. Firefighters will receive training. Information services will give the latest in public safety on fire safety, and model projects will be conducted to demonstrate new methods of controlling the spread of fires. These goals will be achieved, in part, by a program of grants made to State and local governments, and to other public and nonprofit institutions.

There also will be established a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control which will take a searching look at the entire problem of fires in the United States, and what we need do to keep ahead of the danger.

The bill reflects the views of many groups who are responsible for various aspects of fire prevention and control. Its enactment will demonstrate that the Government is responsive to the needs of all the people, and I urge all Members to give thoughtful consideration to this important item of legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the dis-
tungished gentleman from Connecticut to give us an explanation of section 204, to be found on page 11 of the bill, which states that “for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, hold hearings, take testimony, and require the attendance and the testimony of witnesses appearing before the Commission or any subcommittee or member thereof.”

Why the administering of oaths in hearings pertaining to this subject? In what fields is it proposed to hold hearings that require administering of an oath?

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman’s question goes just to the nature of this investigation. I would not understand that it would be in any unusual inclusion in legislation of this kind.

Mr. GROSS. Is it proposed to go into insurance rates with this Commission?

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I would not understand that would be in the nature of this investigation. I would say that the insurance industry, as it testified before our committee by representatives, indicated its support, not only for installation, but for the Commission and the contents and the terminology that is presently before us.

Mr. GROSS. This was a part of the bill at that time. Is that correct?

Mr. DADDARIO. Yes, it was.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross. On page one, strike out lines 6 through 17.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can be talked out of this amendment, if the gentleman from Connecticut will give me his attention, but it seems to me this is a wide-open invitation to empires building by the provision of an unemployment policy, a policy of a bill brought in providing for unlimited employment by a commission and an unlimited ability to fix the salaries of such employees.

Is that the intention of the committee?

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. It is certainly not our intention to provide any opportunity for empire building.

The report indicates that the number of employees who would be hired by the Commission would be 11. That is an absolute ceiling.

Our reason for having this language, as I indicated to the gentleman from Pennsylvania earlier, is that we thought it would be adopted in the first instance by adhering to civil service requirements in order to hire these 11 people. They would not then be on the civil service roster after the 2 years of Commission’s activity has expired.

We believe this to be a simple part of our legislation, and it makes it a much cleaner operation than it would be if the language was not there.

Mr. GROSS. This is the reason why I took the floor. Perhaps I should have asked the gentleman to explain this provision of the bill before offering the amendment.

I understand the temporary nature, or at least the hoped-for temporary nature of this Commission. I agree with the gentleman it would be unwise to put a number on the employment of employees on the payroll when it is possible, with the oversight of the committee, to hold down the employment, to hold down the number of supergrades and so on and so forth, of high priced personnel, and to keep them on a temporary basis and therefore be able to dispense with them at the end of 2 years.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield further.

Mr. DADDARIO. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Iowa has brought up this particular point. It has been our intent to do so.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman’s question goes just to the nature of this investigation. I would not understand that it would be in any unusual inclusion in legislation of this kind.

Mr. GROSS. Is it proposed to go into insurance rates with this Commission?

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I would not understand that would be in the nature of this investigation. I would say that the insurance industry, as it testified before our committee by representatives, indicated its support, not only for installation, but for the Commission and the contents and the terminology that is presently before us.

Mr. GROSS. This was a part of the bill at that time. Is that correct?

Mr. DADDARIO. Yes, it was.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross. On page 12, strike out lines 6 through 17.

Mr. GROSS. The question is on the amendment? If not, the amendment is out.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, with the assurance of the gentleman that the committee will give real oversight to this matter of employment, because this is wide open, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Brookes, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11234) to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, to establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 296, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

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 question was taken; and the Speaker proceeded that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 269, nays 78, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]
So the bill was passed. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
- Mr. Welch, for, with Mr. Andress against
- Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Watkins against
- Mr. Kuykendall for, with Mr. Devine against
- Mr. Riegel for, with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin against
- Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Utz against
- Mr. Gude for, with Mr. Smith of Oklahoma against

Until further notice:
- Mr. Rooney of New York for Mr. Battin
- Mr. Getts with Mr. Michel
- Mr. Kuczenski with Mr. Cleveland
- Mr. Teel with Mr. Browhill of Virginia
- Mr. Nichols with Mr. McDade
- Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Skubitz
- Mr. Rees with Mr. Findley
- Mr. Kochenburger with Mr. Pollock
- Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Mathias of California
- Mr. Madden with Mr. Clancy
- Mr. Watts with Mr. Springer
- Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Latta
- Mr. Abbott with Mr. Gude
- Mr. Clark with Mr. Wyant
- Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Smith of Oklahoma
- Mr. Everett with Mr. Anderson of Illinois
- Mr. Rivers with Mr. Gurney

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. DADDARIO. The Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 296, I call up from the Speaker's table for immediate consideration the bill S. 1124.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DADDARIO

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read the title as follows:

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DADDARIO

Mr. DADDARIO: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1124 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in S. 1194 as passed, as follows:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968'."

"TITLE 1—FIRE RESEARCH AND SAFETY PROGRAM"

Declaratory of Policy

"Sec. 101. The Congress finds that a comprehensive fire research and safety program is needed in this country to provide more effective measures of protection against the hazards of death, injury, and damage to property. The Congress finds that it is desirable and necessary for the Federal Government to provide for the coordination of this title, to cooperate with and assist public and private agencies. The Congress declares that the purpose of this title is to amend the Act of December 23, 1960, as amended, to provide a national fire research and fire safety education and training program; fire safety education and training programs; and demonstrations of new approaches and improvements in fire prevention and control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage. Additionally, it is the sense of Congress that the Secretary shall establish a fire research and safety center for administering this title and carrying out its purposes, including appropriate fire safety liaison and coordination.

"Authorization of Program"

"Sec. 102. The Act entitled 'An Act to establish the National Bureau of Standards', approved March 3, 1901, as amended (15 U.S.C. 271-278c), is further amended by adding the following section:

"Sec. 16. The Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to—

"'(a) Conduct directly or through contracts or grants—

"'(1) investigations of fires to determine the causes, frequency of occurrence, severity, and other pertinent factors;—

"'(2) research into the causes and nature of fires, and the development of improved methods and techniques for fire prevention, fire control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage;—

"'(3) educational programs to—

"'(A) inform the public of fire hazards and fire safety techniques, and—

"'(B) establish standards, criteria, and procedures for the dissemination of data, research results, and other information, derived from this program or from other sources and related to fire prevention, fire control, reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage;—

"'(4) the development, for use by educational and other nonprofit institutions, of—

"'(A) fire safety education and training programs;—

"'(B) support for educational and training programs; and—

"'(C) fire safety courses, seminars, or other instructional materials and aids for the above curriculum or other appropriate curricula or courses of instruction;—

"Sec. 17. With respect to the functions authorized by section 106 of the Act—

"'(a) Grants may be made only to States and local governments, other non-Federal public agencies, and nonprofit institutions. The Secretary may provide a fraction of the total cost of the project for which such grant is made. The Secretary shall require, whenever feasible, as a condition of approval of a grant, that the recipient contribute money, facilities, or services to carry out the purposes for which the grant is sought. For the purposes of this section, 'State' means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and public agencies includes combinations or groups of States or local governments.

"'(b) The Secretary may arrange with and reimburse the heads of other Federal departments and agencies for the performance of any such functions and, as necessary or appropriate, delegate any of his powers under this section or section 15 of this Act with respect to any part thereof, and authorize the redelegation of such powers.

"'(c) The Secretary may perform such functions without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 539)."
"(1) provide that a grantee will from time to time, but not less often than annually, submit to the Commission a current report of activities funded under section 16, and
"(2) provide for fiscal control, sound accounting procedures, and the periodic reporting of financial activity to the Secretary regarding the application of funds paid under section 160.

"NONINTERFERENCE WITH EXISTING FEDERAL PROGRAMS

"Sec. 103. No title contained in this title shall be deemed to repeal, suspend, or diminish existing authority or responsibility of any agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 104. There are authorized to be appropriated, for the purposes of this Act, $5,000,000 for the period ending June 30, 1970.

"TITLE II—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

"Sec. 201. The Congress finds and declares that the growing problem of fire in the isolation and property from fire is a matter of grave national concern; that this problem is particularly acute in the Nation's urban and suburban areas where the increasing population of the United States resides but it is also of national concern in smaller communities and rural areas in which the prevalent population concentrates, the means for controlling and preventing destructive fires has become progressively more complex and frequently beyond public local control; and that there is a clear and present need to explore and develop more effective fire control and fire prevention measures throughout the country in the light of existing and foreseeable conditions. It is the purpose of this title to establish a national Commission to undertake a thorough study and investigation of this problem with a view to the formulation of recommendations whereby the Nation can reduce its losses from fire and the economic and social benefits resulting from the control and prevention of fire.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

"Sec. 202. (a) There is hereby established the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission') which shall be composed of two members each appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and eight members appointed by the President. The individuals so appointed shall be individuals who (1) shall be eminent in research and teaching in the field of fire prevention and control, (2) are qualified by training or experience as fire control officers, (3) are qualified by training or experience in the field of fireservice personnel, (4) are qualified by training and education for fire-service personnel, (5) are qualified by training or experience in the field of fire prevention and control, (6) are qualified by training or experience in the field of fire prevention and control, and (7) are qualified by training or experience in the field of fire prevention and control.

"(b) The Commission shall have four advisory groups which shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, respectively, to provide representation of the views of individuals and organizations of all areas of the United States concerned with fire research, safety, control, or prevention, including representatives drawn from Federal, State, and local governments, industry, labor, universities, labor organizations, and other interested institutions or organizations. Not more than six members of the Commission shall be appointed from the Federal Government or the Government of the District of Columbia, and the President shall designate the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Commission.

"Powers and Administrative Provisions

"Sec. 204. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of effecting the purposes of this title, hold hearings, take testimony, and make investigations, including procedures for recruiting personnel;

"(b) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as he deems necessary, and

"(c) Subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Commission, the Chairman, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to chapter 55 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule positions, make appointments, and designate the grade and classification of such positions under this title.

"(d) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government is authorized, except an independent agency, to furnish to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, such information as the Commission deems necessary to its functions under this title.

"RECOGNITION OF UNIFORMITY OF LAWS

"Sec. 205. The Congress finds that the growing problem of fire in the isolation and property from fire is a matter of grave national concern; that this problem is particularly acute in the Nation's urban and communities; and elsewhere.

"EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

"Sec. 206. There are authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the expenses of the Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

"EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

"Sec. 207. The Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after the submission of its report under section 206 (a)."
able for sport and commercial fishing, wildlife conservation, recreation, and scenic beauty, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan. The motion was agreed to.

In the Committee of the Whole

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 25, with Mr. Bascom in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H.R. 25 is to provide a means for protecting and conserving our Nation's estuarine areas and the waters of the Great Lakes.

These areas are rich in a variety of natural resources including habitat and feeding areas for wildlife, spawning areas for fish and shellfish, and are also valuable for sport and commercial fishing, outdoor recreation and scenic beauty. These valuable areas are rapidly being damaged or destroyed and consequently are in dire need of protection.

Mr. Chairman, although many of the Members of the Committee when legislation on this subject was considered under suspension of the rules in the 89th Congress, I think it might be appropriate to briefly review the background of this legislation.

H.R. 25 dates back to September 23, 1965, when the gentleman from New York, Congressman Tenzoes, introduced legislation—limited in scope—which would provide for the protection, administration, and preservation of the estuarine-wetland area of Hempstead-South Oyster Bay, Long Island, N.Y.

Subsequently, I and several other Members of the Committee introduced legislation—broader in scope—which would establish a nationwide system of protecting our estuarine areas.

As many of you will recall, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries reported my bill, H.R. 13477, which blended the best features of all of these bills. However, it failed to pass under suspension of the rules of the 89th Congress, I think it might be appropriate to briefly review the background of this legislation.

H.R. 25 as introduced last year I again introduced legislation on this subject—H.R. 25, which is now before you for consideration.

H.R. 25 as introduced, was considerably broader in scope than the previous bills and contained several provisions which proved to be quite controversial.

As a result of the lengthy hearings and discussions which ensued, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries deemed it desirable to strip from the bill those controversial provisions and report a bill which would still provide the best possible means for protecting our Nation's estuarine areas and estuarine resources.

Briefly explained, section 1 of the bill contains congressional findings that the estuarine areas of the Nation are rich in a variety of natural, commercial, and other resources; that consideration should be given to the need to protect, conserve, and restore these estuaries in a manner that maintains a balance between the national need for protection in the interest of conservation and the need to develop these estuaries to further the Nation's economic growth and development.

Section 2 of the bill would direct the Secretary of the Interior—in consultation and in cooperation with the States, the Secretary of the Army, and other Federal agencies and for the purpose of protecting and restoring estuaries in accordance with the purposes of this act. Such programs are the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964, and the Andromous and Great Lakes Fisheries Conservation Acts.

Section 6 would make it clear that this bill would not affect the authority of any Federal agency to carry out Federal projects within an estuary heretofore or hereafter authorized.

Mr. Chairman, all of the testimony at the hearings was strongly in favor of the legislation and the bill, as reported, would receive the approval of all departments reporting on the legislation.

The Committee was unanimous in reporting H.R. 25 to the House and I urge its prompt passage.

Mr. PELLY, Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Morton).

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, we are again dealing with the question of the conservation and preservation of our estuarine areas. A bill very similar to H.R. 25 before the Committee today was before the House in the 89th Congress.

There were several things about that bill which concerned me a great deal. In the first place, I believe the State Department of Interior should have had responsibilities under this bill. In other words, the citizens of each State should have had some voice in the designation of estuarine areas and their particular interests should have been taken into consideration.

Secondly, I believed we should have had some specific provisions in the bill for the protection of estuarine areas, and particularly those areas which have been designated as national wildlife refuges or areas under the jurisdiction of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Federal Wildlife Services.

The present bill which is being offered today, in my opinion, is a far better bill. It has been discussed and debated in this Committee and in the Senate. It provides for the conservation and preservation of those areas which the President and the Secretary of the Interior have determined should be protected.

The present bill also contains a provision which would provide for the protection of those areas which the President and the Secretary of the Interior have determined should be protected.

The amendment which will be offered to section 3 completely protects the States...
and local communities from any arbitrary action by any Federal agency. It also guarantees to the State involved the power of decision over any proposed action affecting its waterways and estuarine areas.

The preservation of our estuarine areas is, as far as I am concerned, without question among the most vital of our national policies. The preservation and responsibility for the conservation practices needed to preserve our wetlands and estuarine areas.

The Chesapeake Bay is, perhaps, the noblest of all our estuaries because of its great size and the blend of salt water from the sea and fresh water from the land. The Chesapeake is, in itself, an environment almost perfectly formulated for salt water. It contains the spawning ground for the shad, for the herring, for the striped bass, and many other species. It contains the entire migratory cycle of the blue crab. It is a factory of the mysterious and the strange. But more than this, the marshes of its shores, the grasses of its shallows, and the protection of its coves provides for migratory waterfowl an almost perfect habitat.

As we crowd its shores with works of civilization, as we dredge its bottoms with new channels, as wespan its surface with bridges, as we reshape its shores to suit the needs of industry or the needs of recreation, more and more do we invade the natural environment and upset the balance of its vast ecology. Preserving the wetlands and the estuarine areas is, but a facet in the program we must develop in the management of this great basin if we are to preserve it as a great natural resource.

I mention the Chesapeake because of its importance to me, to Maryland and Virginia, to the great cities near it, and, finally, to the Nation. But the Chesapeake is only an example. This Nation is blessed with magnificent estuaries: Puget Sound, Long Island Sound, Pamlico and Albemarle, the vast bayou of the Mississippi Valley, the Chesapeake Bay, Buzzards Bay, the long coastal waterway of the east coast and Gulf of Mexico, Pamlico and Albemarle, the vast bayou in Louisiana, the vast bays and estuaries in the States; the purposes are to develop an understanding of the potential of our estuarine areas, to understand their ecology, their potential for recreation, and, as I shall try to do later, to define them and work out the best plan for their management, preservation, and conservation.

It will be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior, and, I hope, the oversight of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to see that this program to preserve our estuarine areas does not overlap with other Federal and local programs or State programs of a parallel nature. This legislation, in itself, is a new adventure in conservation. The success of our efforts here will be a measure of how well this program is integrated into other conservation efforts carried out by State, Federal, and private interests.

In closing, I would urge my colleagues to support this bill which holds great promise. It supports the concept of the preservation of a part of our environment essential to many aspects of marine life and extremely important in the total ecology, including man.

Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to answer any questions that any of the Members might have concerning the bill, which I believe was well explained by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dingell].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MORTON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Under the definition of estuarine areas as defined in the report, and perhaps a definition which promotes better understanding would be to cite some examples.

The large estuarine areas, of course, are areas such as Puget Sound and the Chesapeake Bay. The wet lands in these areas are an integral part of them, and the wet lands are those lands which are subject to flooding by normal tides. Mr. KYL. Would the gentleman yield right there for a question of clarification?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Webster and other authorities also list as estuarine areas areas such as the outlet of streams composed of only of fresh water. Are those intended to be included in this legislation?

Mr. DINGELL. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. If the Great Lakes are included, does the gentleman include only those areas where there is this commingling of salt water and fresh water?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DINGELL. Would the gentleman permit in the committee report in the 90th Congress, it states as follows:

Estuaries are places where salt water meets fresh water.

And then it goes on to say:

A meandering river flows to the sea and terminates in an estuary. The river, river waters, the ocean tides, the coastal currents, and the contours of our shores intersect resulting in the depositing of river sediment and estuarine areas which by their dictionary definition are caused by the flow of large springs are not included in this legislation?

Mr. KYL. If the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. MORTON. Let me say this to the gentleman before I yield for another question: that the thrust of the bill before us is aimed at the wetlands, the areas which make up our shoreline that are of extreme biological importance because they house the life-giving elements of many of our very small shellfish, and fish of other species which are vital to the total cycle of a tidal ecology, and are such large bodies of water as Long Island Sound, Great South Bay, the Albemarle and Pamlico Sounds of North Carolina, Chesapeake Bay—these are some of the areas.

I would add further that one can conceive of himself about the technical definition of the words such as "estuarine areas."

But what we are concerned about is that vital boundary between fresh and salt water in our coastal areas and that vital boundary between the shore and deeper waters of our fresh-water masses, such as the Great Lakes.

Mr. KYL. Now so that we may absolutely put the use of this. I would ask the gentleman these two questions.

Am I right in assuming that those areas which by their dictionary definition are caused by the flow of large springs are not to be considered as eligible under this bill; is that correct?
Mr. MORTON. I do not believe I am qualified to answer that because I am not sure what areas you have in mind.

Mr. KYL. Well, that is exactly why I ask the question.

Mr. MORTON. If these springs would exist, for example, in the shores of the Chesapeake Bay or the shores of the Great Lakes areas, I think they would qualify.

Mr. KYL. But only under those circumstances?

Mr. MORTON. Yes, but only under those circumstances.

Mr. KYL. Then am I right in assuming that under the Great Lakes portion of this legislation, any place where a river, fresh water, flows into a lake of fresh water, it is eligible for consideration as an estuarine area?

Mr. MORTON. I do not believe that under the terms of this legislation it would be in every instance.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. If I may read from page 29 of the report, I think this subject is covered.

[Reads from page 29 of the report]

The report reads as follows:

H. R. 25 and the companion bills are not concerned with the open ocean, nor with the fresh water streams of streams that go down to meet it. Rather, it deals with the areas in between that are under the direct influence of the salty sea and its tides. Hence, we are talking about the kinds of places that have such common names as bays, coasts, sounds, harbors, lagoons, tidal marshes, inshore waters and channels.

That is from the testimony of Dr. Stanley A. Cain as a witness before the committee.

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

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Can the gentleman tell me what areas in the Great Lakes are to be considered as potentially estuarine areas for conservation under this act?

Mr. MORTON. I think the study itself will determine that. That is what we are trying to determine exactly what area.

Mr. KYL. Are you talking about Lake Michigan and Lake Superior?

Mr. MORTON. Yes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, my district will be a beneficiary of the research and study and I hope the committee will be reached by the commission which is established by this bill to look into the relationship of the estuarine areas to the wild life and to the fish that spawn within these areas and whether or not we can find their way to the marketplace and on to the tables throughout our country.

It is very important that this relationship be understood.

The author of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the witnesses who appeared before us, the rights of the States and the subdivisions thereof have been respected.

The legislation calls for a most thoughtful study and before actual moneys can be spent to implement the recommendations of the study, the report must come back to the Congress for action.

In my view, this legislation can be very helpful not only to the coastal areas and the Great Lakes that are specifically included, but also to the further benefits which flow from these great natural resources which are necessary to sustain us and provide the protein that is so necessary in our diets.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Congress will support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume in order to answer the question raised a moment ago by the gentleman from Iowa as to what parts of the Great Lakes were included in this legislation. I am able to answer him a little more fully at this time. I refer to the table and summary on page 30 of the hearings, where there is included a footnote under "Michigan":

In Great Lakes only shoals (areas less than 6 feet deep) were considered as estuaries.

I think that is the best I can do in answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. MORTON. This bill in and of itself authorizes the acquisition of any lands by the Federal Government.

Mr. PELLY. My understanding is there will be no authority to acquire any lands under this bill.

Mr. KYL. Is there any obligation in the bill with regard to acquisition of the Federal Government to build, maintain or administer any of these areas, in the language of the bill itself?

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

Mr. KYL. Does this bill in and of itself authorize the acquisition of any lands by the Federal Government?

Mr. PELLY. My understanding is there will be no authority to acquire any lands under this bill.

Mr. KYL. I would like to revert to the gentleman from Iowa and ask him to further question an unrelated subject?

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

Mr. KYL. Does this bill in and of itself authorize the acquisition of any lands by the Federal Government?

Mr. PELLY. My understanding is there will be no authority to acquire any lands under this bill.

Mr. KYL. In the House of Representatives, January 10, 1967, Mr. Dingell, I refer to the table and summary on page 30 of the hearings, where there is included a footnote under "Michigan":

In Great Lakes only shoals (areas less than 6 feet deep) were considered as estuaries.

It appears at the bottom of page 5:

Estuaries are places where salt water meets fresh water, etcetera.

I would like to have the question with reference to the Great Lakes clarified by an extension or revision in the record, because on page 16, it says:

No lands within such area may be acquired until authorized by the subsequent Act of Congress.

Mr. PELLY. The study, if I might suggest, will develop as to where the estuarine areas are. I cannot myself tell you why the Great Lakes were included other than the fact that there are certain important resources, fishery resources in, as I understand, the shoals of the Great Lakes.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further? Perhaps we could ask the author of the pending bill, the gentleman from Michigan, to explain why the Great Lakes were included as estuaries.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to transgress too much on the time of my good friend, the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I have promised to yield time, and perhaps the gentleman can get some time from his side of the aisle and answer the question.

Mr. KYL. At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, in the very first line after the introduction of the bill itself, it says:

In the House of Representatives, January 10, 1967, Mr. Dingell introduced the following bill:

There is the answer as to how the Great Lakes got in.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, we will let Mr. Dingell on his own time explain it.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, it says further, on page 16, in section 2:

The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation and in cooperation with the States—

And so on—shall conduct directly or by contract a study and inventory of the Nation's estuaries, in—
cluding without limitation coastal marshlands, bays, sounds, seaward areas, lagoons, and islands and waters of the Great Lakes.

So it was the intent of this committee, as I believe is the intent of this Congress, that for purposes of this bill the Great Lakes should be included.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield for a short question to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to demonstrate to the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Massachusetts they are not the only ones who have a concern. In the report from the Corps of Engineers we find this language:

We believe that all references in the draft bill to waters of the Great Lakes should be deleted. These waters have problems, but they differ greatly from the aesthetic, recreational, and fish and wildlife problems with which the bill is designed to deal.

I support this idea of conservation, but I believe by putting the Great Lakes in we will diminish the money and activity which will be necessary in the coastal areas.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan for a short answer.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, first of all, the objection of the Corps of Engineers, to which our good friend from Iowa alludes, deals with the bill as originally drafted, before it was amended by the committee. At that point the corps had some objections, because the bill as drawn then set up the dual permit system. That is no longer in the bill. There is no provision for dealing with permits at all. So the bill is entirely outside the area of the Army Corps of Engineers to deal with these permits.

I had a meeting with the Corps of Engineers and others, and, subject to one very narrow objection which I will offer later, the objections of the Corps of Engineers have been removed.

With regard to how the Great Lakes got in there, the gentleman from Massachusetts hit the nail on the head. The conservation departments of the Great Lakes States requested they be included under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman from Michigan said the gentleman from Massachusetts has hit the nail on the head, I will yield to him briefly.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, the greater part of the money contained in this bill was, in my view, to go to correlate studies already in existence. Estuaries had been made until, as we say in Massachusetts, the cows come home. Somebody has to take them and correlate all that information. A large part of this money, this million dollars, will go to that end, not to original research. Certainly there will be sufficient funds in my view in this bill to help with the fresh water problem as it relates to the Great Lakes. I would hope no. Indeed, the Corps would object to translation of the studies, as they come from the Great Lakes, to other areas in the inland States.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER].

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to take this conversation away from the Great Lakes for a few moments, because its main thrust is what was generically known as estuarine areas of the Nation, which are along the seacoast.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill, which is essentially a study bill of the estuarine areas. A year ago I made the same statement that I was in support of the legislation, before the committee which was then holding hearings on the bill.

Last December a bill was reported out of the committee at the last minute with a section on estuaries which I felt was in section 3 of the bill. Everything I say here today shall relate to section 3 of the bill, which is the section which has been in dispute.

That section, as changed at the last minute and reported out by the committee, was going to affect only New York State and, in fact, only certain limited wetlands areas in the towns of Hempstead and Oyster Bay, both of which towns I have the pleasure of representing here in the Congress.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], requested me to talk to the people of New York to get their reaction to the proposed change. I did that. They objected.

I asked the leadership on both sides of the aisle to withdraw the bill from what was then an attempt to have it passed under a suspension of the rules, until the disagreements could be worked out. The leadership complied. The bill was withdrawn.

I then arranged for a meeting to which all of the interested parties could come to discuss differences in the bill. This meeting was held.

What were these objections which had to be met?

First, all, the new revised section 3, which at that time was proposed by the subcommittee, was so narrowly drawn that the State of New York and indeed the towns of Hempstead and Oyster Bay would be set apart from all the others. With that language in the bill, I felt they were 'being singled out and felt they were 'being singled out because they consider that that was not what they had in mind when they passed the legislation. I want to congratulate him on his efforts a full agreement has been reached. I want to direct certain questions, if I may, to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]. I should like to have his statement here to complete.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I shall be pleased to respond.

Mr. WYDLER. The difficulty I now have with the legislation is this. We have before us the report of the committee on the bill, which is wrong, because the bill is now going to be changed, yet people reading the legislative history on the bill may refer to this report and will come to wrong conclusions about what it means.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDLER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is entirely correct. The report does differ somewhat from the language.

Mr. WYDLER. I should like to point out to the chairman of the committee that the language on page 3, the last paragraph, which I do not believe has any application whatsoever to the legislation as will be passed here today. Also the second paragraph on page 5 of the report and the third and fourth paragraphs on page 7 of the report, all of which deal with the specific prior reports made in the area of the Nation and of New York State, none of which are mentioned now in the legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. I will tell my good friend that at the appropriate time we are going to offer an amendment which I believe will meet the objections of my good friend from New York and which will get the language in a form I feel that would be consistent with the language in the report, that language naturally related to the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. WYDLER. I just want to get these things on the record.

Mr. DINGELL. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WYDLER. I just want to get four questions answered for the record. If I may, I will tell the chairman of the subcommittee.

The first question is: Is it a fact that under the legislation as will be finally passed here today any State in the Nation will have to be a party to any agreement within that State under this bill?

Mr. DINGELL. Well, it would have to be a party to those agreements between the Federal Government and the local government for management of estuaries which will be completed prior to the completion of the whole study as referred to in the bill. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WYDLER. Second, before any agreements are entered into in the Long
Island area or, for that matter, in any area of the United States will new studies have to be conducted and completed? Mr. DINGELL. No. The overall study does not have to be completed before agreements can be entered into. Under the amendment that will be offered, that does not have to be done. However, before lands can be acquired or an interest in lands may be acquired by the Federal Government, the study must have to be completed and the Congress must act to appropriate affirmatively such acquisitions of land.

Mr. WYDLER. What I am asking the gentleman is this, for example: If the Federal Government were to try to enter into an agreement with any political subdivision of Long Island, for example, before they did it, they would have to complete a new study, would they not, whether it is a complete study or a partial one?

Mr. DINGELL. I understand what the gentleman is saying. Yes. The area in question must be studied and, in the case of the Long Island waterway, to which I am sure the gentleman is alluding, the study would have to be updated, and at the same time it will have to be approved affirmatively such studies have to be completed.

Mr. WYDLER. The gentleman is saying. Yes. The area in question must be studied and, in the case of the Long Island waterway, to which I am sure the gentleman is alluding, the study would have to be updated, and at the same time it will have to be approved affirmatively such studies have to be completed.

Mr. DINGELL. Under the language of the amendment which will be offered, the action of the Secretary with regard to entering into agreements for the management and control of the area of the Interior in entering into an agreement under partial studies have to follow the procedures outlined in section 2 of the bill for agreements to be entered into after any general studies.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the gentleman for that statement. I also wish to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] for the letter dealing with this point from the Secretary of the Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wydler.

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

Mr. WYDLER. Finally, the question which was raised by the Secretary, as the gentleman will remember, at the conference we held, is whether any partial study of any sector or will the Secretary of the Interior in entering into an agreement under partial studies have to follow the procedures outlined in section 2 of the bill for agreements to be entered into after any general studies?

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is fully correct in that statement and, as he will recall, I sent in all of the corre-

spondence received by me throughout the years, including some concerning the area of the Governor, which was just raised. I have no objection to them being placed in the Record at the appropriate time.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the chairman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington, D.C., for his offer of a 60-minute amendment to H.R. 25. I would like to commend the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] and the gentlemen from New York [Messrs. Wykle, Groves, and Teeters] for their initiative on this vital conservation measure.

This bill enjoys the support of Governor Rockefeller and the New York State Conservation Commissioner, Stew­ art Kilbourne. It is my hope that it will have the strongest bipartisan backing.

The bill before us, considerably reduced in scope from the original version, would authorize a 2-year study and in­ ventory of the Nation’s estuaries and valuable adjacent wetlands, that the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with the States and other Federal agencies.

The study and report, to be submitted to the Congress, must be completed no later than January 30, 1970, at a cost of not to exceed $750,000. In addition, the bill provides $750,000 for fiscal year 1969, and $350,000 for fiscal year 1970. In addition, with respect to certain publicly owned lands on Long Island, N.Y., which were studied by the Secretary in conjunc­tion with the State of New York in 1961 and 1965, the Secretary would be authorized to enter into an agreement with New York or any political subdivision thereof for the permanent manage­ ment, development, and administration of such areas.

Throughout the Nation, estuarine areas have both conservation and economic value. Estuaries, as marginal areas, are important for many natural resources, including large populations of wildfowl, such as ducks, geese, swans, rails, and snipe. Many of our most valued commercial species of fish spend at least a portion of their lives in estuarine areas, including prawns, men­ haden, bluefish, oysters, soft clams, blue crabs, and diamondback terrapins. It is estimated that, in 1960, approximately 690,000,000 pounds of these resources were supported by approximately 69,000 commercial fish­ermen at the rate of about 2.8 billion pounds.

Specifically, in terms of the Long Is­ land wetlands, the area comprises 135,000 acres, or 18 miles long and 3½ miles wide, including Hemp­ stead and South Oyster Bays. The com­ mercial and recreational value of the fin­ fish, shellfish, waterfowl, and shorebirds that thrive in these areas and the demand for these resources is in­ creasing. A report by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service indicates that some 29 percent of the Long Island wetlands have been destroyed between 1910 and 1964, and an accelerated rate of wetlands de-

struction will continue unless a positive program of acquisition and management is undertaken.

This legislation would make possible such a program. When a political subdivi­sion other than a State desires to enter into a management agreement with the Department of the Interior, such an agreement must have the approval of the Governor.

If we are to save more of the valuable estuarine areas of the United States, a much larger undertaking is clearly re­ quired. This legislation is a necessary first step—yet, if we postpone even this mini­ mal beginning any longer, the opportuni­ ty to preserve these resources may well pass us by.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the chairman.

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

Mr. WYDLER. Finally, the question which was raised by the Secretary, as the gentleman will remember, at the conference we held, is whether any partial study of any sector or will the Secretary of the Interior in entering into an agreement under partial studies have to follow the procedures outlined in section 2 of the bill for agreements to be entered into after any general studies?

Mr. DINGELL. Under the language of the amendment which will be offered, the action of the Secretary with regard to entering into agreements for the management and control of the area of the Interior in entering into an agreement under partial studies have to follow the procedures outlined in section 2 of the bill for agreements to be entered into after any general studies.
contain several provisions found to be objectionable to various interested parties. Hopefully, Mr. Chairman, as chairman of our Sub-committee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation has taken exceedingly great pains to provide all parties every opportunity to make their views known. Every possible effort has been made to as to hammer out legislation acceptable to all interests. Quite frankly, I hope that in so doing we will not fall prey to the fate so aptly described in one of Aesop's Fables, and I quote:

Mr. Chairman, I urge prompt passage of H.R. 25.

Mr. DINGELL, Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Tonzawa] who originated the fight to preserve our estuaries.

Mr. TENZER, Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the sub-committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], for yielding this time to me.

However, Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the entire 5 minutes, because I shall not undertake to repeat that which has already been said, but shall ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, however, I should like to address myself to one matter related to this bill which in my opinion is of extreme importance but which up to this point has not been touched upon by some who have spoken in support thereof. Mr. Chairman, this is really a measure of economy for future Congresses to act upon in connection with the provisions as contained in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, until today, hopefully, if this legislation is passed, the Federal Government was not allowed to use its expertise for the improvement or development of any of our natural lands, without acquiring those lands by either condemnation or purchase.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 25 includes this new concept which has been brought into being in which I was proud to have included in my first bills introduced in the 89th Congress and that philosophy is based upon the fact that where the land is already in public ownership, already owned by the people of a State or a political subdivision thereof, it should not be necessary for the Federal Government to acquire such land either by condemnation or purchase or using the expertise of the Federal Government in the management and preservation of our natural resources.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 25 and I urge its unanimous approval.

Mr. Chairman, from aside from all the other worthy reasons which have been expressed here today in support of this legislation, it is my opinion that the concept of our remaining Federal ownership or protection with reference to these lands is a concern and concept which deserves the support of every Member of this body.

Further, Mr. Chairman, the legislation before the House this afternoon is a credit to our distinguished colleague [Mr. DINGELL] and to the other members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on both sides of the aisle. The members of this committee have approached the subject of preserving our natural resources—our valuable estuaries and coastal wetlands—with utmost dedication.

Unfortunately, prior attempts to bring this bill to the House floor with bipartisan support failed due to a lack of communication, understanding, and a lack of willingness on the part of state or local officials on Long Island to work together. On three prior occasions bipartisan support was given and then at the last possible moment withdrawn by certain members of the New York State Conservation Department and of the town of Hempstead.

Finally on January 31, 1968, a meeting was held in the office of Subcommittee Chairman Dingell and with the cooperation of our distinguished colleague [Mr. Morton] of Maryland, and my colleagues from Long Island, agreement was finally reached on the language of section 3 which Mr. Dingell and I introduced today by way of amendment. State and local officials present at the meeting in Mr. Dingell's office pledged their support of H.R. 25 as amended and the road is now cleared for final passage of this important measure.

The purpose of H.R. 25 which I have cosponsored with Chairman Dingell is to preserve the valuable estuaries and coastal wetlands of our Nation which have all too often been allowed to be suffering under foundations of concrete presumably for future generations of Americans. To achieve this objective, H.R. 25 provides for a nationwide inventory and study of the Nation's estuaries with particular emphasis on recommendations for protecting and preserving these valuable natural resources in perpetuity.

In the 89th Congress on September 23, 1965, I introduced a bill to preserve 16,000 acres of valuable wetlands located on the south shore of Long Island. In that bill I proposed a new concept for the preservation of natural resources already owned and local of­

servation Department and of the town of Hempstead.

Finally on January 31, 1968, a meeting was held in the office of Subcommittee Chairman Dingell and with the cooperation of our distinguished colleague [Mr. Morton] of Maryland, and my colleagues from Long Island, agreement was finally reached on the language of section 3 which Mr. Dingell and I introduced today by way of amendment. State and local officials present at the meeting in Mr. Dingell's office pledged their support of H.R. 25 as amended and the road is now cleared for final passage of this important measure.

The purpose of H.R. 25 which I have cosponsored with Chairman Dingell is to preserve the valuable estuaries and coastal wetlands of our Nation which have all too often been allowed to be suffering under foundations of concrete presumably for future generations of Americans. To achieve this objective, H.R. 25 provides for a nationwide inventory and study of the Nation's estuaries with particular emphasis on recommendations for protecting and preserving these valuable natural resources in perpetuity.

In the 89th Congress on September 23, 1965, I introduced a bill to preserve 16,000 acres of valuable wetlands located on the south shore of Long Island. In that bill I proposed a new concept for the preservation of natural resources already owned and local of­
tion. H.R. 25 would authorize cooperative management agreements, under which Federal, State, and local governments would work together to preserve our waters while simultaneously sharing the costs of maintaining, improving, and managing such resources.

Under the proposed amendment to H.R. 25, sponsored by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dingell] and supported by New York State and local officials, the Secretary is authorized to negotiate agreements with States and with local political subdivisions with the approval of the States and localities after completion of the inventory and a study of the area involved has been made.

At the conclusion of the nationwide study the Secretary of the Interior is required to report to the Congress on the results of the study and his recommendations for preserving valuable areas of estuaries and wetlands throughout the United States.

The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has made an outstanding contribution to conservation by reporting H.R. 25 favorably and by providing this new vehicle for protecting our nation's treasures.

Throughout the history of the estuarine protection bill many organizations, a number of States and political subdivisions have testified in favor of the legislation. Meritorious bills have been passed through the House hearings and written letters expressing their support for this measure.

The amendments which have been incorporated in H.R. 25 have met the objections raised by certain States.

Among the States whose recommendations have been adopted are California, New Jersey, New Hampshire, South Carolina, Washington, Oregon, Florida, North Carolina, Massachusetts, and Idaho. The bill also has the full support of the Mid-West Fish and Game Commissioners Association, which includes representatives from the States of Michigan, Kansas, Nebraska, Wisconsin, South Dakota, Maryland, Iowa, Colorado, North Dakota, Minnesota, and Illinois.

It is important to note that the provisions of Sections 6, 8, and 12 of H.R. 25 authorize cooperative management agreements are completely voluntary. There is no coercion, no Federal control, and no obligation imposed upon any State or local subdivision to enter into such agreements. The terms of the management agreements may vary from area to area and they are to be negotiated at arm's length by the State or political units involved and Secretary of the Interior.

During the hearings held before the 89th and 90th Congresses I testified and I have made speeches on the House floor stressing the importance of Long Island's wetlands. I have pointed out that when I moved to Long Island's south shore in 1938 there were 30,000 acres of valuable wetlands but now only 18,000 remain.

This bill provides a new way to preserve the remaining wetlands on Long Island and throughout the United States. It would enable us to preserve our resources.

More and more of our local communities are now realizing the importance of preserving open space and recreational areas. They are recognizing the urgency of providing for expert planning and maintenance of their remaining natural resources. Efforts are now being made in many communities and States across the Nation to accomplish this and I believe the Federal Government should assist—both financially and by making available Federal expertise—to work with the States and localities before it is too late.

After this legislation is enacted, the complex of Long Island wetlands in Nassau and Suffolk Counties may become one of the nation's areas which the study and inventory is completed. Prior studies in 1961 and 1965 of the Long Island wetlands are referred to in the committee report on H.R. 25 and have called these the most important spawning grounds for fish and waterfowl on the North Atlantic coast.

Other areas will be studied and the voice of the people in each area who want their resources protected and preserved will be heard. If their voice is not heard, what legacy will they leave to their children, other than a filled bay—a polluted stream—and natural resources preserved under concrete.

The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has reported H.R. 25 unanimously. Its distinguished subcommittee chairman, the Honorable John Dingell has been a magnificent and articulate spokesman for those who are concerned about preservation of our remaining natural resources. I am pleased to have become his ally. I am proud to have originally sponsored legislation in 1965 to protect Long Island's wet lands and extremely gratified that Chairman Dingell has with great foresight broadened the battle to preserve the Nation's wet lands.

I urge my colleagues to give to the people the protection they need and deserve. The concept of cooperative management agreements between Federal, State, and local governments—rather than condemnation or Federal acquisition—will provide the best solution. We should not spend Federal funds to purchase lands for protection which are already in public ownership. We should survey and inventory our resources and encourage Federal, State, and local agreements to preserve them. That is what H.R. 25 authorizes. That is what you are being asked to support today.

Mr. Chairman, I insert in the Record at this point a number of recent newspaper editorials giving expression to the widespread support of the purposes and intent of H.R. 25:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 15, 1967]

'\"The LAST WORD\"\n
The bays, estuaries and coastal wetlands where the fresh waters of a river meet the sea, the mixing zone that has been crucial in the evolution of man. For other species, they are still the survival zone. Here nearly two-thirds of the world's oysters and shellfish spawn. Here are found oyster, shrimp, clams and crabs. And here water birds still and migratory birds rest on their journeys.

Human beings, forgetful of their own past and heedless of the welfare of other species, have been the destructive force that has brought them to the brink of extinction. It is not too late. \"If the public comes to understand better the unique value of estuaries and coastal wetlands, the time draws nearer when long-term ecology rather than short-term economic considerations will determine the final power of decision.\"

Despite this drastic downward revision in subcommittee, the bill is still of some value. It authorizes the first comprehensive study of estuaries. Where wetlands are already under local public control, as in parts of the southern coast of Long Island, a provision sponsored by Representative Tenzer of New York would enable the Secretary of the Interior to provide Federal administration if the localities agreed. Federal supervision is the most effective barrier against pressures by developers on village and town officials.

If the public comes to understand better the unique value of estuaries and coastal wetlands, the time draws nearer when long-term ecology rather than short-term economic considerations will determine the final power of decision.

The struggle to preserve Long Island's Wetlands has bogged down in a morass of politics and jurisdictional jealousies. At one point last year, Herbert Tenzer, the Lawrence Democrat, provided for voluntary federal-local agreements for the preservation of nature in marine life and so tempting for real estate developers.

When introduced last March, it had wide bipartisan backing. But a potent Republican minority forced the House on Monday to postpone action.

Leading the opposition was Rep. John Wydler, the Garden City Republican. An early supporter of the bill, he now holds—together with Ralph G. Caso, whose town contains most of the contested areas—that existing state-local agreements are adequate.

Herein lies the rub of the dispute. Mr. Caso, while he says he recognizes the conservation imperative, consistently refuses to enter into any agreement that will hold the Wetlands forever in a public conservation trust. He would like to keep the town's options open for future consideration. But it has been the exercise of local options that caused the disappearance of thousands of acres of beautiful water in irreparable loss.

Rep. Tenzer and Wydler have expressed willingness to confer and try to resolve their differences. That's a good idea— and maybe a bill guaranteeing full protection for public tracts and a moratorium on the sale of building lots in the future—is the House floor and be passed into law after the new year.

[From New York, Jan. 16, 1968]
although our town now has its own conservation program in conjunction with the state (despite the wetlands destruction) the program could evaporate easily, as times change and strong pressures grow to make use of the wetlands in some form other than their natural state. The town-state program is merely a mutual agreement, with no lasting legal protection, and can be cancelled by town vote. It is easy to foresee both the town and state wanting to put a super road through the wetlands 10 or 15 years from now; or golf course developers could convince the town of its legal right to control a fragment of the town. This is so important—to make future encroachment of the wetlands more difficult. The federal involvement is not ownership or control, but merely a voluntary agreement for studies, management advice, financial assistance, etc. Our town helped torpedo the last session of congress in order to weaken it) under the guise that local control is better than federal—but the entire federal proposal is voluntary! We need federal involvement as watchdog help, if for nothing else—our town history proves this.

There are some important meetings to resolve the problem coming up soon in Washington, when congress reconvenes in late January.

Write this week to: President Supervisor Ralph Caso, Town of Hempstead, Mineola, New York. Send copy to: Cong. Herbert Tenzer, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Say: Don't obstruct passage of the federal wetlands bill! Don't water it down.

Mr. Chairman, the following is a partial list of those supporting H.R. 25:

CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES—Mineola, N. Y.

Defenders of Wildlife—Washington, D.C.

American Wildlife Federation—Washington, D.C.

The Audubon Society—New York City, N. Y.

National Audubon Society—New York City, N. Y.


National Wildlife Foundation—Washington, D.C.

Sierra Club—San Francisco, Calif.

The Wilderness Society—Seattle, Wash.

The Isaac Walton League—North Bend, Wash.

Wildlife Management Institute—Washington, D.C.

Hempstead Town Lands Resources Council—Washington, D.C.

Conservation Planners, Inc.

League of Women Voters—Washington, D.C.

Garden Clubs of America—Washington, D.C.

Federated Garden Clubs of New York State—Washington, D.C.

Nassau County Planning Commission—East Meadow, L. I., N. Y.

Long Island Federated Fish & Game Associations—Main Line Office Building, Freeport, L. I., N. Y.

Long Island Federation of Water Sportsmen—Oceanside, L. I., N. Y.

Mr. Chairman, I have received many letters from constituents expressing support for the federal wetlands bill and I pleased to call these to the attention of my colleagues—and include them in the Record at this point:

[From the Nassau (N.Y.) Herald, Jan. 19, 1968]

DEAR MRS. SPANEHOWER:—Our Town of Hempstead has been instrumental in blocking passage of the Federal Wetlands Bill, which has far greater importance—besides affecting us here locally.

Although our town now has its own conservation program in conjunction with the state (despite the wetlands destruction) the program could evaporate easily, as times change and strong pressures grow to make use of the wetlands in some form other than their natural state. The town-state program is merely a mutual agreement, with no lasting legal protection, and can be cancelled by town vote. It is easy to foresee both the town and state wanting to put a super road through the wetlands 10 or 15 years from now; or golf course developers could convince the town of its legal right to control a fragment of the town. This is so important—to make future encroachment of the wetlands more difficult. The federal involvement is not ownership or control, but merely a voluntary agreement for studies, management advice, financial assistance, etc. Our town helped torpedo the last session of congress in order to weaken it) under the guise that local control is better than federal—but the entire federal proposal is voluntary! We need federal involvement as watchdog help, if for nothing else—our town history proves this.

There are some important meetings to resolve the problem coming up soon in Washington, when congress reconvenes in late January.

Write this week to: President Supervisor Ralph Caso, Town of Hempstead, Mineola, New York. Send copy to: Cong. Herbert Tenzer, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Say: Don't obstruct passage of the federal wetlands bill! Don't water it down.

Mr. Chairman, the following is a partial list of those supporting H.R. 25:

CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES—Mineola, N. Y.

Defenders of Wildlife—Washington, D.C.

American Wildlife Federation—Washington, D.C.

The Audubon Society—New York City, N. Y.

National Audubon Society—New York City, N. Y.


National Wildlife Foundation—Washington, D.C.

Sierra Club—San Francisco, Calif.

The Wilderness Society—Seattle, Wash.

The Isaac Walton League—North Bend, Wash.

Wildlife Management Institute—Washington, D.C.

Hempstead Town Lands Resources Council—Washington, D.C.

Conservation Planners, Inc.

League of Women Voters—Washington, D.C.

Garden Clubs of America—Washington, D.C.

Federated Garden Clubs of New York State—Washington, D.C.

Nassau County Planning Commission—East Meadow, L. I., N. Y.

Long Island Federated Fish & Game Associations—Main Line Office Building, Freeport, L. I., N. Y.

Long Island Federation of Water Sportsmen—Oceanside, L. I., N. Y.

Mr. Chairman, I have received many letters from constituents expressing support for the federal wetlands bill and I pleased to call these to the attention of my colleagues—and include them in the Record at this point:

[From the Nassau (N.Y.) Herald, Jan. 19, 1968]
Mr. EDMONDSON. I have one further question, if I may.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself this time during which I wish to pay tribute before I yield to my next colleague.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word of praise to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GROVER], who has worked so long and hard on this bill, and to say a word of praise to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER], who has worked so long and hard upon this legislation, as well as my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KERR], and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GROVER], who have helped iron out many of the difficulties with which we were faced in drafting up this legislation.

And, of course, the distinguished member of the subcommittee [Mr. PELLY] without whose help on this legislation, and much else, we would not have been able to bring the legislation to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to yield 1 minute of this time to my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I want to be certain that the record indicates that there is already a great deal of work that has been done, that the integrity of those studies is subject to the review of the State governments and local municipalities involved, and pending their approval or disapproval of any studies that would be recognized in the development of the overall report.

The same situation would obtain also with reference to the Federal studies. I know that there have been many studies made of many estuarine areas throughout the country, and I for one am certain that these studies can provide a sufficient basis for action in some areas. One of the major problems that I think the subcommittee will clear up this year.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, in response to the inquiry of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, may I say that it is expected that the Secretary has already said, a large number of such studies in existence. It is expected that these studies will be used in all cases as a starting point.

Indeed, one such study now going on involves a study of the estuarine areas insofar as pollution is concerned. It is expected by the committee that these matters will be considered and will be meshed together with the identification of the estuarine areas to be preserved, and it is expected that by reason of these studies we will be able to accomplish substantial economies in terms of identifying estuarine areas, and in determining in what way they should be preserved.

Further than that, it is also the intent of the committee that, insofar as possible, we should engage—or the Federal Government should consult first with the States and with the other local units of the Federal Government in terms of identification of the areas to be studied, and the identification of the manner in which the areas should be studied.

Subsections 2(a) and 2(b) specifically indicate that whatever studies may be engaged in by the Federal Government will be engaged in with cooperation of and in consultation with the State and other local units of government.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have yielded my last 2 minutes first to complement the gentleman from Michigan who, once again, has demonstrated to us all his legislative skill in bringing a difficult subject to the floor. I understand further that the studies are now proceeding, and I am intending to offer an amendment which will change the bill, if adopted, to provide that Presidential approval for designation of estuarine areas will be necessary, in addition to these preliminary studies and agreements between the Secretary of the Interior and the States.

Is that correct?

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is correct, but only insofar as where the management agreements will be enacted. It is the opinion of the gentleman from Michigan that such language is not needed, because in any event the Department of the Interior will not engage in any agreement without the full approval of the President of the United States.

However, this language is included.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

However, Mr. Chairman, the language was included insofar as the section which will be offered at a later time dealing with State agreements rather, dealing with the agreements by the Department of the Interior with all units of government for management of the estuarine areas and wetlands which will be the subject of the legislation at the time that the studies authorized by the bill are completed.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I understand further that the bill in its final form provides that the Secretary of the Interior will consult with the Department of the Army, or other interested Federal agencies on their position with regard to designation of estuarine areas.

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct. It is expected that the Secretary will engage in broad consultation with other Federal agencies and also with local and State units of government.

Mr. EDMONDSON. So you are not aligning those which flow through States and which do not within those States enter a body of salt water; is that correct?

Mr. DINGELL. The language is very clearly defined in the bill as to what constitutes an estuary and I will read it now. It reads as follows:

Estuaries are places where salt water meets fresh water. A meandering river flows to the sea, its estuary begins at the point, the river waters, the ocean tides, the coastal currents, and the contours of our shores interact resulting in the deposition of river sediments and sediments washed up by the sea in the estuary. It is a holding place for nutrients and, in some cases, for petroleum.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GROVER].

Mr. GROVER. I have said before that I am in enthusiastic support of this bill and I just want to make it a matter of record that indeed I am.

I am pleased to be among those who have not really been close to the work which has been done on the estuarine bill in the last few years, and for those of you who live in the rockribbed part of our country and who have not got our beaches, and in the Pacific coast beaches—and of course that is not to say that they do not have fine beaches on the west coast—I want to say that this is really landmark legislation, and I hope that we will incorporate a great deal of the wetland areas along our coast and the Pacific coast.

I am happy to support my friend, the chairman, and the other gentlemen who have spoken on this bill.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. I appreciate the gentleman's generosity in yielding time. There is pressure on all of us to get this bill on the way.

H.R. 25 as originally reported by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee was acceptable legislation insofar as I am concerned. It was arrived at after long and intensive discussions and compromises between all interested parties.

This bill, as such, is far reaching in its scope. It affects many segments of our Nation's industries. The bill is wide in its scope. Under the definition of "estuary, "
In fact, it covers a much larger area than estuaries. It includes the land adjoining the Great Lakes and all of our coastal waters.

The section in question is important legislation that should be carefully considered by the Congress, not only at this time, but at a later period. That was the original intent of H.R. 25 as it was reported from committee.

The key sections of that bill, sections 2 and 3, in both cases authorize the Secretary of the Interior—and I emphasize this point—authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into the actual question of acquisition of estuarine lands and also the overall problem of managing these lands. In both cases the Secretary was to report back to the Congress for further consideration if the proper committees and the Congress itself.

I am now advised that the gentleman from Michigan is prepared to offer an amendment to section 3 of H.R. 25 which would, in essence, eliminate one-half of what would be the original action of its own action. His amendment, as he presents it, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements with the State or any subdivision thereof for the purpose of managing and development of either State or federally owned estuarine areas. It would permit the Secretary to do this without any further authorization from the Congress. All that would be required for him to carry out this provision would be the necessary funds which he would obtain from the Appropriations Committees, but the committees that have the basic jurisdiction in this matter would, in essence, by-passed, and the Secretary would indeed have a free hand in the matter.

This is the point I wish to raise to this body.

What we will be doing here if we approve the amendment as presented by the gentleman from Michigan is, on the one hand, to require the Secretary to study the question of acquisition of estuary areas, and, on the other hand, remove any further congressional approval, I believe this is wrong. Too many parties have an interest in this matter. They should be given their proper day in the Congress to be heard at hearings.

I am, therefore, in opposition to the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Michigan. I suggest that the bill as reported was an acceptable bill, as I have stated previously, arrived at after many discussions and negotiations. I do not see a reason for the gentleman's amendment.

I would like to ask a question pertaining to the gentleman's proposed amendment, to save time under the 5-minute rule, and perhaps it would be more opportune to ask this now.

May I ask the gentleman again, for my recollection and for the record—is it correct that section 2 of H.R. 25, as passed unanimously by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, provides:

"the Secretary to enter into agreements such as the one authorized by subsection (a) of this section for the administration, management, and development of estuaries. It includes the land adjoining in other States as another method of conserving the Nation's estuarine areas."

The Secretary could not enter into such contractual agreement or arrangements but could only recommend them to the Congress and then wait for an authorization by a committee of the Congress; is that correct? That is in the language as I have indicated.

Mr. DINGELL. That is the language of the bill at this moment. But it is the intention of the committee to offer language at the earliest possible time under the 5-minute rule, at least it is the intention of the gentlemen from Michigan, to offer language at the earliest possible time affording permission to the Secretary to enter into these management agreements appropriating necessary funds where the study has been completed in consultation with the several States and the affected agencies and also subject to approval in the case of a State by the Governor and in the case of the District of Columbia by the President, which essentially needs the review of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BLATNIK. He would eliminate then the necessity of the recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior and this proposition going back to the proper committee of the Congress going back for authorization?

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is correct. That is what the amendment will do.

Mr. BLATNIK. Is there any reason for bypassing or eliminating the committee of the Congress?

Mr. DINGELL. It is not felt that this was necessary. It was felt that it would occur after such careful safeguards and subject to such careful review of the committee that has jurisdiction over this matter, that is, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, that any such a requirement would not be necessary.

Mr. BLATNIK. The reason I raised that point is—and I am trying to limit myself to the procedural situation and not to the substantive principle involved here which I support—and I do support the bill and I support the intent of the amendment—but let me give you an example of what I think will probably happen once it happens and which causes me some concern. Let us take a given estuarine area. Its proper management may permit many varied uses. One may be channel improvement. If so, it would come before the Congress, Waterways and Harbors, and Harbors of the Public Works Committee. Another aspect may require downstream augmentation or flow control. If so, it would come before the Congress, Waterways and Harbors, and Harbors of the Public Works Committee. Another aspect may require downstream augmentation or flow control.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. DINGELL. We have no expectation that any of these agreements will involve that. The agreements are simply with regard to the management agreements between the Federal Government of the area after the study. We are not discussing any question of flow, channel improvement, stream improvement, dams, flow increase, or flow augmentation. These are simply questions of managing wetlands located in other States as another method of preserving them from encroachment, and to keep up the fish and wildlife.

Mr. BLATNIK. I understand the gentleman. Let us take the intracoastal canals, the Atlantic Intracoastal Canal, and the Gulf Intracoastal Canal. You have there navigation and marshlands. They are all related. There is the question of flood control and augmentation of water in the States, for it would be necessary to keep the wet lands wet in the dry seasons. There is a navigation aspect, a beach erosion control aspect, and the flow control aspect. Those three purposes would require authorization of a committee of Congress and an act of Congress. We have had no problem with those questions, no delays, no difficulties at all.

This other hand, we would now abrogate certain of our authority to the Secretary of the Interior, who could deal directly with towns, municipalities, counties subject to the approval of the Governor or a State to enter into agreements, with a great deal of difficulty and uncertainty to establish policies and programs already authorized and approved and appropriated for by the Congress itself. You have a sort of dual operation, and yet unrelated. This cannot be good. It can be a problem. I am sure the gentleman is absolutely sincere in his intentions that it shall not be a problem. But I am sincerely concerned that there could well be a sort of dual and separate operation. That was not the intent of the Congress to create.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Pickle.).

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a few questions on this bill.

In my own State of Texas, the historic situation has been that a shell dredging company holding a permit from the State of Texas to dredge the mouth of a river would apply for Department of Army permits. The powers of the Corps of Engineers in matters of this type are purely regulatory, not proprietary. The dredged lands are owned by the State—but certain features relating to navigable waterways are subject to Federal supervision. Hence, up to a few years ago, the extent of Federal concern was merely that the dredging did not impair navigation.

More recently, laws—good laws—have been enacted dealing in various degrees with protection of fish, wildlife, and pollution in these areas. These laws have been passed through the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Interior.

It is a general premise of these laws that the extent of Federal interest is to state what prohibited activity in the wildlife in these areas, and to assist States in programs they create to protect these interests.

The memorandum of understanding, mentioned in the committee report on H.R. 25, is made between the Secretary of the Army, and the Secretary of the
Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.
Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, the question raised by the gentleman from Texas is a very valid one—that is the reason I raised it earlier—when we allow several service functions to come before the public and whether or not some areas are directly involved with the immediate area. They have definite effects. There can be too much water or too little, or too fast a turnover, and people can or cannot dredge. That is why I question the wisdom of eliminating the need to amend the bill now, that the Congress should authorize these wetland agreements so they do protect the rights by law, whether it be of States or Federal agencies. Congress has already considered that.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that we are limited in time, and I will have additional remarks under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that H.R. 25 is before us today. Measures to conserve the Nation's wetlands and estuary areas are long overdue. We are finally beginning to appreciate the importance of wetlands in the processes caused by industrial, commercial, and population growth. The Congress is at last coming to grips with the need to preserve our wetlands and estuary areas, which are so important to the preservation of life cycles of all kinds of wildlife and to the conservation of natural recreation areas. I introduced legislation in both the 89th and 90th Congress to accomplish this objective.

I commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] for his leadership in bringing this bill, which I originally cosponsored, to the floor. Our colleague from New York [Mr. Tenzira] deserves special credit for his efforts in connection with the Long Island wetlands area.

A 1944 survey on the Long Island wetlands revealed that 33 percent of the total wetlands area had been lost in the previous 20 years to saltwater intrusion, dredging, or erosion. Nearly 7,000 acres had been lost since 1959 alone. The need for prompt action to conserve what remains of this precious natural resource is apparent, and New Yorkers should be grateful to Congressman Tenzira for his leadership in the fight to halt the steady destruction of the Long Island wet lands. I regret that the legislation as originally introduced has been weakened.

The 12th of the original legislation would have required the Secretary of the Interior to determine whether or not dredging would impair the natural values of any estuary before granting a permit to dredge. That attractive reliance is to be placed on an administrative arrangement, a memorandum of understanding, lacking firm congressional mandate, for consultation between the States or the appropriate Federal departments and the Federal Government coming in and preempting what they may have worked out on a State level.

Mr. DINGELL. That question was worked out in the Flood Control Act of 1986. That question was not considered by the committee on which I served.

It is

Mr. DINGELL. I would say to my good friend that that question is really not before us, because that agreement which has been executed by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior with regard to dredging applies to navigable waters.

Mr. PICKLE. Let me say to the gentleman that previously and historically the Federal interest has been concerned when the act of dredging affected naviga tion. Now they have come in and said that the Federal Government, through the Department of the Interior, must concern itself with that which pertains to pollution. Do you have the memorandum that I refer to? I want to know what does that with respect to the rights of the States and the rights of the individuals who are doing the dredging.

Mr. DINGELL. I have to tell my good friend that that provision of that understanding appears in the report on page 34 and following. It was the thought of the committee when we took out the dual permit section previously in the study, and that is necessarily by reason of the memorandum of understanding.

Mr. PICKLE. I understand that the dual permit provision has been eliminated. You just made one Federal step, going to a single permit, and unless I am mistaken, it is a decision about the control of a particular estuary?

Mr. DINGELL. In connection with dredging and filling permits, the Corps of Engineers would still do so, subject to the provisions of the memorandum of understanding and the authority of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. PICKLE. If my State of Texas were granted a permit for any dredging operation, could the Department of the Interior or the Department of the Army, either one, prevent the dredging operation if they thought it had something to do with navigation, even though it was outside of the estuary?

Mr. DINGELL. No. I would say to my good friend, if it is under the navigation waters, under the Flood Control Act of 1899, under which these permits are issued, anyone who is going to dredge or fill must have a permit from the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. PICKLE. Even though they will not interfere with navigation?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes. They have to have a permit because the whole idea is affecting navigation. If they fail to do that, they may find themselves in jail.

Mr. PICKLE. There is a great controversy on that brewing in Texas, and it has not been settled by the States or the Corps or the Department of the Interior, and I think that the Federal Government is coming in and preempting what they may have worked out on a State level.

Mr. DINGELL. That question was worked out in the Flood Control Act of 1986. That question was not considered by the committee on which I served.
section 2(a)(3), providing that, in carrying out the inventory of the Nation's estuarine areas, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Army, and the Secretary of the Navy shall delineate the areas in a manner that will result in the protection of coastal, ecological, esthetic, and navigational values—their value for commercial and industrial development. It is careless commercial and industrial exploitation that has necessitated protective legislation. It is that sort of exploitation to which the Secretary of the Interior has referred in his letter to the Senate. It is that sort of commercial and industrial exploitation that is now being practiced by some of our local governments that have not been aware of the magnitude of the problem. It is that sort of exploitation that is causing us to bring this legislation before Congress.

H.R. 25, as reported from the committee, restricts the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreement for the management of wetlands to certain publicly owned lands in the State of New York. The problem is nationwide. I am hopeful that the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell) to extend this authority will be adopted. It is also unfortunate that the question of actual acquisition of wetlands by the Secretary has been deferred for further study.

Nevertheless, this legislation is another necessary step toward the proper management of the Nation's natural resources. The health of our river and coastal areas cannot be regained once these areas have been eroded and contaminated.

Mr. PASCEN! Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity of recording my support for H.R. 25 which would authorize studies to provide inventory information and to outline the means for establishing a nationwide system of protected estuarine areas.

Further, H.R. 25 would raise the estuary, as a land form, to the status of mountain wilderness, wild rivers, the seashore, and other areas already protected under existing conservation legislation.

The rapid influx of population along our national shoreline has posed a clear threat to the preservation and management of coastal natural areas. Seventy-five percent of our population now live in States bordering the seaside and Gulf of Mexico, and in the subjecting the submergence of additional population and industrialization of shore areas predicted for the next twenty years, any delay in enacting this legislation will endanger countless brook sounds, bays and tidal streams along the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts and the marshes of the Great Lakes.

No effective nationwide controls have so far been applied against filling and dredging operations which are continually expanding estuaries. Such operations are carried on by many local developers for a number of reasons. Often a marsh is the easiest and cheapest place to deposit the spoil from minor dredging or other earthmoving work. Frequently coastal land values have soared, and estuaries have justifiably been turned into prime residential and industrial sites. Many speculators, however, have been buying up relatively cheap marshlands, and redeveloping them for the benefit of future generations. There is anticipation of future bidders, but little expectation of immediate profit.

Left as they are and protected from pollution, estuaries are highly productive of plant and animal life. Many of the commercial and sports fish spend part or all of their lives in these waters. In my home State, for instance, the fish life to the vacation industry is enormous. It seems to me that the protection of a reasonable number and distribution of estuaries and the development of sound planning both from the economic standpoint and the conservation objective of maintaining a variety of nature to promote a balance between man and other living things.

I hope you will be confident that the House will enact into law this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill as an original bill for purposes of amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee substitute amendment be considered as read, printed in the Record, and open to amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The committee substitute amendment is as follows:

H.R. 25

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress finds and declares that many estuaries in the United States are rich in a variety of resources, including environmental, economic, aesthetic, and navigational beauty, and are of immediate and potential value to the present and future generations of Americans. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to provide a means for considering the need to protect, conserve, and restore these estuaries in a manner that adequately and reasonably maintains a balance between the national need for such protection in the interest of conserving the natural resources and natural beauty of the Nation and in the interest of economic development, including environmental natural beauty, and are of immediate and potential value to the present and future generations of Americans.

It is therefore the purpose of this Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a study to provide information and to establish a means for considering the need to protect, conserve, and restore these estuaries in a manner that adequately and reasonably maintains a balance between the national need for such protection in the interest of conserving the natural resources and natural beauty of the Nation and in the interest of economic development, including environmental natural beauty, and are of immediate and potential value to the present and future generations of Americans.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress finds and declares that many estuaries in the United States are rich in a variety of resources, including environmental, economic, aesthetic, and navigational beauty, and are of immediate and potential value to the present and future generations of Americans. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to provide a means for considering the need to protect, conserve, and restore these estuaries in a manner that adequately and reasonably maintains a balance between the national need for such protection in the interest of conserving the natural resources and natural beauty of the Nation and in the interest of economic development, including environmental natural beauty, and are of immediate and potential value to the present and future generations of Americans.

It is therefore the purpose of this Act to provide a means for considering the need to protect, conserve, and restore these estuaries in a manner that adequately and reasonably maintains a balance between the national need for such protection in the interest of conserving the natural resources and natural beauty of the Nation and in the interest of economic development, including environmental natural beauty, and are of immediate and potential value to the present and future generations of Americans.

It is therefore the purpose of this Act to provide a means for considering the need to protect, conserve, and restore these estuaries in a manner that adequately and reasonably maintains a balance between the national need for such protection in the interest of conserving the natural resources and natural beauty of the Nation and in the interest of economic development, including environmental natural beauty, and are of immediate and potential value to the present and future generations of Americans.
feasibility of authorizing the Secretary to enter into agreements as the Secretary shall determine by subsection (a) of this section for the administration, management, and development of publically owned estuarine areas, and encourage States and local subdivisions thereof to consider, in their comprehensive planning and proposals for financial assistance under the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act of 1937, and all that follows down through line 9

4. In planning for the use or development of water and land resources, all Federal agencies shall give due consideration to the method of conserving the Nation's estuarine areas and their natural resources, and their importance for commercial and industrial developments, and all project planning and proposals for financial assistance of such development submitted to the Congress shall contain a discussion by the Secretary of the Interior of such developments, their resources, and the effects of the project on them and his recommendations thereon. The Secretary shall make his recommendations within ninety days after receipt of such plans and reports.

5. The Secretary of the Interior shall encourage States and local subdivisions thereof to consider, in their comprehensive planning and proposals for financial assistance under the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act of 1937, and the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 1156), the National Wetlands Reserve Act, the Dungeness and Puget Sound Lakes Fisheries Conservation Act of October 30, 1955 (79 Stat. 1125), the needs and opportunities for planning and restoring estuaries in accordance with the purposes of this Act. In approving grants made pursuant to said laws for the acquisition of all or part of any area, land, interest therein, the Secretary shall establish such terms and conditions as he deems necessary to assure the permanent protection of such areas, including such provision that the lands or interests therein shall not be disposed of by sale, lease, donation, or exchange without the prior approval of the Secretary.

6. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect the authority of any Federal agency to carry out any Federal project hereafter or hereforever authorized within an estuary.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL: Strike out line 25 on page 18 and line 1 on page 19 and all that follows down through line 9 on page 20 and insert the following:

"Sec. 3. After the completion of the general study authorized by section 2 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the President, may enter into an agreement, containing such terms and conditions as are mutually acceptable, with any State or with a political subdivision or agency thereof, or with a political subdivision or agency designated for that purpose—" or by a State agency designated for that purpose for the permanent management, development, and administration of any area, land, or interest therein within an estuary and adjacent lands which are owned or subsequently acquired by a State or by any political subdivision thereof: Provided, That, with the approval of the Governor of the State involved or by a State agency designated for that purpose, the Secretary may also enter into such an agreement for any particular area whenever the segment of the estuary therein is complete subject to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of section 2 of this Act. Such agreement shall, among other things, provide that the State or a political subdivision or agency thereof and the Secretary thereon in the report authorized by Federal agencies shall

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues will recall, we have been discussing for some while the provisions of this amendment, which generally has been explained already. The functions of the amendment are simple. They are to assure that previous to the time that the whole overall study has been completed, the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the President, may enter into an agreement, containing such terms and conditions as are mutually acceptable, with any State or with a political subdivision or agency thereof:—"
land or interests therein." That covers a heap of spending any way you look at it.

Mr. Chairman, I think that logic demands we reject this amendment and adopt the bill that the committee reported to the floor.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the author of the bill, the very able gentleman who has pioneered in this field, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), if he can assure me of the fact as to the intent as contained in the clause of the report which appears, beginning on page 34, to the general effect that there is no intent to give any legality to such law?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DINGELL. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas that the Department of Interior, the Department of Agriculture, Housing and Urban Development, Health, Education, and Welfare, the Coast Guard, and others would be required to give consideration to these projects. Their views would be sought, would they not?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

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

Mr. DINGELL. In the first place, I would like to remind my good friend from Michigan that the only thing the Federal Government will be able to do under this amendment is enter into agreements for management with State and local subdivisions of government. Under the terms of the amendment, they must consult and coordinate very carefully with other Federal units of Government, such as the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation and other agencies of that sort. They must also consult with the Department of Agriculture and all of the others to make sure that the administration is done in the best possible way and that the views of all the Federal agencies are considered.

Mr. BLATNIK. That gives me much more confidence because the committees will have access to the recommendations of their respective agencies, which in our case would be the Corps of Engineers. Second, may I ask the chairman if under this amendment any estuary area in which a study has been completed would be immediately eligible for this process of contractual agreement between the local government and the Federal Government? I think the amendment would provide for bringing it up to date and to encompass some of the recreational areas in the field of our fish and wildlife.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) has been a fighter in this field and I wish to commend him for it.

However, it is my opinion that we ought to await this report. It is due in 1970. It is my further opinion that then we can be more specific and that the Congress will be able to review these terms and the provisions of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, all we need is an agree-
carefully with this study; other than the broad powers that are proposed by the amendment offered by the gentleman I believe the gentleman has an excellent bill.

Mr. DINGELL. I would say further to my good friend that there will be very few areas set aside, and each must be identified specifically before any agreement can be entered into, and in each instance the budgetary authority must be achieved with that agreement.

Mr. CASEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask several other questions of the author of the bill.

In the first place, I would like to know whether the assurances that are contained on page 3 of the report still hold, if this bill is adopted in the amended form that is proposed by the gentleman from Michigan, and that is the assurance included in the last sentence of the second paragraph of the "purpose of the bill" where it says:

However, no lands could be acquired unless authorized by a subsequent act of Congress.

Mr. DINGELL. That is still correct, I will tell my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. So that if there is to be any land acquired to which the Federal Government makes a contribution for the land acquisition, an act of Congress would be required in that instance?

Mr. DINGELL. In each instance before the Federal Government acquires an interest in the lands there must be action by the Congress, and that cannot take place until the time that the study has been completed under the requirements of the bill.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to ask for the purpose of asking a question of clarification on this point by the gentleman from Michigan. The gentleman would not be proposing that the Secretary of the Interior under existing law which permits States to use money from the land and water conservation fund, can acquire lands owned by the State, and they then turn around and enter into an agreement with the Secretary of the Interior to exchange a management of those wetlands? This would not permit lands owned by the States to be purchased with Federal monies by the States, and then be managed more or less according to the criteria and procedural requirements set forth by the Federal Department of the Interior; is that possible?

Mr. DINGELL. I will say to my good friend from Minnesota that in the consideration of this legislation that the gentleman did not go into the question of whether States could go into the land and water acquisition funds. This legislation does not, I will say to my friend from Minnesota, in any way change the authority of the States under the land and water conservation fund.

I would assume—and it would be my private expectation—that unless the language of the bill and the conservation fund very clearly permits this kind of activity, that the Secretary would not allow something such as that to be done. But he does not generally allow this matching of Federal funds with Federal funds, which is essentially what would take place there.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman comment further on the amendment which has been offered that says that the Secretary shall share in an equitable manner in the cost of managing, administering, and developing such areas?

It is my understanding that the gentleman has the opinion—or has given as his opinion—that this would not in any case exceed 50 percent. Is that correct?

Mr. DINGELL. No, I have not made that statement. It was my general expectation to other circumstances that was included in the bill that the allocation would be generally on the basis of a 50-50 sharing by and between the Federal Government, the States, and local units of government.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. But it was also my expectation that there were certain circumstances where it would be necessary to deviate from that—for example, where you have an area that is notoriously poor and totally incapable of engaging in this kind of management agreement. Then conceivably the figures might necessarily be jiggered to accommodate the peculiar economic circumstances that might exist there.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is the gentleman talking of a State where the resources are limited or is he talking of a locality?

Mr. DINGELL. No, and the local units of government. Remember, this authorizes an agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and other local units of government or the States and the economic circumstances that you could find a local unit of government that simply does not have the means to manage that or to enter into this 50-50 managing program by and between it and the Secretary of the Interior. In that event the language included would permit the Secretary of the Interior to engage in an agreement which might have a different balance and conceivably where it might go as high as to a 90-10 agreement.

Mr. EDMONDSON. When the gentleman speaks of "equitable manner" he does not have any real yardstick that he applies—it is a variable proposition.

Mr. DINGELL. It is expected that it will be 50 percent in most instances.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question as to the effect of the "equitable manner, the cost of managing" and so forth would have upon the development of any State estuarine area which a State might contemplate developing on its own. Knowing now that this law is in existence would not a State consider delaying action in the hope that it could enter into a contract with the Federal agencies involved, because the local people or the States might hope that the Federal Government would pay a portion of the cost of administering this program, whatever it is.

Mr. DINGELL. Conceivably a State could go into the instance where they are owned by a political subdivision, of course, the judgment would have to be made by the political subdivision and not the State. I do not know the particular circumstances—the question with regard to management differs very greatly in each State and the economic desirability again differs very greatly from State to State.

There are occasionally States which under no circumstances would enter into an agreement.

You want to remember that there are many, many checks and balances in the language of this amendment. The President has to agree. The other Federal agencies have to agree. The Budget has to agree. The Department of the Interior and the local subdivision of the State must enter into a fair and open arm's-length agreement.

Again, of course, in the instance where it is a local subdivision of the government entering into an agreement, the concurrence of the State must be had before the agreement can be finally consummated.

Mr. KEITH. It would appear to me it could have a beneficial effect in some instances and an adverse effect in others.

The local interest could argue that they should let the Federal Government determine if they would be beneficial. And the Federal Government help and failing that they might get nowhere—might just waste time in hoping and in negotiating. If they do enter into a contract, then the State is going to want all the money is appropriated, because it is already authorized under the terms of this act. Is that correct?

Mr. DINGELL. This authorizes an agreement subject to an appropriation. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KEITH. It seems to me that all of this is a good argument for tax sharing.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to place in the Record at this point two letters which will serve to supplement legislative history and also assist in the carrying out of the legislation.

The letters follow:

February 8, 1968

HON. STANLEY A. CAIN
Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am hopeful that my bill, H.R. 25, to preserve and protect the wetlands of the United States, will shortly be passed by both the House and the Senate and enacted into law.

In its present form, the legislation will probably call for a nation-wide study of the
The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Mr. BROOKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee has had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2010) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the States, to preserve, protect, develop, restore, and make accessible estuarine areas of the Nation which are valuable for sport and commercial fishing, wildlife conservation, recreation, and scenic beauty, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1038, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is there objection to a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the States, to conduct studies of the Nation's estuaries and their natural resources, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the previous question is ordered.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the distinguished majority leader to consider a clarification or revision in the schedule which was previously announced.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I appreciate the minority leader calling this matter to the attention of the House, because we would like to reverse the bills that we have scheduled for Tuesday, February 20 and the balance of the week. We shall schedule for action first the bill H.R. 14743, to authorize to eliminate the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890, to come ahead of H.R. 11308, amending the National Foundation of the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, private bill rule on Monday on H.R. 14743. Otherwise, the program is as announced, unless there are future changes.

The complete revised program is as follows: for the week of February 12, 1968, there is no legislative business; for the week of February 19, 1968, we will have on Monday, the Consent Calendar; two suspensions.

H.R. 14834, reduction of ratio of career substitute employees to regular employees in Postal Field Service; and H.R. 14935, regulation of mailing of master keys for motor vehicles.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week, Private Calendar.

H.R. 14743, to eliminate the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890, subject to a rule being granted: H.R. 11308, amending the National Foundation of the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965—open rule, 2 hours of debate; and S. 839, jury selection and Service Act of 1968, subject to a rule being granted.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, that it adjourn to meet on Monday, February 12, that when it adjourns on that day, that it adjourn to meet on Thursday, February 15; and that when it adjourns on that day that it adjourn to meet on Monday, February 19.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS NOTWITHSTANDING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON CRIME

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise
The United States contributes to the Alliance by providing capital and technical assistance through a number of organizations, including the Agency for International Development, the Export-Import Bank, the social progress trust funds, and the fund for special operations of the Inter-American Development Bank. This last fund, the Peace Corps, was established for the purpose of providing a method for assisting nations which would compel the nation to be self-reliant. Yet, leadership, the labor, and most of the money come from the countries themselves.

The Department of State, with contributions from other members of the multilateral Inter-Agency Alliance for Progress, has recently prepared the year-end review of the Alliance for Progress which reports on this program's activities during 1967. I would like to include a brief summary of this review in the record for the benefit of colleagues:

**U.S. Assistance to the Alliance for Progress**

The Aid loan and grant disbursements to Alliance countries for the year ending June 30, 1967, amounted to $265 million, a new high in the annual volume of U.S. assistance. During calendar year 1967 the authorization rate of development and program loans totaled about $694 million, against $650 million in 1966 and $278 million in 1965. Summary figures, subject to adjustment, for all U.S. economic aid to Latin America for the past six fiscal years—1962 through 1967—are $6.2 billion, or $1 billion over and above Latin America's 2.9 percent annual population growth rate.

**Latin American Agriculture Gains in 1967**

1967 closed with an encouraging announcement from the U.S. Department of Agriculture which maintains the Latin American Agriculture Production Survey. The 1967 Index, said the USDA, was up substantially over 1966 when drought added to the woes of large farmland areas in several Latin American countries. The annual figures are over and above Latin America's 2.9 percent annual population growth rate.

**Latin American Cooperative Flourish**

U.S.-AID missions are likewise continuing their assistance in the organization and management of credit unions, cooperative banks, rural electric cooperatives, insurance, farm supply and production and consumer cooperatives. Training activities were also expanded.

More than 200 new credit unions were established in 1967, reaching about 2,400 with a membership of 600,000 in 12 countries and total savings of about $44 million at year-end. During 1967 these credit unions disbursed about $47 million in small loans, to reach a total of 851 $ million in interest-bearing loans for farm supplies, education, health and other purposes. The rural electric cooperatives have been organized in twelve Latin American countries. AID's loan assistance of about $20 million for 1967 and 1968 contributions have financed rural electric cooperative operations in Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Costa Rica, Nicaragua and Peru. More than 20 pilot cooperatives now serving

*For comparison purposes, agricultural production in the years 1957-1956 is equivalent to 100 in the Index ratings.*
more than 40,000 families are in various stages of relocation. More than 140 Latin Americans have received specialized technical and management training in rural electric cooperative operations.

**EXPORT-IMPORT BANK CREDITS AT AN ALL-TIME HIGH**

In 1967 the Export-Import Bank authorized credits for long- and medium-term loans, marking the highest level of short-term insurance for exports to Alliance countries totaling $491.1 million for the year ending June 30. The figures exceeded the total for the previous year was an all-time record. Every dollar of this credit assistance was earmarked for goods and services needed to further the purpose of the Alliance for Progress.

**PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE—THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS AT THE GRASSROOTS LEVEL**

Private citizens imbued with the "development spirit" fostered by the Alliance for Progress expanded their scope of operations in 1967 to include 34 areas in 14 Latin American countries and 34 States in the United States. Now about four years old, the Partners program embraces citizens of the Hemisphere who want to take an active part in furthering the programs of the Alliance.

Since its inception the Partners program has generated a flow of more than eight million dollars in material and technical assistance to Latin America from the private sector of the United States. Activities include an exchange of teachers and students through scholarships and in-service training programs; business and industry programs including technical and commercial relationships; projects to promote food production and to strengthen democratic institutions.

During 1967 five investment conferences sponsored by the project were held, on which resulted in joint business ventures. In November a Partners’ Investment conference in Washington brought together about 60 Brazilian businessmen and 75 prospective U.S. investors. In 1967 the stateside Partners committees formed the National Association of the Partners of the Alliance with Edward M. Marcus, of Dallas, as president. This association is a clearinghouse for voluntary activities and new ideas as well as a network of contacts through which investment opportunities are channelled to prospective investors.

**PEACE CORPS EXPANDS IN LATIN AMERICA**

The Peace Corps expanded its programs in Latin America in 1967. Volunteers served in 19 nations, representing about one-third of the world-wide total. This was an increase of 500 over 1966.

**ENGINEERING GIVES LATIN AMERICA A NEW FACE**

**HIGHWAY DEVELOPMENT**

Through 1967 AID and its predecessor agencies had made road construction and improvement loans amounting to some $370 million to Latin American countries. Of this sum, 5,000,000 miles of road construction. During the year about 500 miles of new Alliance roads principally financed by AID were completed.

**AIRPORTS**

Chile's new international airport at Santiago, now serving 19 airlines, was completed late in 1967. Jet service has been inaugurated with regular flights between Santiago and Buenos Aires. The airport is well equipped for passenger and cargo operations.

**Water and Sewerage**

Improvements and extensions to Panama City's 30-million gallon-per-day water distribution and sewerage systems were completed in 1967. Further extensions will get underway in 1968.

**School Building**

Among the AID-assisted school building projects in 1967:

- In Panama 30 new primary schools were completed and an additional 23 primary schools are under construction.
- A 40-school construction program in Chile was completed in 1967.
- El Salvador's school construction program, involving 1,000 classrooms for 64,000 children, was also completed.
- In Mexico the University of Guadalupe is developing a new campus.
- Under a project loan to Honduras, 20 secondary schools with 358 classrooms will be constructed and equipped.

**TRENDS IN HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT**

Congress in 1967 indicated its continuing support of Latin American housing and urban development by approving two substantial measures:

- It amended the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, adding "food and decent housing" to the three previous AID priorities—health, education and agriculture—and expressed the aims of capital development and cooperatives among the purposes of capital assistance.
- It also added $50 million to the investment guarantees authorized for Latin American housing, bringing the total Congressional authorization to $500 million. A total of 47 AID-assisted housing projects having a total value of $224.4 million have been authorized to date under this program. Contracts have been awarded for 26 of these projects with 24,050 dwelling units, for a total cost of $114.6 million.

**COUNTING LOCAL CURRENCY HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT**

The total value of these guarantees was $410 million, compared to $320 million for all of 1966. Thirteen of the 46 projects involved investments in food or agriculture valued at $44 million; these investments are protected by $140 million worth of AID insurance under the three coverages offered in the political risk insurance program. Other projects include construction of high-rise buildings, petrochemicals, mining, aluminum fabricating, pharmaceuticals and business machines, to name a few.

**Investment Surveys**

AID's Investment Survey Program encourages U.S. investors to study the feasibility of business projects in less developed countries. During the first nine months of 1967 AID made 24 surveys for carrying out pre-investment surveys in Latin American countries.

**WAGING WAR ON HUNGER IN LATIN AMERICA**

The President delegated responsibility for implementing the War on Hunger to the Agency for International Development. In 1967, AID consolidated all activities in food, health, nutrition, food-from-the-sea, population planning and voluntary relief services in the Office of the War on Hunger. At the same time, AID’s food resources was charged with the responsibility of enlisting private industry’s active participation. During 1967 more than six million Latin American school children received nutritional meals through U.S. Food for Freedom feeding programs. Another 1.3 million pre-school children and mothers were served.

During 1967 four U.S. industrial firms under AID service contracts undertook high-technology studies for the purpose of overcoming the critical protein shortage and developing marketing techniques for protein-rich food supplements.

Other developments:

- 15 nationwide nutrition surveys were completed in Latin America.
- An Information Research of the U.S. Public Health Service, in collaboration with the Pan American Health Organization and the Nutrition Institute of Central America and Panama.

On another front, AID Administrator William S. Gaud underscored his view that U.S. assistance to family planning and food production programs would share the highest functional planning priority in AID. He also announced that assistance would be given to low government population programs only upon the request of central governments and to non-governmental programs only with the prior consent of central governments.

AID has assigned a specialist in each country mission to follow developments in the population field and assist local government programs on request.

AID has increased the amount of its program assistance loans is now available for contraceptives and other necessary devices.

In 1967 commodities valued at more than $140 million were purchased through Food for Freedom programs in Latin America. About 48 percent of this amount supported programs of voluntary agencies, with the remaining 52 percent going to the local American private and public agencies.

**CONGRESS, 1968**

Mr. SCHWENGEL: 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on December 15, 1967, the National Educational Television Network, in association with the Eastern Educational Network, aired a wrap-up of the first session of the 90th Congress. The program was entitled "Congress, 1968" and the following distinguished guests: Senator Walter E. Hensley of California, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Senator S. Muskie, and Representatives Melvin L. Laird and Hale Boggs; Dr. Alfred de Grazia of New York University, and Dr. Robert L. Peabody of Johns Hopkins University, political scientists; Congressional Quarterly Reporters N. Prentice Bowsher, Joseph Foote, William B. Dickinson, Jr., and Neal R. Peirce, together with NET Correspondents Paul Niven and Dick McCutchen.

Discussion centered around four main topics: Vietnam and foreign policy, problems of the American cities, taxes, and congressional ethics and reform.

The transcript of the hour-and-a-half program is understandably somewhat...
long, but in view of the expertise of the assembled commentators and the significance of the subject matter to all of us, I would like to place the entire text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CONGRESS, 1968

This broadcast of the National Educational Television Network in association with the Educational Radio Network starts at 9:45 P.M. E.S.T. on December 15, 1967. The program was an analysis of the 1st session of the 90th Congress.

The House of Representatives let out a whoop of joy when Majority Leader Carl Albert made the final motion. In the Senate, Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine, the last of the three major leaders of the 90th Congress, put in a plug for peace in 1968; and Minority Leader Everett Dirksen put in a plug for his television friends and all his constituents to rush home and see it.

Oregon Democrat Wayne Morse tut-tutted the Senate for quitting on Friday afternoon so as to get home and serve notice that he would object next year. But then even Morse had come to the Christmas spirit and he should go away with a prayer on his lips.

Well, all of this at 6:36 in the House and 6:56 in the Senate; fifteen minutes later the place was deserted. Not a Senator in sight; the restaurant closed and thousands of people who have toiled in this building for the last eleven months are now on their way home, some to Georgetown, some to Hawaii, and Alaska.

Mr. McCUTCHEN. Before we list the important bills of the sessions we’re going to try to describe the process by which a bill becomes law. Some members of the Congress may have missed as five or six years to understand this process fully. We are going to try to do it in a couple of minutes.

Here are the essentials: Action on a bill may in most cases be initiated in either house, but let us suppose our lawmaker is a Congressman. He analyzes the need of the legislators to test their mood and line up support. The Senator draws up a bill and takes it to the Senate, where the legislative metaphor begins. The bill is recorded by title, categorized by content and sent to the appropriate committee for a closer look. Here the merits of the measure are debated, hearings held, its possibilities of enactment weighed, changes made, either to improve the bill or to gain votes for it.

Now, returned to the Senate, it is read, debated and amended by members of the entire assembly and voted. If a majority of Senators are in favor, but another bill should the majority approve it is declared passed and sent to the House where essentially the same process is repeated. If the bill is rejected in the House, it is then sent to a joint conference committee made up of key committee members from both houses. If the differences are resolved, the resulting compromise measure must then be passed again by both houses. A bill which survives this long and rigorous procedure—and many fall by the wayside—is sent to the President. If he approves it he signs it into law; if not, Congress can override his veto and pass it, two-thirds of its members vote in favor of adoption, So much for the legislative process as such.

Now for the actual legislation which has so affected the lives of the people. As of this afternoon, there have been 202 bills, most of them, as for any Congress, of limited impact, but some indeed important only to one or two individuals. Even among major bills we’re going to have to be selective and we’ve divided the measure into four major categories: Vietnam, the cities, taxes, and congressional ethics and reform.

In foreign policy the Constitution places the President in charge of foreign relations and his orders can be carried out without congressional authorization and appropriation he could neither pay the men nor buy the arms. The laws have been on the books for many years, but the President has greatly influenced federal policy in the domestic field.

For a review of legislative action on Vietnam and foreign policy, here is Prentice Bowsher.

Prentice Bowsher. Thank you, Dick.

There is no question about it, that the issue of Vietnam was a big issue in Congress this session. But it is important to remember that Congress did not pass more through committee hearings and through floor debate than it did through legislation as such.

In terms of legislation there really were two big Vietnam issues, and these were money—$20 billion of it. It came in two appropriations bills, one for $12 billion early in the session and another that included $20 billion for Vietnam. This was the fiscal ’68 defense appropriation bill. The total for this bill was $20 billion; of that, $20 billion was for Vietnam.

Debate in Congress on Vietnam surrounded these two bills. We’ve put a “plus” for bills that have cleared the congressional process you saw described. We put a “minus”, as you understood it, the administration favored the bill. We put a “zero”, if the administration opposed the bill. And we put a “zero”, as you see here, if the administration took no position on the measure.

All right, The top two, those are the appropriation bills, $20 billion in this one for Vietnam, and $12 billion for this one. Veterans aid, they simply extended it to GI’s fighting in Vietnam. Veterans aid, this was a chance for Congress to vote on the American GI’s. We have on the floor a debate on a Senate resolution, just recently reported by Senator J. William Fulbright of the Foreign Relations Committee, it’s ran.$20 billion in this one for Vietnam, and $12 billion for this one. Veterans aid, they simply extended it to GI’s fighting in Vietnam. Veterans aid, this was a chance for Congress to vote on the American GI’s. We have on the floor a debate on a Senate resolution, just recently reported by Senator J. William Fulbright of the Foreign Relations Committee, it’s ran.

Prentice Bowsher. Thank you, Dick.

There is no question about it, that the issue of Vietnam was a big issue in Congress this session. But it is important to remember that Congress did not pass more through committee hearings and through floor debate than it did through legislation as such.

In terms of legislation there really were two big Vietnam issues, and these were money—$20 billion of it. It came in two appropriations bills, one for $12 billion early in the session and another that included $20 billion for Vietnam. This was the fiscal ’68 defense appropriation bill. The total for this bill was $20 billion; of that, $20 billion was for Vietnam.

Debate in Congress on Vietnam surrounded these two bills. We’ve put a “plus” for bills that have cleared the congressional process you saw described. We put a “minus”, as you understood it, the administration favored the bill. We put a “zero”, if the administration opposed the bill. And we put a “zero”, as you see here, if the administration took no position on the measure.

All right, The top two, those are the appropriation bills, $20 billion in this one for Vietnam, and $12 billion for this one. Veterans aid, they simply extended it to GI’s fighting in Vietnam. Veterans aid, this was a chance for Congress to vote on the American GI’s. We have on the floor a debate on a Senate resolution, just recently reported by Senator J. William Fulbright of the Foreign Relations Committee, it’s ran.

Prentice Bowsher. Thank you, Dick.

There is no question about it, that the issue of Vietnam was a big issue in Congress this session. But it is important to remember that Congress did not pass more through committee hearings and through floor debate than it did through legislation as such.

In terms of legislation there really were two big Vietnam issues, and these were money—$20 billion of it. It came in two appropriations bills, one for $12 billion early in the session and another that included $20 billion for Vietnam. This was the fiscal ’68 defense appropriation bill. The total for this bill was $20 billion; of that, $20 billion was for Vietnam.

Debate in Congress on Vietnam surrounded these two bills. We’ve put a “plus” for bills that have cleared the congressional process you saw described. We put a “minus”, as you understood it, the administration favored the bill. We put a “zero”, if the administration opposed the bill. And we put a “zero”, as you see here, if the administration took no position on the measure.

All right, The top two, those are the appropriation bills, $20 billion in this one for Vietnam, and $12 billion for this one. Veterans aid, they simply extended it to GI’s fighting in Vietnam. Veterans aid, this was a chance for Congress to vote on the American GI’s. We have on the floor a debate on a Senate resolution, just recently reported by Senator J. William Fulbright of the Foreign Relations Committee, it’s ran.
that Vietnam money requirements had gone up something like $4 billion beyond what had been estimated. So there is the need for the supplemental next year. In addition, Chairman George Mahon of the conference committee made the point that it is correct that additional funds will be needed, and that is the man who should know.

Thank you.

Mr. McCUTCHEON. If the subject of Vietnam overshadowed all other foreign policy problems this year, the fate of the anti-smog towered over the domestic field. Even before the summer the Nation was increasingly pre¬occupied with the problem of the big increase in smog in and around the major metropolitan centers. Then came Newark, Detroit and other explo­sions.

The fact of the crisis was clear, but there were different diagnoses and different pre­scriptions.

Joseph Foote.

Mr. Foote. Yes, Dick, the seriousness of the riots this summer, I think, impressed upon everyone, including a good many Congress­men, just perhaps what was going on in the American cities. And yet no comprehensive scheme for dealing with either the riots, with urban problems, with air pollution, transpor­tation, has ever been put before the Congress before.

The President has several programs, however, and let's discuss a little bit how they fared.

The model cities program was one directed at coordinating efforts to strike at socialills, at the physical blight of urban areas. Now the House Appropriations Committee voted for $462 million for that; he got $312 million.
The rent supplements was another pro­gram. It was designed to help low-income families—not welfare families, but people who were making an income—to obtain better housing. The President got only a quarter of his funds on that.
The other thing I might mention is an anti-smog program to help communities update their law enforcement; the bill went down 10-3 in the Senate.

Twelve years ago a Democratic-controlled Congress turned down a Democratic Pres­ident in his request for a 10 per cent surtax to finance the General Revenue Fund. The objection has come against the best advice of both government and private economists. They say that higher taxes are essential to stem inflation, protect the dollar, hold down interest rates, limit budget deficits, and, last but not least, pay for the war in Vietnam.

Then, too, by the time the economy to a bad end, there will be plenty of blame to spread around. President Johnson himself is faulted. His critics say that he failed to make himself clear enough in 1967 and then that he failed to push hard enough for its passage. It was not until August 3rd that President Johnson actually signed the supplementary taxes to the Capitol Hill. Any sense of urgency in the message seemed to be lost on the Congress.

The American Medical Association and Means Committee held a meeting of a months and then put the whole business aside. Prospects for action revived a little when British Prime Minister Macmillan told the House of Commons that the British government was hurried to Capitol Hill with specific promises of spending cuts and with a second anxious plea for passage of an anti-inflationary tax increase.

Meanwhile, at the White House, President Johnson warned publicly of a budget deficit that might reach $30 billion, even $35 billion. Where he got this figure remains somewhat of a mystery. Under close questioning on Capitol Hill, administration officials con­ceded that the actual budget deficit for this fiscal year would be no more than $22 billion. That would still be a record deficit since the end of the Depression, if the House can accept the President's estimate.

Apparently the red ink possibilities don't terrify members of the Congress. Chairman Wilbur Mills clearly spoke for most of them when he turned down the idea of higher taxes in 1967. Today, however, only this af­ternoon Mr. Mills announced that the House Ways and Means Committee would reconsider the tax bill on January 22. His decision was based on the fact that the House had lost $3.5 billion through gold bullion exchanges.

In other words, the debate must be started over again. The President's greatest legislative failure of the year. Congress simply didn't fear inflation or big budget deficits. The President feared the wrath of tax-averse voters back home.

Let's take a quick look at some of the other legislation in the tax field.

The President is here, the House was delayed to com­plete action on the Social Security bill. This will provide across-the-board 13 per cent in­creases for 22 million Americans beginning in March 3rd. The cost—$3.5 billion. The bill contains controversial new restrictions on welfare payments to the aged, blind, or handicapped, and these will provide fuel for further debate in 1968.

The one thing I might mention is an investment tax credit, actually a tax cut for business; and the debt limit which was raised to a permanent limit of $358 billion.

Mr. McCUTCHEON. Bill, thank you very much.

One subject that looms larger in every ses­sion is the question of the nature of the House and of the Senate. This year will be of particular interest to those concerned with the question of congressional ethics. There were several triggers this year in the form of spe­cific irregularities on the part of specific members. But, as usual, there was more talk than action. Both houses pondered codes of ethics but neither House adopted one.

In the related fields of campaign finance and legislative reorganization, the Senate acted but the House did not.

Neil Petrol.

Mr. McCUTCHEON. The nationally publicized cases of Thomas Dodd and Adam Clayton Powell this past year forced Congress to delve into a subject that has been closed doors, the ethics of its own members. The House voted last winter to exclude Adam Clayton Powell from the 90th Congress after investigations disclosed that he had used House funds, House committee funds, falsi­fied travel accounts and had apparently pocketed his House paychecks. Powell is still trying to get a court order to regain his seat. As for Thomas Dodd, the Senator from Connecticut, he was censured by his colleagues with $1,000 out of proceeds from testimonial dinners which were purportedly for political pur­poses for his own personal use instead. Con­gressional ethics got a further airing this year when the Senate Ethics Committee felt obliged to investigate press allegations that Missouri Senator Edward Long had used his position in the Senate to aid James Hoffa, the imprisoned boss of the Teamsters Union. Finally, one might note that early this year both houses of Congress were considering a code of specific irregularities on the part of specific members. But, as usual, there was more talk than action. Both houses pondered codes of ethics but neither House adopted one. The secretary of the Senate Majority in the Senate was convicted in Federal Court on seven counts of income tax evasion, theft and conspiracy to defraud the Federal Gov­ernment.

Mr. McCUTCHEON. Well, you certainly would think so. Dick, that is the climate we expect to get out of this but certainly the events of this past year pointed up the lack of any kind of clear guidelines now for Congressmen as to where the line is drawn between what they should and should not do in regard to outside income, gifts, honorary and campaign contributions and the like, but Congress did not seem to be in any kind of a hurry to set guidelines for the future. In the House, for instance, an ethics committee was appointed last year, but it has never met and it has never been revealed why. In the Senate, Senator Stennis agreed to reopen the case.

Finally, one might note that early this year both the House and the Senate were considering a code of ethics. But the Senate Majority in the Senate was convicted in Federal Court on seven counts of income tax evasion, theft and conspiracy to defraud the Federal Government.
an important breakthrough because many experts believe that unless there is some kind of legislation of outside income and activity by members of Congress, this ethics problem will always be a very troublesome one. In September, as a matter of fact, Senator Muskie introduced a bill which would allow public disclosure, rather than the current system in which disclosure only came four votes short of passage indicating that the idea which is rather popular, which is out there, is to have a chance in the future. Also in September, the Senate did pass a comprehensive campaign spending reform law, the most far-reaching law in recent time and we don't see much hope for its passage, at least not very good hopes right now.

Finally, we should note that the Senate last session passed the Legislative Reorganization Act, the first in 20 years, to tighten up committee procedures and also to the extent possible to alter the registration laws, but that bill got snarled up in the House Rules Committee where it still is.

Mr. McKECHNIE. Neal, thank you and gentlemen, thank you all for those reports on what Congress did and failed to do in 1967.

Let's switch now to our four guests from the Congress with Paul Niven at the Capitol. Mr. Niven, Senators Morton and Muskie, Congressman Boggs and Laird. I would like to ask each of you in turn to give your personal verdicts on the work of the Congress. This to me has been a very frustrating year, so the result is we did something down the middle that did little for the city but not what we should have done. I think this is the product of the strong rhetoric. We did or we didn't.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator Morton, will you begin?

Senator Muskie. Paul, after the rundown we have just heard, I think anything any of us could add would be superfluous. I suppose you want now from us the partisan rhetoric. We did or we didn't. I think that it is fair to say from my point of view that it has been a Congress of solid accomplishment. A lot of things we didn't do, a lot of things that we did do, but I think that the achievements are real and meaningful.

Let me take the last day of the session today. We completed action on the biggest social security bill in the history of the country. We sent the President a poverty bill which at some places had 30 years to go, and then we died out. It was killed and finally his bill that was a continuation at the present level of spending.

In addition, we finally passed a foreign aid bill considerably reduced from the President's request but nevertheless a continuation, and I think the reduction is simply in the context of reducing congressional support for this program over a period of years. So I think this is the product of the strong rhetoric. We did or we didn't.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator Morton, first, let me say that I am many years older than any of my colleagues who have been sitting here but I am a junior to my friend, Congressman Boggs, in service in the Congress. This to me has been the most frustrating year from a personal standpoint to me, to Senator Morton of the United States and I speak not as a partisan Republican. I am a pragmatic politician. I have held extracurricular jobs in my party, but I speak personally.

First, I think that the breakdown of communications between the Administration and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is a tragedy.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator Morton, do you blame?

Senator Cooper. I don't know who to blame. It is specific and it is there. And under our Constitution the Senate has a greater role in the conduct of affairs in the House. I will admit that our role in the Senate is somewhat negative. It is the veto power. But this disturbs me as a citizen and as a grandparent.

Second, I think that we didn't face up quickly enough to the terrible situation that developed last summer, and I hope it never develops again, but I am afraid it will in connection with the so-called riots, the civil unrest, and so forth. We must find a way to accomplish this.

Now, the President set up a commission of fine people, no question about that. We all know as members of Congress the long-range causes and foundations of this problem, but we have got to have sort of a fire brigade.

Now, I ask that we take—put in transferable but 10 percent of that which we have already allocated to the cities so it doesn't have to go through Congress, give it to the local officials, who have the ability to fire a brigade.

Senator Kennedy came along with a similar idea. Nothing was done about it. Here we are going into another year, another long hot summer, complicated by a presidential election, which may indeed make it even more difficult than it was last year.

But I say frankly this has been a frustrating session. When I came—when we came in January and I heard my majority leader, the late Mr. Ryan, and ever known, Mike Mansfield, get up and say, "Now we are going to review these welfare programs objectively, these things that we should have done in the past few years." I had great hope. I thought we were going to do that. And then we end up with a commit­tee in the House which is being headed by the senator from Pennsylvania, and we whitewashed all of them. I, for instance, was very much against the Housing and Urban Development program. I think we have changed my mind. I think it is a good program. In most places it is a good program. There is the political reality that in 1966 there is the Republican side, the pressure to maintain the integrity of the government of the United States from some members who had never voted for it before. In all of these programs I think we have done a great deal. I disagree with the remark that you attributed to Senator Kennedy. I think that if you look at what we have done in education, in the poverty program, in social security, in health, the session will go down as one of the really constructive sessions of Congress.

Mr. NIVEN. Congressmen Boggs, have you found this session as frustrating as Senator Morton?

Representative Boggs. No. As a matter of fact, my mood is quite different from that of Senator Cooper and Senator Morton.

Mr. NIVEN. Well, let me say this to you. I am one of the fellows who has to get
votes. It is my job as the Democratic whip to put those votes together.

Mr. Niven. You see now—excuse me.

Representative PEABODY. I know what you have done is quite remarkable and I can understand the frustration Senator Morton expressed because there are frustrations all over the country. It is one of the frustrations that should be attributed to Congress. The frustrations come from Vietnam. They come from the cities, from the rural areas, from cities, from elsewhere, of poor people. They come from a change in the population pattern. And I know that that is what we have. I think that Congress has tried to face up to them and with the resources that we have at our command, while we are at war, I think it has responded very adequately.

Mr. Niven. Congressman Laird, do you say your views?

Representative LANN. No, I don’t. I would have to say that this Democratic controlled Congress with its better than two to one majority in the United States Senate, its three to two majority in the House of Representatives, will have to go down as a very successful Congress. It has made possible the greatest deficit that this country has ever experienced at any time since World War II. And this deficit is going to have its effects on the economy and the vegeta tion is going to be levied upon all our people. The housewife in the home, the worker in the factory, the farmer in the field, is going to feel the effects of deficit financing to the extent that we have embarked upon in this first session of the 90th Congress. We have had no new ideas coming from the Executive Branch of the government. True, the poverty program was re- enacted, but of the new aid programs were asked for by the President.

Grant-in-aid programs using the old model of the 1930’s. Instead of moving into a new model, that is one of the things that the 47 new Republicans in the House and four more Senators than they had before. So before the program is over, I guess what I would like to do is to evaluate the output of a Congress? How do you determine whether it is truly representative of the body politic? And so far I guess I am still up in the air.

Mr. Niven. Thank you, Professor Peabody. We will get to some of those questions in a few minutes. I am going to take a very slight break. We are on our second hour of that hour limit of your colleague on this program, speaking from New York, Professor Alfred de Grazia, of New York University.

Mr. de Grazia. I guess Professor Peabody and myself are thinking along the same lines. I meant to make several comments about the analysis of how Congress, how proposals for aid and programs on the discharge of defense appropriations bills, but we can not speak as one voice on Vietnam, and we are usually separated into two groups. But we have heard, and I sometimes a third group variously called owls or eagles is introduced. I don’t think any of these labels is one sufficiently accurate to encompass more than a handful of Senators. I think there are probably a 100 views on all aspects of the Vietnam policy. Basically, of course, we have to decide whether or not to support the President’s policy or not. The basic question which was asked of me was has there been a contradiction between the two. I speak of the American people by the American people.

Mr. Niven. I know these labels sometimes are stereotyped, but whatever Senator Morton was at the beginning of the year on Vietnam, he is something else now. You have changed your view, haven’t you, Senator Morton?

Senator Morton. I have changed my view merely because I think what we are doing and some of the same isn’t going to accomplish our mission. I think that we failed to recognize that we are engaged in two wars, we are engaged in a war in Europe and a war in Vietnam. There is our moral obligation. I am not talking about the morality of it. I have never questioned that. I am talking about the morality of it. I think that the people in the field around the world want to know that the Congress as well as the Executive Branch and Department of Defense is fighting the war.

Mr. Niven. In this program please stay in place.

Mr. Glasser. Then the Congress has had a number of the most interesting hearings and I shall mention these, too, add up to a very busy period of time, for the most part highly constructive for which the Congress has to be commended.

If Congress is a little behind the husband and wife who are buying his wife a gift for Christmas time, at least it is also the husband who has done a good job most of the year.

Mr. Niven. Thank you, Dr. de Grazia.

Gentlemen, we are now going to have a free for all discussion. All mikes will be open. I want to say, Professor Peabody, I don’t want to comment on the perform ance of the Executive Branch and Department of Defense in this program.

Professor Peabody. Do you want to start off with Vietnam, Paul? Would that make sense?

Mr. Niven. Yes, please.

Professor Peabody. Then, I would like to say to Senator Muskie and Morton, given the fact that the President clearly has initiative in the area of foreign policy and rightly so, he is one man, he can act quicker than Congress can to emergencies and crises, do you believe Congress has done a good job, has done all it could to inform the American public as to the issues involved in Vietnam, as to the facts, as to the effects? It is a 100 different views is not likely to be especially enlightening. Really, on a subject such as Vietnam, as the analysis of what the Congress has done in this field earlier in the program indicated, takes place in committee hearings, takes place in floor debate, takes place in speech making, public as to the reasons why we are in Vietnam, and I must say that the President feels that he has in his own way done what he can to enlighten his constituents as to the issues involved in Vietnam, as to the facts, as to the effects. I can not speak as one voice on Vietnam, and we are usually divided into two groups. But we have heard, and I sometimes a third group variously called owls or eagles is introduced. I don’t think any of these labels is one sufficiently accurate to encompass more than a handful of Senators. I think there are probably a 100 views on all aspects of the Vietnam policy. Basically, of course, we have to decide whether or not to support the President’s policy or not. The basic question which was asked of me was has there been a contradiction between the two. I speak of the American people by the American people.

Mr. Niven. I know these labels sometimes are stereotyped, but whatever Senator Morton was at the beginning of the year on Vietnam, he is something else now. You have changed your view, haven’t you, Senator Morton?

Senator Morton. I have changed my view merely because I think what we are doing and some of the same isn’t going to accomplish our mission. I think that we failed to recognize that we are engaged in two wars, we are engaged in a war in Europe and a war in Vietnam. There is our moral obligation. I am not talking about the morality of it. I have never questioned that. I am talking about the morality of it. I think that the people in the field around the world want to know that the Congress as well as the Executive Branch and Department of Defense is fighting the war.

Mr. Niven. In this program please stay in place.

Mr. Glasser. Then the Congress has had a number of the most interesting hearings and I shall mention these, too, add up to a very busy period of time, for the most part highly constructive
tion and from the military commanders in Vietnam, well, from my own state the 101st Airborne just went over there and they are the greatest outfit in the world, I think, the greatest fighters in the world, and every Republican, every Republican in the House and Senate has supported the troops in Vietnam and continues to do so. Those lads aren't there because of any policy decision. I hope the Democratic Party can achieve that same sort of unity in support of those gallant men, but I must say to you that I think that it is time for some of us to question the policy which I don't think is going to in any way solve the problem that exists there.

Professor Peabody. I am in agreement in part.
Senator Morton. Yes, sir.
Professor Peabody. I just would like to kind of question that last statement about the unity of the Republican Party. It does not seem to me that they are any more unified than the Democrats.

Senator Morton. No, we are not. No. I didn't mean to imply that.

Professor Peabody. Right.
Senator Morton. Well, I don't mean to imply that.

Mr. Niven. Professor de Graziis, do you question Professor Peabody. It's a problem, though, that I--

Professor de Graziis. Professor Peabody. No question about it.

Mr. Niven. Excuse me just a moment--

Representative Laird. The Vietnam situation. It seems to me that when you ask for the whole question of Congressional oversight can be brought into focus. I don't believe that in the amount of the job undertaken as far as the war is concerned that we should do. I take the question of financing the war. At the present time serving on the Defense Appropriations Committee I know that we are using O&M, operation and maintenance money for the third and fourth quarter. We are borrowing against the taxes to finance the fiscal 1968 to finance the second quarter of this fiscal year. We are operating on a deficiency spending program and everything about this war. I think the American people have the right to know what the war is costing. The President continues to talk about $23 billion, or we will have a tax bill of $32 billion. I wonder if the Appropriations Committee know the war is costing closer to $50 billion. And I think here is a responsibility that the Congress has under our Constitution to do a better job of oversight, a better job of informing people as to what these costs are. Earlier in the program you talked about the two votes we had on the one supplemental, some $13 billion. There wasn't much anybody could do but vote for that. And I think the Defense Appropriations Branch had already obligated the funds.

Mr. de Graziis. Well, don't you think, Congressman Laird and Senator Morton, it is about time for the Congress to draw a line, maybe set a date after which the Congress will take rather decisive action with respect to the Vietnamese war? I mean by that either introduce a kind of resolution that would bring us into a state of hostilities on terms that Congress might define with objectives that would not be indefinite. I think the matter has gone along too far. Perhaps the Republican Party should introduce such legislation.

Representative Boggs. I think the gentleman should be more specific. What does he mean? He wants Congress to take over the war?

Mr. de Graziis. Commander in Chief.
Senator Morton. I don't agree with what he is doing, but I still don't see how the 537 of us up here on Capitol Hill--

Representative Boggs. You really would have pandemonium if you followed that suggestion.

Representative Laird. I am sure that must be what he is talking about, though, must be what he is thinking, because there are 537 members of this House, and we have over several on both sides of the aisle in the House that introduced a similar resolution so that we will have open debate on this particular question.

I think we have had very few opportunities in the House. I think you have had more opportunities in the Senate, but in the House there is a frustration on part of many Members, and I think some 70 Members now have signed a written statement saying that whether that kind of a debate would be helpful or not I really can't say.

Senator Muskie. I must say I am not under the impression that there has been an insufficiency of debate in the Congress on Vietnam.

Senator Morton. Certainly not in the Senate.

Senator Muskie. Not in the Senate. I don't think in the House. As a matter of fact, it seems to me that the only real matter here is that there should be some kind of a hearing here and a responsibility here that we don't always respond to. Sure, all of us can raise questions as to how we happened to get there in the first place. All of us can ask questions, and legitimate ones, about whether or not we are hitting the proper targets, all of these things.

It is proper to consider the question of whether or not a cessation of the bombing in the north would expedite or slow down progress in the south. Sure, but at some point we have learned the lessons in 180 years that after you ask all the questions to the Commander in Chief, and the options, you exercise a little self-restraint and a little steadfastness to sup­ press, you--

Mr. de Graziis. You mean it is improper for the Congress ever to raise the question about the top command of a war?

Senator Muskie. It seems to me I spent about three minutes saying first that it was proper to do this, so I think your question has to be, I have said it is proper to raise all these questions. It is proper to do it from time to time, but at some point, as we have in previous wars—and this is the point that I am trying to get at—is that at some point we ought to exercise not restraint imposed.

Mr. Peabody. Let me make--

Senator Muskie. Don't break in on me yet—not restraint imposed by someone else. Restraint imposed by ourselves in the light of the importance of steadfastness behind our policy.

Mr. Peabody. Sir, let me break in here. I am sorry, I probably picked a controversial subject like Vietnam to open this one with. Let's go to a less controversial one.

Representative Laird. The Vietnamese war is a good thing to talk about in connection with this Congress because it is the overriding thing.

Representative Boggs. But we could stay here with Vietnam for another half-hour.

Representative Laird. We might have to have a tax bill, and the idea that we won't have one is something that I am not sure about being for one, and I said to the members of the Ways and Means Committee the other day that there were only three members of that committee who ever voted for a tax bill. Congressman Byrnes of Wisconsin, Congressman Mills, and me. All the rest of them voted against the idea of just voting against taxes but every now and then you have to vote for them. We had to vote for a tax bill, and so we had to very strongly in World War II, and we are going to have to vote for them now.

Representative Boggs. I think that some January, when we look again, and I think that Congressman Laird is undoubtedly correct, that the President is going to propose a tax bill of $3 billion more than $23 billion, and that we are going to have to have a tax bill. And the idea that we won't have one is something that I am not sure about being for one, and I said to the members of the Ways and Means Committee the other day that there were only three members of that committee who ever voted for a tax bill. Congressman Byrnes of Wisconsin, Congressman Mills, and me.

Ms. de Graziis. Well, I think that there is a tremendous burden.

Mr. Niven. I think that the--

Senator Muskie. The interest rates have gotten very high, and this means the housing industry, the building associations, and so forth, are bearing a much greater burden than other sectors of the economy.

Mr. Peabody. Mr. Laird.

Senator Muskie. So that I think that come January, when we look again, and I think that Congressman Laird is undoubtedly correct, that the President is going to propose a tax bill of $3 billion more than $23 billion, and that we are going to have to have a tax bill. And the idea that we won't have one is something that I am not sure about being for one, and I said to the members of the Ways and Means Committee the other day that there were only three members of that committee who ever voted for a tax bill. Congressman Byrnes of Wisconsin, Congressman Mills, and me.

Mr. Niven. I wonder--

Representative Muskie. I must say I am not un­ acquainted with the difficulties that are happening now is that the burden is being unequally.

Boggs. The idea that the American people get off by not having a tax bill, particularly one as modest as this one, is one that doesn't bear inspection.

Congressman Laird talked about inflation and said no inflationary trend is in the economy. And if they continue they could be much more devastating than a 10 percent surcharge. In addition to that--

Representative Boggs. Excuse me. Let me go ahead.

In addition to that, certain sectors of the economy have been a tremendous burden. The interest rates have gotten very high, and this means the housing industry, the building associations and so forth, are bearing a much greater burden than other sectors of the economy.

Mr. Peabody. But it does affect so many things.

Representative Laird is undoubtedly correct, that the President is going to propose a tax bill of $3 billion more than $23 billion, and that we are going to have to have a tax bill. And the idea that we won't have one is something that I am not sure about being for one, and I said to the members of the Ways and Means Committee the other day that there were only three members of that committee who ever voted for a tax bill. Congressman Byrnes of Wisconsin, Congressman Mills, and me.

Ms. de Graziis. Well, I think that some January, when we look again, and I think that Congressman Laird is undoubtedly correct, that the President is going to propose a tax bill of $3 billion more than $23 billion, and that we are going to have to have a tax bill. And the idea that we won't have one is something that I am not sure about being for one, and I said to the members of the Ways and Means Committee the other day that there were only three members of that committee who ever voted for a tax bill. Congressman Byrnes of Wisconsin, Congressman Mills, and me.

Mr. Peabody. But I was sure there would be enough Republicans in the minority that would get--

Representative Boggs. I think that is true.

Representative Laird. The Democratic majority that wouldn't give the votes to reject, or to proprietà about the President's bill, isn't that correct?

Representative Boggs. Well--

Senator Morton. As a member of the Finance Committee, and to the President comes out and tells us in February it is an $8 billion deficit and in October it is $9 billion and it's--

Mr. Niven. More one minute from each of you.

Representative Boggs. I think it has to do with our whole spending program and everything about this—I can understand why it would be brought up.

Mr. Niven. One more minute from each of you.

Representative Boggs. Thank you.

Mr. Peabody. This one is on tax policy. You are a member of the Ways and Means Committee, a very important member of that committee.

Representative Boggs. Well, I would suggest that you direct that question to Congressman Mills, the chairman of the committee. He would be better able to answer the question. I can only speak for myself and say to you that any time that I am given an opportunity to vote for a tax bill, I am going to vote for the President's proposal, and I think the Congress might define.

Representative Boggs. Well, I would suggest that you direct that question to Congress¬ man Mills, the chairman of the committee. He would be better able to answer the question. I can only speak for myself and say to you that any time that I am given an opportunity to vote for a tax bill, I am going to vote for the President's proposal, and I think the Congress might define.
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historical record. Senator I was on the committee and was a member of the House back in the beginning of the war in Korea.

Senator Morron. Yes.

Representative Boogs. And we had instituted a tax bill in the House and as you know, under the Constitution the House has that prerogative, and it was a tax reduction bill.

Senator Morron. Right.

Representative Boogs. And the schedule and the House had actually passed a tax reduction bill, both in individual and corporate taxes, and excise taxes. Between the time that the House passed the bill and the time that the Senate Finance Committee, your committee, acted on the bill.

Senator Morron. And that changed the whole picture.

Representative Boogs. Right. And by the time the bill got back to the House it was a tax increase, rather than a tax decrease and it — compared to what is proposed here, it was unbelievable. It upped the rates tremendously. It imposed an excess profits tax. It increased all the excises and also compared to the gross national product, the take, so to speak, the amount of money you take out of the economy, was tremendously more than is proposed in this tax bill.

Representative Boogs. I would like to pose a question which is really more about the issues that prevail in this building than it is about the time. Mr. President, when the President of the U.S. with 30-million odd votes behind him, wants a tax increase he has to approach more or less as a petitioner a Congress, whereas now the Democratic Party has 196 million people perhaps? What is the source of Congressman Mills' great power? Is it the source of his system?

Representative Lain. No one has power in the Congress unless he has votes on the committee backing him up and Congressman Mills is one of the members of his party supporting him.

Mr. Niven. Does that mean a majority of the members of the House supporting him, do you think?

Representative Laird. I think it developed into a position here quite frankly that the minority party is the Republican Party and it shouldn't be our responsibility to pass the President's tax bill.

Now, all we asked was that a majority of the 15 members on the Ways and Means Committee vote out a tax bill.

Senator Morron, 15 Democrats.

Representative Boogs. But Congressman and 10 Republicans. Now, Congressman Mills has his power because he is supported by members of his party, in particular.

Mr. Niven. Congressman Boggs?

Representative Boogs. Well, you know, I am always reluctant to try to divine the mind of another man, and—

Mr. Niven. Does Congressman Mills represent the mood of the House on taxes?

Representative Lain. Some Congressmen Mills is one of the ablest members of the Congress. I would say to you that in my judgment that if Congressman Mills in the Republican Party takes a stand on a tax reduction bill, if the committee reports a bill, that the House would pass it. These things don't happen overnight. Do you know how long it took to pass a tax reduction bill? People were complaining about that. They said my goodness alive. What is wrong with the country? And it took a long time to pass a tax investment credit which was a terrific help to business in our country. These matters don't happen overnight and the press generally, you like to keep these controversies going. You like to say, well, the bill is on the floor. Well, as far as I am concerned, if there was any fight it is over with now. We are looking to the second session of the Congress.

Senator Morron. Well, but isn't it true, sometimes these political scientists fail to realize the simple mathematics of this thing. It is a question of votes and you are more familiar in this than anybody else, being a Democratic Whip.

Professor Peabody. I would say you are both pretty good vote counters.

Mr. de Grazi. Professor de Grazi, did you have a question?

Professor de Grazi. I was listening to some lessons in political science. But I did have one. I would like to ask the gentleman who has just commented here — very concerned about inflationary tendencies. I wonder why he was so enthusiastic about raising the debt ceiling.

Representative Boogs. Well, certainly enthusiastic is a word that doesn't fit the situation. I face the fact that unless we raise the debt ceiling the credit of the government of the U.S. would be nil and any person who would take a contrary point of view to me must find a right, times, a clear majority of the Democratic Party to raise the debt ceiling under Presi­dential direction. The question of raising the debt ceiling was something that came after the fact. This is a result of what Congress had done previously, not what it was doing that minute, and the notion that you would cut down expenditures by not raising the debt ceiling is preposterous.

Professor Peabody. I don't believe you do either.

Representative Boogs. Therefore, the question is something like this, I guess. Is Congress doing all that it could do to solve the problems of the cities? Here I am talking about the — we had an anti-poverty bill passed. Some people liked it. Some peo­ple didn't think it was possible to do it. We have done something about riot con­trols. We had a lot of fun and some grief, and a lot of party maneuvering on the rat bill, and looking ahead now to what could be a very hot and very unfortunate kind of summer next year, particularly since it is just before Presi­dential election?

Mr. Niven. Professor, Congressman Laird reacted a little violently to your assertions about party maneuvering on the rat bill.

Professor Peabody. All right.

Mr. Niven. Let's direct your questions to him.

Representative Lain. I don't know of any party maneuvering on the rat bill. I know the majority of my party, minority party, which doesn't have the votes in the Congress, were against putting it over in this Congress or the next Congress, whether they are—next session of this Congress or the next Congress, whether this Congress is in session or not. This Congress is not so important, but if we get this thing back on the track, I think we will have ren­dered a great service to the people of this country.

Senator Muskrat. I would like to make a comment.

Representative Boogs. I would like to make one, too, when you get through.

Senator Muskrat. I have been listening with a great deal of interest to Congressman Laird from time to time and Senator Morron just now making an argument that is all too familiar around here, that the purpose we seek to serve, the particular piece of legis­lation or program that we seek to get, the way to do it and until we find the right way to do it we are not going to get support. Mr. de Grazi. Yet they don't come up with the means for finding the right way. Is that right, Senator?

Senator Muskrat. Well, they offer sugges­tion from time to time, but they, as Congress­man Laird distinctly said tonight, not being in the majority, he disclaims re­sponsibility for getting the votes necessary for implementation of all the programs for responsible action and I am all for getting the best idea that we can, but when you deal with prob­lems of cities, if you are one of those who have got finally to come to grips with the best idea that the majority can agree to and go forward with it.

Now, there are a number of programs that...
have been developed in the last two years. Congressman Laird asked for new ideas. The Model Cities Program is new, as new as last year. The Rent Supplemental Program is new.

Representative Boozé. The poverty program is a new program.

Senator Muskie. Poverty program is a new program. It isn't exactly as he would tailor it, but I say to him, with all urgency, and I say to the country with all urgency, that these are programs on hand. And they are addressed at the very critical urban problems with which we must deal, so why not let's go on with them?

Representative Boozé. Let's go on a little further there, Senator. The Education bill which we passed today, which we financed today, was the largest educational program for all practical purposes is a new program. For the first time we passed this program just a couple of years ago. Today we experimented with it for two years with almost $10 billion authorization. Now, most of this money will be spent in the cities. They are holding up sewer applications. They are holding up sewer

Senator Muskie. And pollution.

Representative Boozé. And pollution—to the problems of the city. I want to go on about the Security thing.

Representative Lamm. Then I would like to break in.

Representative Boozé. I served on the committee that wrote the Social Security bill, and I served on the conference that ironed out the differences between the House and Senate, and, as a matter of fact, Senator, we did write in a work program, a training program which it was anticipated—under which it is anticipated that 300,000 people now on welfare will be trained for gainful employment within the next two years.

Senator Morton. Mothers of one or two-year-olds.

Professor Peabody. Can I break in here a minute?

Representative Lamm. I would like to rebut sometimes these four categorical aid programs that were brought up because we have a better way.

Mr. Niven. Professor Peabody tries to set you up for that.

Professor Peabody. Just a minute.

Representative Lamm. Pretty hard when professors and politicians are on the same program.

Professor Peabody. Equal time.

Senator Muskie. The position I have is this. It seems to me Republicans have come up and now let's say we are in our last five minutes and I would like to move along to a last one. I now think it is one that you don't always like but which did get a great deal of attention early in the session especially, and that is the question of Congressional ethics.

Mr. Peabody. Can I start that one out with a quote?

Mr. Niven. Yes, sir.

Mr. Peabody. I will have to rework it a little bit because it is not directly Congressional ethics but it is really Congressional reorganization. It is the problem of the Image of Congress and, to me, it is the question of, if you are all dearly loved in your districts but collectively Congress is kind of a whipping boy. It is, you know, mistreated in the New York Times and the Washington Post and most journalists don't seem to understand. They understand the Senate, Paul Niven particularly, but not too many of them seem to understand what goes on in the House.

Let me just read this quote:

"It is regrettable that a bill to regulate campaign contributions has been entered into by the leaders of the United States House of Representatives to have the votes of the House recorded by an electrical apparatus beginning with the opening of the next session. The device which will probably cost $20,000 to install is intended to appear as a roll call so that all seated by the House or any member of the public might be counted on an issue?"

This is John Mathews, the News and Note section of the American Political Science Review, August, 1914.

Mr. Niven. What is your question, is that a good idea?

Mr. Peabody. No. My question is how come you are not dealing with these problems of Congressional ethics? How come you are not introducing electronic data processing techniques? How come you are not dealing with the ethics of the 20th Century more than you are?

Senator Morton would like to tackle that one.

Senator Morton. Well, I would like to comment on that.

I don't see how a computer or a vote machine is going to change Congressional ethics.

Now, you are smarter than I am but I don't see how that has anything to do with ethics, frankly.

I think we have got to do something about ethics. I think we ought to do something and I think that we ought to have a code of ethics. I think we ought to have a vote machine that doesn't change it. They still steal as many votes in Chittling Switch, Kentucky, with a voting machine as they used to with the ballot box.

Mr. Niven. Senator, aren't there occasions when all of you would have preferred for some other reason to have the ethics of Congress change and not be counted on an issue?

Mr. Boozé. No.

Senator Morton. No. We get there but we are in committee meetings. We are all over the Hill, we are downtown seeing somebody, doing something for a constituent, I mean, this thing of putting voting machines in the House.

Mr. de Grazia. I don't think that is very important, Senator. Certainly not much of an ethical question.

Senator Morton. I think a full disclosure of our income. Professor, but you came out for it the first time this year. You changed your position.

Senator Morton. Oh, no. I came out—I published—I put it in the Louisville papers, what I was worth, what I got, what my income was.

Mr. Niven. Didn't you for the first time this year come out for a bill for compulsory disclosure by all Members?

Senator Morton. No. I came out for that several years ago.

Mr. Niven. Why hasn't it happened?

Mr. Lamm. I think it is about to happen. The special committee of the House has a recommendation that is about ready to come out. We set this committee up this year and I think that the thing is about ready to come out. Mr. Boozé. I do, too. Again, let me, somebody said, be the devil's advocate. I don't think there is an opposition in the House to a code of ethics. I am sure these gentlemen can speak for the Senate.

Senator Muskie. I am sure it is about to come.

Senator Morton. Well, the thing is, the thing rubs off on all of us. You have got 357 people up here and you get a sour apple in your basket and I mean you are all dearly loved in your districts but collectively Congress is kind of a whipping boy. It is, you know, mistreated in the New York Times and the Washington Post and most journalists don't seem to understand. They understand the Senate, Paul Niven particularly, but not too many of them seem to understand what goes on in the House.

Let me just read this quote:

"It is regrettable that a bill to regulate campaign contributions has been entered into by the leaders of the United States House of Representatives to have the votes of the House recorded by an electrical apparatus beginning with the opening of the next session. The device which will probably cost $20,000 to install is intended to appear as a roll call so that all seated by the House or any member of the public might be counted on an issue?"

This is John Mathews, the News and Note section of the American Political Science Review, August, 1914.

Mr. Niven. What is your question, is that a good idea?

Mr. Peabody. No. My question is how come you are not dealing with these problems of Congressional ethics? How come you are not introducing electronic data processing techniques? How come you are not dealing with the ethics of the 20th Century more than you are?

Senator Morton would like to tackle that one.

Senator Morton. Well, I would like to comment on that.

I don't see how a computer or a vote machine is going to change Congressional ethics.

Now, you are smarter than I am but I don't see how that has anything to do with ethics, frankly.

I think we have got to do something about ethics. I think we ought to do something and I think that we ought to have a code of ethics. I think we ought to have a vote machine that doesn't change it. They still steal as many votes in Chittling Switch, Kentucky, with a voting machine as they used to with the ballot box.

Mr. Niven. Senator, aren't there occasions when all of you would have preferred for some other reason to have the ethics of Congress change and not be counted on an issue?
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of Maine. And Congressman Hale Boggs of Louisiana and Melvin Laird of Wisconsin.

Reporting on the legislative record of the Congress from the staff of Congressional Quarterly, Prentice Bowsher on Vietnam, Joseph Foote on Cities, William Dickenson on Taxes, and Neal Peirce on Congressional Budget, this is Dick McCutchen for National Educational Television.

FREE-WORLD SHIPS ARRIVING IN NORTH VIETNAMESE PORTS

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out in remarks in the Record on January 15, 1968, during 1967 there were 78 free-world ships arriving in North Vietnamese ports. Sixty-seven of the vessels were free-world British flag. Just this morning, I was informed by the Department of Defense that during January 1968 there were 10 free-world flag ships arriving in North Vietnam and that nine of these flew the British flag.

Time and tune again, I have pointed out these incredible and intolerable facts only to be advised just as many times by the administration that this trade wasn't a matter of great concern and that the British Government had indicated it could do nothing under its present laws about the movements of these vessels under its registry.

Mr. Speaker, it should be clear to everyone, in view of the enemy's concentration of forces in the Khe Sanh area at this very moment, that the North Vietnamese are fighting an all-out war—they mean business. Any supplies that they receive, however they get it, including the free-world ships of other countries, must be of significant importance to them. In addition, I am advised that free-world vessels have, in fact, delivered strategic goods of the most vital character. It matters not at all whether these goods were of Communist or of free-world origin. The point is that free-world ships are being used to help relieve the strains and pressures of other transportation facilities available to the North Vietnamese. Mr. Speaker, the American people are concerned about the lack of action by the administration in this matter.

Without the presence of the Prime Minister of Great Britain in our country at this time offers an excellent opportunity to discuss this matter with our British friends. I have sent a telegram to the President today expressing my hope that he will use the occasion to seek more cooperative action from the Prime Minister with respect to this disturbing situation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my telegram to the President, as well as a chart relating to free world shipping to North Vietnam during the month of January 1968.

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

There was no objection.

The telegram and chart referred to follow.

February 8, 1968.

THE PRESIDENT, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Washington, D.C.: May I express the hope, Mr. President, that during your current discussions with Prime Minister Wilson you may have occasion to remind the Prime Minister that 87 of the 78 free world flag vessels that carried cargoes to North Vietnam this past year were flying the British flag and that you will enlist his earnest support and cooperation in an effort to reduce and eliminate this source of supply that is helping to continue and to intensify its aggressive action against the defenders of freedom in South Vietnam. The fact that this trade was increasing rather than decreasing, Mr. President, is most alarming as evidenced by the information just made available to me today by the Department of Defense indicating that 8 of the 10 free world flag ships arriving in North Vietnam this past month were flying the British flag. When related to events recently transpiring in both South Vietnam and Korea it appears to me that the time has come to urge the British with greater force to stop renting their flag in support of the aggression of North Vietnam.

Most respectfully yours, Charles E. Chamberlain, Member of Congress.

FREE WORLD SHIPS IN NORTH VIETNAM, 1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Deadweight tonnage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprian</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR MEMORABILIA AT SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to inform the House that the uniform worn by my good friend and comrade, the late Michael J. Budinger, in the battle in Manila Bay 70 years ago is now on display at the Smithsonian Institution, as related in the following news article from the Chicago American of June 1, 1967:

MEMORABILIA AT SMITHSONIAN: SPANISH AMERICAN WAR VETERAN HONORED

(By Robert Glass)

Michael J. Budinger, a Spanish-American war hero, wore his medals and uniforms each year at Memorial Day parades until his death in 1965 at 89.

Now they will be permanently displayed in the armed forces history collection in the Smithsonian Institution in Washington as the result of a letter his widow wrote.

Mrs. Caroline Budinger, 80, of 3038 Hutchinson st., said she wrote the Smithsonian last month to ask whether they wanted the items.

MUSEUM WANTS ITEMS

She soon received a reply from M. L. Petersen, superintendent of the armed forces history department, that read:

"We believe your husband's uniform along with the other memorabilia will make a lasting gift for the Smithsonian Institution. We do not have many uniforms from that period."

COPY OF SHIP'S LOG

Among the items are a copy of the ship's log from the U.S.S. Baltimore, on which Budinger served as a gunner's mate, and a medal forged from a cannon on the ship.

Another medal Budinger received was a Purple Heart for being the most seriously wounded seaman at the Manila Bay battle during the war.

He was critically hurt when a shell from Spanish naval vessels struck the Baltimore, blowing up a box of ammunition.

CONGRESSMAN GARMATZ INTRODUCES CONCURRENT RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that every effort should be made to encourage American industry and the American public to own or charter free-world vessels to the end that the balance-of-payments drain resulting from payments to ships of other countries be substantially reduced—and that the Department of Commerce, the Department of Transportation, and all other Government agencies should take all measures at their disposal to accomplish this objective.

In this, and an identical resolution, I am joined by all other members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and 9 other cosponsors.

During the past several years, the United States has been suffering from an unfavorable balance of payments. Efforts have been made to control this outflow of American capital—yet the unfavorable balance continues to increase—and could seriously affect the stability of the dollar.

Because of this dangerous situation, the President has suggested a number of means—both legislative and voluntary—for diminishing the flow of dollars abroad—and thus materially reverse the present trend.

All Americans should be concerned about our worsening balance-of-payments situation and seek to find ways and means of correcting it.

In this vein, on January 19, I wrote to the Secretary of Commerce pointing out that an important factor in the outflow of American dollars since World War II has been the foreign construction of land-borne vessels by foreign shipbuilders for the account of U.S. companies and their affiliates operating vessels under foreign flags.

In fact, almost twice as many large oceangoing vessels have been built for U.S.-affiliated companies and their affiliates under foreign flags in the period up to April 1, 1967—at an estimated foreign cost of nearly $6 billion.

The purpose of my letter was to call this fact to the Secretary's attention in
connection with his responsibilities for seeking ways of retaining dollars at home. Just as construction of ships in foreign shipyards for American account may cause a drain on our gold position—so does the employment of foreign-flag ships for the transportation of goods and passengers.

Yet, somehow it seems that the extent to which the net foreign trade earning of U.S. ship operators favorably affect our balance of payments is not generally recognized.

But consider this—even though our aging and declining American-flag merchant marine is only carrying about 7 percent of our total foreign waterborne commerce—it nevertheless is currently producing net foreign trade revenues of somewhere around $1 billion per year. Even in its present condition, the services of American-flag ships are among our largest single category of exports.

In the past, as in the American shipping industry have estimated that, if U.S. ships moved from 34 to 50 percent of its total foreign commerce, there would be no balance-of-payments deficit whatever, and that we would have to be done to preserve this Nation's gold.

This is a major factor in the determined efforts that I—members of the Merchant Marine Committee—and other Members of Congress—have been making in recent years to attempt to revitalize one of the most vital elements of the American security and economy—the American merchant marine.

This nation we are introducing today is intended to emphasize that a nation's shipping services is an export commodity—and thus American patronage of American ships for travel and the transportation of goods can make a significant contribution to the reduction of our balance-of-payments deficit.

The American merchant marine we have today is capable of carrying enough goods and people to eliminate the balance-of-payments problem singlehanded.

To do that we must rebuild and expand our operating fleet.

But if all who travel or ship will bear in mind the contribution they can make in the national welfare by patronizing ships flying the U.S. flag to the fullest extent possible, I believe major improvements can be made in this serious problem affecting our national economy will be felt immediately.

I hope that early action can be taken on this concurrent resolution and that, where it is reported to the floor, it will have overwhelming support from the Congress.

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

Mr. Speaker, is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress should be given this vote for full and fair discussion. Its request to patronize American passenger and cargo vessels makes more sense than taxing Americans on what they spend overseas or putting a 5 percent tax on their ship tickets.

This is a painless way for the administration to solve its balance-of-payments problem. The American merchant marine already contributes nearly $1 billion a year toward a more favorable payments position. Yet, the foreigners carry 82 percent of the balance of international commerce. Think of how the $3.5 billion payments deficit would start to dissolve if more U.S. foreign traders used American bottoms. The 7-percent trade carried by all our ships excites them. Think of how that payments scale would begin to balance if we tripled or quadrupled that carriage figure. American ships should be carrying at least 50 percent of our import-export trade today to keep in step with the fleets of other nations.

The 100-percent subsidized Russian merchant fleet is being used to preserve their nation's rubles to protect the Soviet's balance of payments. Many foreign countries have favorable balance of payments through a big assist by their merchant marines which carry a sizable percentage of their waterborne commerce and contribute large amounts of foreign exchange to a favorable payments situation.

American passenger and freight ships are among the world's best. What better ship could an American travel on than, say, the fastest, and one of the most luxurious liners afloat? To aid our balance-of-payments dilemma, Americans should patronize our passenger ships that visit resort cities around the globe. America has the world's fastest passenger ship operation and a number of its freighters are among the fastest and best constructed. They employ only the most advanced cargo handling techniques. I, therefore, urge the traveling American public and U.S. exporters and importers to significantly increase their utilization of American ships. Their conference rates are generally comparable with ships of foreign nations.

This timely resolution asks that this be done. Let us act on this resolution quickly.

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICIT

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

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, over a long period of time now, many of us have been greatly concerned about the balance-of-payment deficit and candidly the present status of that most crucial problem gives rise to even more concern day by day.

Only trained expert economists have the knowledge and understanding to analyze this problem in its entirety and make appropriate recommendations.

The questions as to our payments balance and gold supply are probably the most complex economic and budgetary problems that we have before us today.

Prof. Gottfried Haberler, professor of international trade and Prof. Thomas D. Willett, assistant professor of economics, both of Harvard, recently pointed out that current proposals and efforts to solve the international payments problem cannot succeed until the Federal budget deficit is reduced.

Both these distinguished gentlemen, who are experts in their fields, have, said, in effect, what some of us have said here, and I quote:

"If the financial house is not put in order by cutting down excessive monetary growth and by making the Federal budget deficit, devaluation of the dollar will become unavoidable, either open or disguised in a multitude of controls and restrictions on international trade payments."

These experts in their analysis recently released by the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research made very pointed comments concerning past and present balance-of-payments control programs.

They express the view that, since 1959, U.S. balance of payments were "largely a combination of short emphasis on long-term solutions." These policies were in effect calculated to buy time and fundamental corrections have not been made, they observe.

They believe that "higher taxes could not be avoided now, even if Government expenditures were cut to the maximum extent politically feasible."

They are also of the opinion that it is no longer possible to provide guns and butter at the rate of which expenditures for both have been rising, and that checking inflation is the cornerstone to any effective balance-of-payments program and it is missing from our present Government program.

The two experts also disagreed restrictions on foreign investment and travel which they view as a step toward full-fledged control.

These learned gentlemen suggest, the benefits from restricting direct foreign investment can only be temporary, no matter how long the controls are maintained.

Since the investment controls fall on every, different nations, the countries hardest hit are bound to retaliate by reducing imports of American products.

The plan divides foreign investment trade into three categories: advanced, less developed and underdeveloped nations.

The experts also evidently believe certain proposed restrictions on travel would not be helpful and in this opinion many people agree. On the whole, the informed statements of these highly trained, knowledgeable economists impressed one with the need for very careful, penetrating scrutiny of the many-sided facets of the international balance-of-payments deficit, our extremely difficult budgetary situation, and the impact of higher taxes, as well as the need for checking dangerous inflation.

We should bear in mind, however, that it is also of great moment at this time to make very sure that efforts we make in combating inflation do not result, as they
sometimes have in the past, in releasing deflationary forces in the economy.

The Administration ought to be seeking our great Ways and Means Committee, as well as the executive department and its experts give these questions profound study, mature deliberation and continuous consideration in the hope that the right answers will be found before long.

PROBLEMS FOR TRAVELERS

Mrs. BOLTON. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial of February 6 entitled "Problems for Travelers," the Cleveland Press points out that paperwork and confusion involved in the administration's travel tax proposals are more likely to deter overseas travel than the taxes themselves.

The Press recommends that instead of firing off paper wads of this type, the administration should tackle the problem head on: by slashing its own spending abroad, by rigidly restricting official travel, and most of all by balancing the government budget, which is the key to the whole situation. These are excellent suggestions.

Believing my colleagues will be interested in reading the entire editorial, I ask that it be included as part of my remarks.

The editorial follows:

PROBLEMS FOR TRAVELERS

President Johnson wants to reduce the "intolerable" drain of U.S. dollars to countries outside the western hemisphere.

To this end, Secretary of the Treasury Henry Fowler proposes to levy a 5% tax on all purchases outside the U.S. identical to the present tax on domestic travel. He proposes a tax ranging from 15% to 30% on travel expenses outside the Western Hemisphere and a 10% tax on purchases outside the U.S. He proposes to reduce the duty-free limit on foreign purchases from $100 to $10 and to end the duty exemption on gifts sent home from $10 to $1. All this begins to get mighty complex, and the paperwork and confusion involved in these proposals are more likely to deter overseas travel than the taxes themselves.

For instance, a tourist to Europe would pay no tax on the driott $7 a day he spends, he would pay a 15% tax on the next $8 a day he spends and a 30% tax on all over $85 a day.

Moreover, the expenditures tax, so-called, is enormously complicated by exemptions, its and ands and buts. For instance, businessmen, farmers, agronomists, or genealogists to sabbatical would be exempt if they stay abroad more than 120 days and are engaged rural home, education, studies or research.

All this stamps the proposal as unworkable—even with any army of agents to enforce it, an army which surely would eat up the State and local governments. And if it isn't enforceable, it hardly can be expected to reduce the balance-of-payments deficit by any worthwhile amount. No such proposal ever was linked with red tape.

Instead of firing off paper wads of this type, the Administration ought to be tackling the problem head on: by slashing its own spending abroad, by rigidly restricting official travel—and most of all by balancing the government budget, which is the key to the whole situation.

PUBLIC SAFETY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson in his February 7, 1968 message to the Congress, "To Insure the Public Safety," presented a program to make conditions of life for our law-abiding citizens safer. In calling for action against crime and criminals in our society the President stated:

Speeches and strong words and good intentions will not solve our Nation's crime problem.... Only action will be effective to control crime. It is time for the United States to come to grips with the problem.

We in the Congress must heed this call and turn our citizens to action in the cause of interest by enacting an effective anticerime program. I wish to express my past and continued support in urging the swift enactment of a number of the President's proposals which I have already introduced: State Firearms Control and Crime Control Act, a State Firearms Control Assistance Act, and a bill to prescribe penalties for the possession of LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs by unauthorized persons.

I am sure we all agree that crime is essentially a local problem that must be dealt with by State and local governments. However, lawlessness is a national phenomenon and national assistance is needed to support and encourage greater effort by State and local governments to find new answers to the threats presented.

Therefore, early in the first session of the 90th Congress I introduced a State Firesarms Control Act to assist State and local governments to reduce the incidence of crime, encourage coordinated law enforcement and criminal justice at all levels of government, and on August 8, 1967, the House passed the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act of 1967, an amended version. As of today, no action has been taken in the other body.

The need for strong Federal controls over interstate sales of firearms has been established. Records of deaths from illegally possessed firearms, many purchased by mail order, are almost daily news. Local laws, although useful, have proved ineffective. The President's crime program includes enactment of Federal gun control legislation.

During the first session of the 90th Congress, I introduced H.R. 11616, "to provide for the control of the interstate traffic in firearms," to be cited as the State Firearms Control Assistance Act of 1967, which if enacted would place controls on the business of buying, selling, and transporting handguns and other firearms in interstate and foreign commerce. The legislation would require gun dealers to obtain a license from the Secretary of the Treasury and to conduct their firearms business in a prescribed manner. H.R. 11616 would: Stop the interstate mail-order sale of firearms; limit the sale of all weapons, except for rifles and shotguns, to persons living in the State where the sale is made; and establish a national minimum age for the legal purchase of weapons. The bill would not curtail or interfere with the right of the individual to acquire or possess handguns, rifles, or shotguns for the purposes of sport, hunting, or self-defense. It would not require individuals to register their firearms or for their handguns, rifles, or shotguns; nor would it prohibit sportsmen from carrying their shotguns and rifles across State lines. However, such legislation would make it more difficult for criminals to obtain guns and to commit crimes of violence.

No final action has been taken in either body on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, there are many more cracks of rifles, shotguns and handguns in the wrong hands, leading to death in our Nation's streets, must we witness before the Congress acts?

Mr. Speaker, in this same message the President placed special emphasis on the increasing problem of the availability and the use of narcotics and drugs, when he stated that:

In no area of law enforcement is there a greater need for a concentrated drive than in dealing with the growing problem of narcotics and dangerous drugs.

I believe that there is a widespread, growing national concern about the use of LSD—Lysergic Acid Diethylamide—and other hallucinogenic drugs. I intend to focus special attention on this entire problem during the months ahead. However, last session in line with my concern and the growing cases of human tragedies reported where LSD has been used, I introduced H.R. 14299, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prescribe penalties for the possession of LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs by unauthorized persons.

I am sure we all agree that crime is essentially a local problem that must be dealt with by State and local governments. However, lawlessness is a national phenomenon and national assistance is needed to support and encourage greater effort by State and local governments to find new answers to the threats presented. Therefore, early in the first session of the 90th Congress I introduced a State Firearms Control Act to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime, encourage coordinated law enforcement and criminal justice at all levels of government, and on August 8, 1967, the House passed the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act of 1967, an amended version. As of today, no action has been taken in the other body.

The need for strong Federal controls over interstate sales of firearms has been established. Records of deaths from illegally possessed firearms, many purchased by mail order, are almost daily news. Local laws, although useful, have proved ineffective. The President's crime program includes enactment of Federal gun control legislation.

During the first session of the 90th Congress, I introduced H.R. 11616, "to provide for the control of the interstate traffic in firearms," to be cited as the State Firearms Control Assistance Act of 1967, which if enacted would place controls on the business of buying, selling, and transporting handguns and other firearms in interstate and foreign commerce. The legislation would require gun dealers to obtain a license from the Secretary of the Treasury and to conduct their firearms business in a prescribed manner. H.R. 11616 would: Stop the interstate mail-order sale of firearms; limit the sale of all weapons, except for rifles and shotguns, to persons living in the State where the sale is made; and establish a national minimum age for the legal purchase of weapons. The bill would not curtail or interfere with the right of the individual to acquire or possess handguns, rifles, or shotguns for the purposes of sport, hunting, or self-defense. It would not require individuals to register their firearms or for their handguns, rifles, or shotguns; nor would it prohibit sportsmen from carrying their shotguns and rifles across State lines. However, such legislation would make it more difficult for criminals to obtain guns and to commit crimes of violence.

No final action has been taken in either body on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, there are many more cracks of rifles, shotguns and handguns in the wrong hands, leading to death in our Nation's streets, must we witness before the Congress acts?

Mr. Speaker, in this same message the President placed special emphasis on the increasing problem of the availability and the use of narcotics and drugs, when he stated that:

In no area of law enforcement is there a greater need for a concentrated drive than in dealing with the growing problem of narcotics and dangerous drugs.

I believe that there is a widespread, growing national concern about the use of LSD—Lysergic Acid Diethylamide—and other hallucinogenic drugs. I intend to focus special attention on this entire problem during the months ahead. However, last session in line with my concern and the growing cases of human tragedies reported where LSD has been used, I introduced H.R. 14299, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prescribe penalties for the possession of LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs by unauthorized persons. Current Federal law did not make it illegal for individuals to possess LSD for their personal consumption. Therefore, by enactment of this legislation it will clearly establish that the illegal presence of LSD and other dangerous hallucinogenic drugs is firmly condemned when used for non-medical purposes. I urge speedy action on this measure.

I wish to commend the President for all his recommendations in the field of public safety and I intend to review with great care his numerous additional recommendations in this field.

GREEN AMENDMENTS TO THE POVERTY ACT

Mr. LANDRUM. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.
Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I have an article that appeared in the February 5, 1968, issue of the Washington Evening Star, an account by Mr. Robert Walters, Star staff writer, about the efforts of the Office of Economic Opportunity to draft guidelines to put to effect the so-called Green amendments to the recent new authorization of the Economic Opportunity Act.

This article suggests that the Green amendments to the authorization were designed to appear stronger and that the motive of the southerners seeking to amend the bill through the Green amendment was to provide a basis to block the implementation of the community action program and assistance being provided to our impoverished citizens.

This is just not true. I was one of several southerners working to have the bill drafted and presented to the House in a fashion that would make it stronger and provide greater assurance that the assistance intended by Congress would go to the needed areas and have the local supervision that would give more hope for the desired results.

The article claims that the southerners wanted the bill put under the control of courthouse politicians, so that the Federal effort would be negated. This is an affront to the intelligence of all of us who sought to work up a better bill and, moreover, is an insult to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon who, after long study of the proposal to place elected public officials on these boards, decided that this was a good move. If she had not felt this way, I am absolutely certain that she would have refused to support the amendment, and, in my judgment, would refuse to support any amendment that was not designed to strengthen the bill.

Our elected public officials are concerned about the conditions in their cities and counties. They know as well as and better than most other people the problems in their respective cities and counties. They are honorable people; they are compassionate people; and they welcome the opportunity to have the legal weapons available to them to meet some of the problems confronting them in their official capacities.

Let us stop this business of always doubting the motive of one who comes from a particular section of the country. It is not so recognized that theills we are seeking to treat with the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act afflict all sections of America and that it is the responsibility of all Americans from every section to join hands and do what can be done to alleviate the causes of these troubles.

CONGRESSIONAL LLOYD MEEDS' OUTSTANDING NEWSPAPER ON THE URBAN CRISIS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, a recent newsletter put out by our distinguished colleague from Washington [Lloyd Meeds] came to my attention just this morning. I believe this newsletter eloquently addresses itself to much of the concern about the long, hot summer that may be impending. I believe that Mr. Member of Congress, who represents a district that has few or no Negro constituents, has made one of the best statements that I have read, not one containing all of the solutions, but yet one that admirably demonstrates concern that this problem should be aired in his district.

The gentleman has done a splendid job. The newsletter concisely outlines some of the important facts about life in urban America that must be understood by all Americans. In order that all Members of the Congress, on both sides of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, may have the opportunity of reading this excellent newsletter which is so pertinent at a time of urban crisis.

The newsletter follows:

**ISSUE: Riots**

How will you react to the riots next summer?

The Los Angeles police are experimenting with a twenty-ton armored personnel carrier. With room for twenty fully equipped men, it bases on gas, tear gas, tear gas launchers, chemical fire extinguishers and a siren so loud its wail can stun rioters. Police are also making a greater effort than ever before to improve strained police-community relations in the slum areas. Citizens’ committees are striving hard to create maximum police and summer employment for young people.

All of these things are essential if we are to stop riots. And stop them we must. There is no excuse in this democratic nation for violence and lawlessness. Nothing can be accomplished with anarchy. "Black power" emotion and "white power" rabble-rousers can only inflame passions at the expense of cool-headed and creative action. Community action will not be corrected by the raging of a mindless mob. Where violence occurs, it must be put down justly, but quickly.

But it is not enough just to make a pledge to law and order. We cannot turn away to other matters and pretend to have achieved peace through the use of military force. The "American Dream" we know, just as you and I, that with hard work, drive, and a little bit of luck of life he wants for himself and his family. The people who surged into the streets of the ghettos in cities across the United States last summer do not share that "American Dream." They do not believe that hard work and the desire to succeed will really get them anywhere. We must recognize this simple truth if we are ever to understand the bitter disillusionment that stalks the slums of our great cities.

Why is the “American Dream” a farce to so many of the poor?

Newsweek recently suggested that “the color line” that they refer to is not real in America. These people who are virtually imprisoned in the slums share neither our “American Dream” nor their rights.

Elliot Liebow says in his book, "Tally’s Corner," that:

"The boy or dishwasher who works hard becomes only a boy or dishwasher. Neither hard work nor perseverance can conceivably carry the janitor to a sit down job in the office building he cleans up. The man does not have a reasonable expectation that, however bad it is, his job will lead to better things. Raised in poverty, few of the Negro poor can break free of its shackles. Good men who are willing to work and who want to escape destitution are defeated and slowly broken down by the persistent cruelties of this "other America.”

"Motivation". "Drive". "Initiative". These are important and meaningful words for you and me. They tend only to mock the poor. Inferior education (and too little of it) and the rotten environment of the slums bring a boy through his formative years to adulthood without skills, without the ability to hold a good job, and without any hope of succeeding in our increasingly technical society. What can motivation, drive and initiative mean to him? This is the kind of situation that would motivate you or me.

One vital difference, then, is that we have hope and success, and they do not.

Another difference is that we are accepted by our fellow men for what we are, as individuals. Other people don’t prejudge us by the color of our skins before we have a chance to demonstrate our abilities.

That isn’t true for our fellow American citizens who are poor.

So the poverty-stricken Negro has two strikes against him when he comes up to bat. It shouldn’t be surprising that he rarely gets to the first base.

We must understand these basic difference if we are ever to find an effective way to get the jobless poor off the streets and into productive roles in society.

What, then, should we do?

Broadly speaking, we should assure true equality opportunity for the Negro.

Despite the fact that this country has pledged equal educational opportunity for everyone, it is a hollow promise to most Negroes in the core cities. Until last summer, the school board of Washington, D.C. spent $100 more per pupil in predominately white schools than in predominately Negro schools. That is, society accepts and the rotating environment of the slums brings a boy through his formative years to adulthood without skills, without the ability to hold a good job, and without any hope of succeeding in our increasingly technical society. What can motivation, drive and initiative mean to him? This is the kind of situation that would motivate you or me.

\[\text{American Dream}\]

\[\text{Other America}\]

Where violence occurs, it must be put down justly, but quickly.

But it is not enough just to make a pledge to law and order. We cannot turn away to other matters and pretend to have achieved peace through the use of military force. The "American Dream" we know, just as you and I, that with hard work, drive, and a little bit of luck of life he wants for himself and his family. The people who surged into the streets of the ghettos in cities across the United States last summer do not share that "American Dream." They do not believe that hard work and the desire to succeed will really get them anywhere. We must recognize this simple truth if we are ever to understand the bitter disillusionment that stalks the slums of our great cities.

Why is the “American Dream” a farce to so many of the poor?

Newsweek recently suggested that “the color line” that they refer to is not real in America. These people who are virtually imprisoned in the slums share neither our “American Dream” nor their rights.
and affluent alike. If God helps those who help themselves, then we should do no less. The people of the ghettos must be willing to try new jobs, new skills, and new approaches. In this regard there is one priority: Jobs. A Community of breadwinners earning decent wages is not a community likely to explode. For housing can be the crown jewel of the foundation of a new life in which there is a real chance for them to get ahead.

For those without marketable skills, jobs must be found. For those without skills, some present vocational training programs will need to grow in size and number. Some other remedial program is needed. Just pride of ownership must be encouraged. Every high school graduate with an academic background that qualifies him for college or for a good job, is one less person who must be dependent upon Training or some other remedial program.

Job Corps.—Designed for young people of the hard-core unemployed, this program offers catch-up work on basic education as well as in skill training. It needs to be expanded and strengthened.

Manpower development and training.—Provides job training, plus subsistence wages during the course. This makes it possible for men who must support families to get job training and to be enabled to earn a stone of a new life in which there is a real chance for them to get ahead.

For those without marketable skills, jobs must be found. For those without skills, some present vocational training programs will need to grow in size and number. Some other remedial program is needed. Just pride of ownership must be encouraged. Every high school graduate with an academic background that qualifies him for college or for a good job, is one less person who must be dependent upon Training or some other remedial program.
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For those without marketable skills, jobs must be found. For those without skills, some present vocational training programs will need to grow in size and number. Some other remedial program is needed. Just pride of ownership must be encouraged. Every high school graduate with an academic background that qualifies him for college or for a good job, is one less person who must be dependent upon Training or some other remedial program.

Job Corps.—Designed for young people of the hard-core unemployed, this program offers catch-up work on basic education as well as in skill training. It needs to be expanded and strengthened.

Manpower development and training.—Provides job training, plus subsistence wages during the course. This makes it possible for men who must support families to get job training and to be enabled to earn a stone of a new life in which there is a real chance for them to get ahead.

For those without marketable skills, jobs must be found. For those without skills, some present vocational training programs will need to grow in size and number. Some other remedial program is needed. Just pride of ownership must be encouraged. Every high school graduate with an academic background that qualifies him for college or for a good job, is one less person who must be dependent upon Training or some other remedial program.

Job Corps.—Designed for young people of the hard-core unemployed, this program offers catch-up work on basic education as well as in skill training. It needs to be expanded and strengthened.

Manpower development and training.—Provides job training, plus subsistence wages during the course. This makes it possible for men who must support families to get job training and to be enabled to earn a stone of a new life in which there is a real chance for them to get ahead.

For those without marketable skills, jobs must be found. For those without skills, some present vocational training programs will need to grow in size and number. Some other remedial program is needed. Just pride of ownership must be encouraged. Every high school graduate with an academic background that qualifies him for college or for a good job, is one less person who must be dependent upon Training or some other remedial program.

Job Corps.—Designed for young people of the hard-core unemployed, this program offers catch-up work on basic education as well as in skill training. It needs to be expanded and strengthened.

Manpower development and training.—Provides job training, plus subsistence wages during the course. This makes it possible for men who must support families to get job training and to be enabled to earn a stone of a new life in which there is a real chance for them to get ahead.

For those without marketable skills, jobs must be found. For those without skills, some present vocational training programs will need to grow in size and number. Some other remedial program is needed. Just pride of ownership must be encouraged. Every high school graduate with an academic background that qualifies him for college or for a good job, is one less person who must be dependent upon Training or some other remedial program.

Job Corps.—Designed for young people of the hard-core unemployed, this program offers catch-up work on basic education as well as in skill training. It needs to be expanded and strengthened.

Manpower development and training.—Provides job training, plus subsistence wages during the course. This makes it possible for men who must support families to get job training and to be enabled to earn a stone of a new life in which there is a real chance for them to get ahead.

For those without marketable skills, jobs must be found. For those without skills, some present vocational training programs will need to grow in size and number. Some other remedial program is needed. Just pride of ownership must be encouraged. Every high school graduate with an academic background that qualifies him for college or for a good job, is one less person who must be dependent upon Training or some other remedial program.

Job Corps.—Designed for young people of the hard-core unemployed, this program offers catch-up work on basic education as well as in skill training. It needs to be expanded and strengthened.

Manpower development and training.—Provides job training, plus subsistence wages during the course. This makes it possible for men who must support families to get job training and to be enabled to earn a stone of a new life in which there is a real chance for them to get ahead.

For those without marketable skills, jobs must be found. For those without skills, some present vocational training programs will need to grow in size and number. Some other remedial program is needed. Just pride of ownership must be encouraged. Every high school graduate with an academic background that qualifies him for college or for a good job, is one less person who must be dependent upon Training or some other remedial program.

Job Corps.—Designed for young people of the hard-core unemployed, this program offers catch-up work on basic education as well as in skill training. It needs to be expanded and strengthened.

Manpower development and training.—Provides job training, plus subsistence wages during the course. This makes it possible for men who must support families to get job training and to be enabled to earn a stone of a new life in which there is a real chance for them to get ahead.

For those without marketable skills, jobs must be found. For those without skills, some present vocational training programs will need to grow in size and number. Some other remedial program is needed. Just pride of ownership must be encouraged. Every high school graduate with an academic background that qualifies him for college or for a good job, is one less person who must be dependent upon Training or some other remedial program.

Job Corps.—Designed for young people of the hard-core unemployed, this program offers catch-up work on basic education as well as in skill training. It needs to be expanded and strengthened.

Manpower development and training.—Provides job training, plus subsistence wages during the course. This makes it possible for men who must support families to get job training and to be enabled to earn a stone of a new life in which there is a real chance for them to get ahead.

For those without marketable skills, jobs must be found. For those without skills, some present vocational training programs will need to grow in size and number. Some other remedial program is needed. Just pride of ownership must be encouraged. Every high school graduate with an academic background that qualifies him for college or for a good job, is one less person who must be dependent upon Training or some other remedial program.
He (Murrah) jumped up and said "You (so-and-so) yellow son of a (so-and-so). I have worked for seven years on this building and here you do that and we don't get it."

Chandler testified that on another occasion Murrah asked him to set aside an order of the court. Mr. Brooks then said, according to Chandler:

Well every other judge of the circuit does what I tell them to, I don't know what the — is wrong with you that you won't.

It was the judges of the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals, sitting as the Judicial Council of the Laramie Judicial Council, that dissolved the Laramie Judicial Council and restored to Judge Chandler the further jurisdiction in the bankruptcy case, and on December 13, 1965, stripped him of all judicial power and authority, leaving him only his title and $30,000 a year salary.

For all practical purposes this amounted to impeachment — an action which, under the Constitution of the United States, is vested in Congress.

Subsequently, in February 1966, because of protests both in and out of Congress, the same Judicial Council screened and restored to Judge Chandler some 160 of the cases previously taken from him. This simply emphasized and compounded the deliberate and ruthless assumption of power implicit in the original action.

In the meantime, Judge Chandler filed an action in the U.S. Supreme Court challenging the authority of the Judicial Council to strip him of his power and authority.

Through the remaining months of 1966 that followed the establishment of the special three-man investigating subcommittee, headed by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Brooks), no decisive action was forthcoming.

Then in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD volume 113, part 1, page 49, Mr. Brooks inserted what I presume to be something in the nature of a report on the case involving Federal Judges Chandler, Murrah, and Bohanon. In these remarks, Mr. Brooks said, and I quote him in part:

The problems before the subcommittee were brought to the floor of Congress as a result of a petition filed with the U.S. Supreme Court, Chandler v. Judicial Council of the 10th Circuit of the United States, misdemeanor, $

More than a month later, on February 23, 1967, and from the marble temple some four blocks away, came an "early reply" consisting of two paragraphs. It reads as follows:

Mr. H. R. GROSS, Member of Congress, Washington, D.C.

My DEAR CONGRESSMAN GROSS: Sometime ago you wrote me concerning the case of Chandler v. Judicial Council of the Tenth Circuit, and asked certain questions concerning it. This case was filed in the Supreme Court on January 6, 1966, but since that time the posture of the case and the issues involved have changed. Hence, now is the proper time for me to advise you when a determination of it will be made, but you may be sure that it will receive appropriate consideration by the Court.

Sincerely,

EARL WARREN.

How wonderfully enchanting and responsive are such phrases as "the posture of the case," and "it will receive appropriate consideration by the Court." Bear in mind that for 2 long and weary years a Federal Judge has sought to ascertain the legality of an action by which his authority was trampled underfoot and he was personally demeaned. It was a determined effort to make in confirming and complementing the circuit judges and makes the charges which I have quoted, as well as others— and for almost 6 years little or nothing is known as to provocation where these charges—that it is a travesty in the name of the courts and justice in this country.

Mr. HALL, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to yield to my friend from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from Iowa yielding, I certainly appreciate him bringing this salient fact before the Judicial Council back to the attention of the Congress and the people of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. I regret, I say to my friend from Missouri, that it is necessary to feel that one has to do this in order to get action somewhere, first of all in the Supreme Court and, if the Supreme Court fails to act, then not much more time should be given the House Committee on the Judiciary to act.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, that is the very point I wanted to make in confirming and complementing his argument and presentation to the people this evening. I just recently, for example, pointed out something which goes even further than the question of malfeasance of one judge, in that it subverts two very basic principles on which this Nation is founded, No. 1, the public right to the impeachment of the executive branch of Government for the separation of the powers.

As the gentleman from Iowa will recall, on February 1, I inserted an article on page 1863 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the 1-minute rule, entitled "Congressional and Judicial Redistricting on Remapping Plan." This refers to the Federal Judge in the western district of Missouri who arranged for and did meet with the Governor of that State and the legislators, who are charged in this special session of their general assembly, with the remapping of the congressional districts therein; after a so-called three-judge court had ruled the action in 1967 of the State legislature to be not in conformance with the high tribunal's findings based on the "one-man, one-vote" rule.

Then I inserted a further article entitled "Repudiation and Judge Oliver" on page 2021 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 5. Yesterday I inserted an article which was entitled "Political Thievery" on page 2463. I cite these articles simply to point out the two things and that the gentleman has brought out here, namely, that the Supreme Court must act in these cases because of the arbitrariness of a so-called three-man court which has
ruled this to be not in conformity or within necessary percentages, in spite of the instructions of this House. There is no question about the precedents or the Committee, all of which can be cited, about the situation, or the powers of the equal and coequal branches of Government. There is no question about the authority of the State legislature to redress the wrongs done to the district thereby. There is no question about rule XI of our own House of Representatives which says:

All proposed legislation, messages, petitions, reports, and other matters relative to the subject listed under the standing committees named below shall be referred to such committees respectively—(12) the Committee on the Judiciary, subheading Federal courts and judges.

Quite outside of the question of malfeasance and quite outside of the question of impeachment—and no one asks that as yet, it is paradoxical the western Missouri legislators so easy and arbitrarily on the one hand, yet aver it will respect the congressional legislation precluding elections at large in the 91st and 92nd Congress.

Dated February 6 to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of this House I asked that an investigation be made into this one Judge Oliver's conduct and his ex parte communication, if you please—and without a legal mind, I do know he did intervene before the fact, because this three-judge court must indeed rule on action of the Missouri Legislature or redraw the lines itself, and therefore, the latter if the special session of the Missouri General Assembly does not act in time for filing or under a stay which the one dissenting judge on the three-judge court has since written.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other principles which we could cite and there is considerable background therefor. But what has evolved here is the lowest kind of intervention for the purposes of political advantage.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would recall to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) and ask if the gentleman does not recall the discussion and colloquy, on the occasion when the Congress increased the number of Federal judges, about gerrymandering, political heirs, and patronage—and I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 5, page 6258 thereof, and thereafter, wherein such remarks were made by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, who now seems loathe to act, who seems loathe to go into the question at hand, who seems loathe to get into the number of Federal judges, and who apparently hesitates to take jurisdiction over the highest tribunal and to recall for interview and investigation these judges who were appointed when or subsequent to the time we increased that number by 83 new judgeships—and subsequently an additional 45—when it was stated:

Of course, there are some gentlemen on the other side of the aisle who do not relish the creation of such a number of judges to be appointed by a Democratic President. Similarly, during the past two Congresses, we Democrats, then in power in the Legislative branch, did not like creating judgeships to be filled by a Republican President.

On one occasion I said, rather facetiously, that as a matter of fact the Committee of the Judiciary—we Democrats do not like putting Democratic eggs under a Republican hen nor are Republicans to hatch Democratic eggs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall not bother the Members of the House at this late hour of the day with other citations. However, I would call attention to the Canons of Judicial Ethics of the American Bar Association, which says in noting the procedures under which our system of jurisprudence is to operate—and which some of us who are not lawyers but who undertake to understand the law and who are disposed to observe it, one will find it under the heading of "Essential Conduct":

A judge should be temperate, attentive, patient, impartial, and since he is to administer the law, he should be studious of the principles of the law and diligent in endeavoring to ascertain the facts.

I cite article 17 under the heading of "Ex Parte Communications":

A judge should not permit private interviews, or communications, and his decisions be signed to influence his judicial action, where interests to be affected thereby are not represented before him, except in cases where provision is made by law for ex parte application.

Then, Mr. Speaker, under the heading of "Partisan Politics" we find the following:

While entitled to entertain his personal views of political questions, and not required to surrender his rights or opinions as a citizen, it is inevitable that suspicion of being warped by political bias will attach to his judicial action, as will the promotion or the interests of one political party against another. He should avoid making political speeches, making or soliciting payments of assessments or contributions to party funds, as a citizen, it is inevitable that suspicion of the public endorsement of candidates for elective offices, and while not fundamentally or increasing his popularity.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I ask the distinguished gentleman from Iowa for the purpose of advancing his personal ambitions or increasing his popularity. Again I ask the gentleman does he not agree with me that the basic principles of public trust have been violated by not only the Committee which fails to act, but by one which is charged with the performance of his judicial duties and with the jurisdiction thereof in the face of this onslaught against the legislative process and branch that we know to be a coequal branch of the Government. In fact, we are asked to give direction and, perhaps, in many cases find and establish the principles of the separation of powers, but beyond all of the urgency of the judicial image which we have been told from childhood at home we should respect, and the lack of surveillance in the review of duly constituted authority, it is my opinion that a very sorry state of affairs has developed in view of all of the foregoing. I think the U.S. citizens are fed up with it and blame political buffoonery for failure of our courts to back up our constitutional law.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Iowa for bringing up this timely and erudite matter. Some of us have had different ap­pointment and tenure of our judiciary, its ousting itself in proving it needs a general overhaul.

Mr. Gross, I thank the gentleman. I believed his statement about failing judicial image was probably the most important that he has made, and that is the growing lack of respect for the courts of this country, a thing that we badly need. The case that I have spoken of is one, but it seems to me a very sad and sordid case, but only one of a half dozen others that cry for attention in this country, cases that involve the Federal judiciary.

Mr. Hall, I certainly agree with the gentleman, if he would yield further, but I want to make it crystal clear and reemphasize the fact that we are defying certain underlying, eternal, and basic principles; and then we set idly by and do nothing about them, we are almost coequally guilty. Is that correct?

Mr. Gross. The gentleman is exactly right. I certainly agree with the gentleman, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Nix). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. Sikes. Mr. Speaker, although confined to Walter Reed Army Medical Center since the spring of last year, former Army Chief of Staff and combat hero in two wars, Gen. John L. Hines, still takes an interest in today's soldiers. He is the oldest living graduate of West Point.

When Hines joined the Army more than 40 years ago, he was just 17, and his initial visit to a General's heart because his old outfit, the 1st Division's 1st Brigade and 16th Infantry, and the 4th Infantry Division, are involved in what some call a
new kind of war. He commanded the regiment, the brigade, and the 4th Division in World War I, a half century ago. Since his graduation from the U.S. Military Academy in 1891, he has seen many changes in the Army-from Indian fighting on the western plains to jungle fighting in Vietnam. From the Punitive Expedition into Mexico with Gen. John J. Pershing in 1916, he has seen World War I, a half century ago. When the United States entered the war, Gen. Pershing was asked to take command of all American forces in Europe. He commanded the 2nd and several foreign divisions. The citation to his DSC read in part:

"At a critical time during the battle southwest of Soissons, when liaison had been broken between the 16th Infantry and the 26th Infantry, and repeated efforts to reestablish it had failed, General Hines, then in command of the 1st Infantry Brigade, personally went through terrific artillery fire to establish contact with the other infantryman, these two, in the last ten years of service together, formed an enduring relationship of mutual respect, understanding, and cooperation."

In 1924 General Hines succeeded General Pershing, on his recommendations, as Chief of Staff of the Army. He served as his Deputy Chief of Staff for the preceding two years. Separated by eight years in age and two in service, he and the other the infantryman, these two, in the last ten years of service together, formed an enduring relationship of mutual respect, understanding, and cooperation.

John Leonard Hines
The battlefield test of the AEF in World War I came in the final months of that war from the German Spring Offensive in 1918 which had been planned to bring about the collapse of the British, French and Allied forces. While in those few months, short in time and in comparison to the years of war but unending in the continued furious pressure of battle, one of the most spectacular feats of the American Infantry in the 1st Division, rose, continuously, to the further battle command of brigade, division, corps, and finally, to command of the American Expeditionary Forces. As Chief of Staff, he wrote of him—by now Major General John L. Hines—"He is able, efficient, conscientious, and loyal, all to a superlative degree. Commanded in battle from regiment to corps in World War and won outstanding distinction in every position. An exceptionally fine officer in every respect. No limit to any command whatever or Chief of Staff. One of the fine developments of the war. A natural leader, capable in any position, 1st on list of general officers known to me."

In 1924 General Hines succeeded General Pershing, on his recommendations, as Chief of Staff of the Army. He served as his Deputy Chief of Staff for the preceding two years. Separated by eight years in age and two in service, he and the other infantryman, these two, in the last ten years of service together, formed an enduring relationship of mutual respect, understanding, and cooperation.
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The years in Washington were not spent in the type of service or milieu nearest to General Hines’ desired way of life. Basically a field soldier, a troop commander, an out- door life, a life on horseback or in camp was his preference. He had had a second system of training staff supervision which was developed during the severe conditions of winter, including tours of trench duty, that Colonel Hines, faced with the common problems of deserting and bayoneting, could formulate. He was therefore by his civilian superiors was supportable.

In the type of service or milieu nearest to his character and personal qualities, he was as his deputy, and as his superiors in large measure by his character and personal qualities, he was next in the junior and field grades served him well, immediately after coming to the command of the division, and, indeed, his three years in retirement were spent in his boyhood home of White Sulphur Springs.


The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, February 7, 1968, an occurrence happened which I consider of sufficient gravity to inform the House of Representatives. In order to present this information in chronological order, it is necessary that we review some letters by dates, addresses, and signatures, and other letters in their entirety, which make up an exchange of correspondence between the Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the board of education and the superintendent of schools of Fayette County, Ga.

This series of letters which constitutes the exchange of correspondence began on or about December 7–8, 1967, when on December 7, 1967, Mrs. Ruby G. Martin of the Office for Civil Rights addressed a letter to the superintendent of schools, Fayette County, Ga.

On or about December 8, 1967, Mr. Lloyd R. Henderson, Jr., of the same Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare addressed another letter on the same subject matter to Mr. A. Eugene Bowers, the superintendent of schools of Fayette County, Ga.

On December 29, 1967, Mr. A. Eugene Bowers addressed a letter to Mrs. Ruby Martin outlining apparent conflicts between some letters by dates, addresses, and signatures, and other letters in their entirety, which make up an exchange of correspondence between the Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the board of education and the superintendent of schools of Fayette County, Ga.

As near as I can tell there was no reply or response from any source to Mr. Bowers’ letter dated December 29, 1967.

On January 26, 1968, Mrs. Ruby G. Martin addressed a letter to Mr. Bowers stating that in her opinion an impasse had been reached and that it would be necessary to issue a notice of deferral which would have the effect of deferring consideration of all funds for new programs and activities for the Fayette County school system.

Upon receipt of the letter of January 26, 1968, Mr. Bowers on January 29, 1968, again wrote to Mrs. Martin telling her that the purpose of his earlier letter was solely to request a clarification and that an effort would be made to comply with such letter upon receipt of the clarification.

On January 30, 1968, Mr. Bowers called me to his office in the House Office Building and told me what had taken place. He told me that the next regular meeting of the Board of Education of Fayette County would be on February 6, 1968, and that he would like for me to submit an urgent request for a delay or extension in the issuance of the notice of deferral until February 15 in order that the board could approve or reject a plan which he would submit to the board, and which he felt confident that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and specifically the Office for Civil Rights would accept.

On that same date, January 30, 1968, my name was called by Mrs. Ruby G. Martin to request this extension until February 15, 1968. Mrs. Martin was not in her office on the 30th and we left word requesting that she call back. On January 31, 1968, she did call back; the message from Mr. Bowers was transmitted to her and she replied that she would be glad to grant an extension until February 15. Whereupon I asked her to notify Mr. Bowers immediately, and she did. The letter from Mr. Bowers to Mrs. Martin dated January 31, 1968, and Mrs. Martin’s reply dated February 2, 1968, are as follows:

MRS. RUBY G. MARTIN, Director, Operations Division, Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Fayetteville, Ga.

DEAR MRS. MARTIN: This letter is to make further request for delaying any further action on your part until we can prepare and recommend a plan designed to accomplish the purposes of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to the Fayette County Board of Education on Tuesday night. The Board approves the plan we will forward same to you by February 15, 1968.

We hereby request delay in any further action on your part until February 15, at which time you would have the opportunity to review the plan submitted for your consideration.

Sincerely, Mrs. Ruby G. Martin,
Director, Operations Division, Office for Civil Rights.

February 2, 1968.

Mr. A. Eugene Bowers, Superintendent, Fayette County Public Schools, Fayetteville, Ga.

DEAR MR. BOWERS: Your letter of January 31 requesting a delay until February 15, of enforcement action against the Fayette County School System has been received.

Your request is granted, and we look forward to hearing from you by that date. If we can be of assistance to you and your board, do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely, Mrs. Ruby G. Martin,
Director, Operations Division, Office for Civil Rights.

January 31, 1968, Mr. Bowers sent me a copy of a letter dated February 2, 1968, to Mrs. Martin attached to an original letter—January 31, 1968—addressed to me, as follows:

February 2, 1968.

Mrs. Ruby G. Martin,
Director, Operations Division, Office for Civil Rights.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: Your letter of February 2, 1968, and Mrs. Martin’s reply dated February 3, 1968, are as follows:

MRS. RUBY G. MARTIN, Director, Operations Division, Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Fayetteville, Ga.

DEAR MR. BOWERS: Your request for February 2, 1968, of delay until February 15, of enforcement action against the Fayette County School System has been received.

Your request is granted, and we look forward to hearing from you by that date. If we can be of assistance to you and your board, do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely, Mrs. Ruby G. Martin,
Director, Operations Division, Office for Civil Rights.

February 6, 1968.

Mr. A. Eugene Bowers,
Superintendent, Fayette County Public Schools, Fayetteville, Ga.

DEAR MR. BOWERS: Your letter of January 31, requesting a delay until February 15, of enforcement action against the Fayette County School System has been received.

Your request is granted, and we look forward to hearing from you by that date. If we can be of assistance to you and your board, do not hesitate to contact us.
February 8, 1968

JOHN CARDINAL KROL WILL BE GIVEN 1968 NATIONAL HUMAN RELATIONS AWARD BY THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, in Cleveland, a great American, an outstanding clergyman, John Cardinal Krol, will be signally honored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews in recognition of the devotion of this distinguished churchman to the plight of the underprivileged. A man of high and noble purpose, he has acquainted himself with the problems of those living in abject poverty and has dedicated his life to the cause of humanity. The character of this eminent man is reflected, in some measure, by an article which appeared yesterday in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, titled "A Busy Day With Cardinal Krol," which I include, under leave granted:

A BUSY DAY WITH CARDINAL KROL

By choice he is a man of God. By circumstance, he is a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church.

Mr. Speaker, I bring to your attention the following:

AUGUST CLERK, Clerk of the Peaceful House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: Enclosed you will find a copy of the following letter, dated this day to Mrs. Ruby Martin. You will also find a copy of a letter from Lloyd Henderson dated December 8, 1967 and also a copy of a letter from Ruby Martin dated December 7, 1967.

As you know from copies of previous correspondence, this is not the first time official correspondence has been sent to us. The plan which Ruby Martin recommended would not be feasible inasmuch as it would place an undue burden on the present educational setup. Space simply would not permit implementation of her suggested plan.

We sincerely appreciate everything you are doing in our behalf. We will keep you informed on activity between the Fayette County School System and the bureaucratic Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "a part of the great society.

I especially call attention to the last paragraph of Mr. Bowers' letter to me dated January 31, 1968:

We appreciate very much your getting a delay from the Office of Civil Rights to bring about an immediate hearing until February 15. This will give us time to get approval for additional funds for the remainder of this school term and also time to get approval for additional NEA Projects in the amount of $12,000 for additional allocations in Title I funds for this term of approximately $5,000.

Sincerely,

A. EUGENE BOWERS,
Superintendent, Fayette County Schools.

February 7, 1968, my office received a telephone call from Mrs. Ruby G. Martin of the Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, stating that a telegram was being sent to Mr. Bowers, or had already been sent to Mr. Bowers, telling him that the extension or delay until February 15, 1968, has been revoked. We asked Mrs. Martin why the extension or delay was revoked in such a peremptory manner. Her reply was that HEW has revoked the delay herefore granted based upon "concrete" evidence which they had received from the Department of Education. Education was not acting in good faith when the request for the delay was made.

The telegram dated February 6, 1968, to Mr. Bowers reads as follows:

Information has reached our office which indicated that you request for a delay until February 15, 1968 in initiation of Title VI enforcement action by this Department was not made in good faith. Therefore, we have asked our general counsel to initiate enforcement action against Fayette County School system immediately.

In addition final approval of any applications filed with the Department for Federal funds for new programs and activities is hereby ordered deferred.

Your state education agency is also being notified that commitment of Federal financial assistance to all new activities are likewise to be deferred.

Detailed letter to follow.

(Signed) F. PETER LIBASSI

Mr. Bowers told me over the telephone that he planned to begin the evening class in business education on February 5, 1968—open to members of both races. In order to give his office sufficient time to accomplish its objectives, he said he had already received a telegram from Mr. Bowers had already received that telegram indicated without question that the telegram from Mr. Bowers had been dispatched to Mr. Bowers prior to the time that Mrs. Martin called me on February 2, 1968, and told me that the Fayette County Board of Education was not acting in good faith and that HEW had revoked the delay heretofore granted based upon "concrete" evidence. Her reply was that HEW has revoked the delay herefore granted based upon "concrete" evidence which they had received from the Department of Education. Education was not acting in good faith when the request for the delay was made.

The telegram dated February 6, 1968, to Mr. Bowers reads as follows:

Information has reached our office which indicated that your request for a delay until February 15, 1968 in initiation of Title VI enforcement action by this Department was not made in good faith. Therefore, we have asked our general counsel to initiate enforcement action against Fayette County School system immediately.
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Wrapped up in the six-foot frame of John Cardinal Krol of Philadelphia, is the determination of a man who wants first to do what is right for his church, even at the price of popularity.

"I do not shrink from my responsibility," the 57-year-old cardinal told me recently during a day I spent with him in his appointed rounds in his adopted city.

The former Cleveland priest and auxiliary bishop believes not all he does for the 1.3 million members of the Philadelphia diocese is popular. Nothing a leader does meets with unanimous consent and Cardinal Krol is not immune to the ways of his church and the world.

He is a man who would rather make quiet history than noisy headlines for his church. He has revered by those around him and has made countless friends in his 30 years as a priest. His opponents respect him in the arena of the church.

Cardinal Krol is a man of concern and he manifests it in an easy and natural way. He has endeavored to obtain better immigration laws, to provide better understanding between the races and to make a better church for himself and the half billion other Roman Catholics in the world.

Because of this concern, the National Conference of Christians and Jews will honor the cardinal next Sunday night with its 1968 National Award for outstanding leadership in the ecumenical movement both nationally and internationally; his efforts in behalf of minorities and Negroes and his shining example of one who believes in the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man.

But the scroll and the gold medallion he will receive from NCCJ president Sterling W. Brown at Hotel Sheraton-Cleveland will not signal an end to the efforts of this man of God.

The NCCJ honor is but another thread in the fiber of character that has typified Cardinal Krol. The weaving of that fabric began on a teacher-to-pupil plain with the fiber of character that existed first on the earth of his native town.

When she died in 1946, John Krol was almost 18. His mother told me recently during a day I spent with him in his appointed rounds in his adopted city, that she was the last of her family.

The cardinal's private office is in one of the high-ceiling rooms in the house. He reads his own mail and dictates replies before setting out for a round of meetings, he remarked.

"I wish I could spare the time for slow travel. It's always meetings, meetings, meetings these days, and to explain his church to them.

Cardinal Krol thrives on those meetings. It gives him a chance to meet more people and to explain his church to them.

When he entered the seminary he carried with him the nickname of "Rex" which means king—as does Krol in Polish. He uses the word "Rex" as part of his episcopal seal: Deus Rex Meus (God is my king).

Following his ordination in 1937, John Krol was named assistant to the archbishop of Cleveland and to the College of Cardinals. When the chain decided to bond its stores, he worked as a meat cutter for a chain store.

The former Cleveland priest and auxiliary bishop believes not all he does for

...
of the Council contacts, especially among the diocesan clergy.

One of his closest friends is Methodist Bishop Fred Pierce Corson of Philadelphia. They were constant companions on the flights to Rome when Cardinal Krol was busy with Council matters.

"From our first contact," Cardinal Krol said, "I thought he was the one. He never fudged. We always find ourselves taking pretty nearly the same viewpoint on civic and community affairs. And we don't give the ecumenical movement an honest chance. People are no differences. We know there are differences, but we know that we are instruments in the hands of their Maker. There are these differences with honesty and sincerity."

Bishop Corson said in Rome last summer of Cardinal Krol: "He and I think like each other, we have a lot of the same goals that you work with, even among churchmen."

Besides ecumenical relations, which the cardinal urges every parish to take part in, he has an active Human Relations Committee that was recently expanded from 11 to 17 members, including laymen.

He sees race relations as "the one tension that will be around for a long time, but the constant pressure of teaching, he feels, will ease it eventually."

He sees communication between individuals and parishes as an important phase of race relations. Some 1,500 high school children, he said, "have been trained to be Community Service Corps to work in the inner city area schools with young pupils on a one-to-one basis.

Despite some internal problems in his seminary last year, the seminarians are now restyled. They were given a purpose. But demonstrations should bring to the negotiations a wane smile and pretend there was a false impression given to the reader that the viewpoint of a theologian is the viewpoint of the Vatican Council." He holds that the laity has a right to administer the church in every area outside of the priesthood itself; "the sacred rites, rituals and sacraments."

THE PENSION AND EMPLOYEE BENEFIT ACT OF 1968

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Halpern) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled the Pension and Employee Benefit Act of 1968.

This legislation is designed to introduce to the body by the able and distinguished senior Senator from New York, Mr. Javits, is designed to deal with the major problems and defects in our private pension plan system. The seven-point thrust of the program would do the following:

First, establish minimum vesting standards for pension plans to assure that an employee who works under a pension plan for many years does not have to forfeit his pension rights because of some "small print" in the contract.

Second, establish minimum funding standards to assure that pension funds will be operated on a sound and solvent basis, enabling the fund to deliver the benefits which it has promised.

Third, enact a program of reinsurance of pension funds so that retirees would be insured against loss of benefits when an employer goes out of business before the plan could be fully funded.

Fourth, establish a voluntary portability fund, providing a central clearinghouse of pension credits for persons transferring from one employer to another.

Fifth, establish minimum standards of conduct, restrictions on conflicts of interest and other ethical criteria to be followed in the administration of pension and other plans providing benefits for employees, to make impossible the kind of discrimination disclosed in congressional investigations.

Sixth, establish a U.S. Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission to administer the requirements of this bill, subject to the jurisdiction of the Speaker.

Seventh, consolidate in the Commission most existing Federal regulatory standards relating to pension and welfare plans, thereby relieving employers, employees, insurance companies and banks of the necessity of dealing with many Federal agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious that with almost $100 billion invested in private pension plans and with almost no Federal regulation or minimum standards concerning their operations, this legislation is vitally necessary.

Millions of working people in this country have invested their labor during productive years in the hope that they will receive enough compensation in their later years to assure that they will continue to have justly comfortable existence. This investment by various single wage earners is multiplied manifold and reinvested, through the pension plans, in the growth of our Nation. Both of these extremely important investments, the individual and the national, must be protected in a comprehensive manner, and, I feel, if this bill is the answer to that end. Further we must assure that employees do not lose a dime of their retirement benefits because of a shift in jobs.

Three years ago, the President's Committee on Corporate Pension Funds issued a report in which it was recommended that every pension plan be required to "provide some reasonable measure of vesting for the protection of employees"; that minimum funding standards be established because "inadequate funding of private pension plans under present standards places an unwarranted financial risk on employees during their retirement years"; that "the ability of defined benefit pension arrangements for transferring and accumulating private pension credits deserves serious study"; and that, although funding provides some measure of protection for retirees, it "may not protect plan participants from losing at least some of their equity in the event of a plan's termination," and, to meet the latter problem, the idea of reinsurance is "worthy of serious study."

It was 3 years ago and until the gentleman from New York, senior Senator Jacob Javits, introduced similar legislation no one had taken steps to implement a comprehensive plan based on these recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that this body will give prompt consideration and action to this vitally needed piece of legislation. The time has come to relieve some of the burden now placed squarely on the shoulders of employees, insurance companies, and banks in dealing with a multiplicity of Federal agencies and assure that uniform and adequate safeguards are erected to protect the investment all workers have made during their productive years.

CRIME IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Poff) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. KROL. Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon, the distinguished ranking minority member of the House...
Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCulloch), made some pertinent observations concerning the President's crime message and the recommendations contained therein. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCulloch) has been informed of the special order of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Poff) and he does know the sentiments that will be expressed in general by Members of the committee and Members of the Republican task force. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCulloch) who has had great experience in the field, is coauthor of a number of the Republican bills which will be discussed. His leadership has contributed greatly to the overall Republican effort in this field.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President sent his message on crime to the Congress. He told the Congress that—

Thousands of Americans are killed or injured each year by criminal acts. Many thousands more are unable to use the streets of their cities without fear, or to feel secure in their homes or shops. Property values of almost $6 billion are lost through crime every year. Millions of dollars are taken from the productive economy of our country by gangsters. Crime formerly should be in the pockets of the poor, or in the bank accounts of honest businessmen.

For decades our system of criminal justice has been neglecting the problem of crime. For decades the conditions that nourish crime have been gathering force.

Residents ask the President why he has waited until now to take action? We ask why he has ignored the findings and recommendations of his own Crime Commission until now?

I think that every Member of Congress knows that crime is our No. 1 domestic concern. Millions of dollars are spent each year fighting crime. Crime has increased 88 percent. This alarming increase cannot be attributed to population growth, which has increased only 10 percent since 1960.

Residents believe that the administration must account to the Nation for these figures. All levels of government—local, State, and National—share responsibility in this area.

Control and prevention of crime is not solely a responsibility of government. In the first and last analysis it is the responsibility of every American. Crime cannot and will not be controlled without the support and assistance of all responsible citizens. Americans need effective and sustained leadership to mobilize and properly channel their concern into constructive action. This legacy of the Johnson administration is its failure to provide Americans with this much needed leadership. No program can fill a leadership gap.

Residents welcome the President's pledge taken by the government. But we express both disappointment and concern over inadequacies of the President's proposed program. The President has failed to fully recognize the problems of crime in America and has been misguided by the challenge. His proposed program is much like a prize fighter with dazzling foot work, but no punch.

I am concerned that an analysis will show that the President has given the Nation a political document and not a much needed plan for national action. The crime message the President proposed is substantially reduced. The Republican Party is committed to solving this problem which each year grows as a deepening crisis. While the Johnson administration slept, Republicans have developed and introduced specific legislative proposals designed to control and prevent crime and lawlessness. I believe these Republican proposals offer great promise for alleviating the problems of crime.

Indeed, the fact that the President has recommended the enactment of two proposals which were developed, drafted, introduced, and overwhelmingly supported by House Republicans—Cramer antiriot bill and the Railsback appeals bill—is but a sampling of the commitment and ability within our party to solve this problem of crime.

Others from our side of the aisle will discuss other instances where Republican leadership has substantially improved administration anticrime legislation in this and previous Congresses.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding to me.

Mr. Poff, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Recognizing the hour, Mr. Speaker, I shall be as brief as the subject will permit.

I believe it is fair to say that insofar as the President's crime message delivered to the Congress yesterday is an indication that he has only been concerned about crime legislatively, that means that he has done something about the problem of crime in this country, all Republicans will welcome the message.

Until now I think it is further fair to say that the administration has been content to rely principally upon oration and outrage. The legislative measures that have been proposed have been until now too few, too narrow, and too slow in coming. All through the administration there has been some change in the climate now and with it hopefully a recognition that what has been offered so far has been inappropriate and inadequate to meet the challenge. It is too early to attempt to make a definitive analysis of the President's proposal. We do not attempt to assume either a negative posture or positive posture with respect to the specific proposals itemized by the President. What we do mean to make plain now is that the sense of urgency conveyed by the entire message cannot help but produce the priority treatment the President in his message adopted the essence of that suggestion and then went forward to suggest an expansion of the program currently conducted in this area by the Federal Government.

Finally, and most conspicuously, the President has called now for the adoption of an antiriot bill. Those who have observed the Congress will recall the chronology of this legislation. It was first proposed as an amendment to the Civil Rights Act of 1966 by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Cramer). That amendment was adopted in the face of a substitute by an overwhelming vote.

And, as will recall the legislation, after it was passed the bill died in the other body where it died that year. I think the date upon which the bill was debated is significant. That date was July 10, 1967. And, in order to demonstrate that the President's recommendations of the antiriot bill is something of a new approach insofar as the administration is concerned, I think it is well to remember that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives during the course of that debate, made it plain at that time that the Attorney General of the United States, the chief law-enforcement officer of the United States, a member of the President's Cabinet, was opposed to the antiriot bill. In order, Mr. Speaker, that this may be made crystal clear, I would like to quote from the Congressional Record for July 19, 1967, page 19322—

"Mr. Cramer antiriot bill and the Railsback appeals bill—" again I think it is important to remember that it was the distinguished minority leader who first in the January 1966 Republican state of the Union message suggested that a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice would make a proper shop for the conduct of basic research in new techniques in law enforcement and in prisons. He said, my colleagues, he did not ask why he has ignored the findings and recommendations of his own Crime Commission until now? Mr. Poff, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday he repeated to me that yesterday he repeated to me that the legislation which the President yesterday proposed is anything but the antiriot legislation previously endorsed by the Republican task force on crime. I might add it was urgently proposed by the President's own Crime Commission several months ago.

Second, as has been indicated already, the legislation which passed the House last year making it possible for the Government to take an appeal on a motion to suppress evidence or confessions was legislation offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Railsback).

Again I think it is important to remember that it was the distinguished minority leader who first in the January 1966 Republican state of the Union message suggested that a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice should be in the pockets of the poor, or in the bank accounts of honest businessmen.

And, as will recall the legislation, after it was passed the bill died in the other body where it died that year. I think the date upon which the bill was debated is significant. That date was July 10, 1967. And, in order to demonstrate that the President's recommendations of the antiriot bill is something of a new approach insofar as the administration is concerned, I think it is well to remember that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives during the course of that debate, made it plain at that time that the Attorney General of the United States, the chief law-enforcement officer of the United States, a member of the President's Cabinet, was opposed to the antiriot bill. In order, Mr. Speaker, that this may be made crystal clear, I would like to quote from the Congressional Record for July 19, 1967, page 19322—
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Second, as has been indicated already, the legislation which passed the House last year making it possible for the Government to take an appeal on a motion to suppress evidence or confessions was legislation offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Railsback).

Again I think it is important to remember that it was the distinguished minority leader who first in the January 1966 Republican state of the Union message suggested that a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice should make a proper shop for the conduct of basic research in new techniques in law enforcement and in prisons. He said, my colleagues, he did not ask why he has ignored the findings and recommendations of his own Crime Commission until now? Mr. Poff, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.
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Mr. Speaker, yesterday he repeated to me that yesterday he repeated to me that the legislation which the President yesterday proposed is anything but the antiriot legislation previously endorsed by the Republican task force on crime. I might add it was urgently proposed by the President's own Crime Commission several months ago.
Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentle­
member yield? Mr. POFF. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, while I was not serving in the Congress of the United States, I was present at the hearings which were held on the anti­riot proposal of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], I wonder if I am not correct in my recollection of the hearings that were were held at that time, and out of which, this bill grew, relating to the interstate activities of the Ku Klux Klan and other organizations of that type, which were repeated over and over again by the various witnesses who appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. POFF. In very large measure that is true. And, the author of the amendment, during the course of the debate, was careful to call attention to the fact that it was aimed at such activities; that it had a broad application; it had a worthy application then as it has a worthy application now. And, the start­ling fact of what the President of the United States has only recently become aware of the merits of such application.

Mr. Speaker, if I may continue for just a moment, while I say it might be pre­mature to make an analysis of certain proposals in the President's message, it would be appropriate to take note of some of the omissions in the President's message.

I hear the Republican task force on crime proposed a series of bills and endorsed other bills in the general law enforcement area to most of which the President made no reference. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to extend at this point in the record an excerpt from the report of the task force.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NIXON). Is there objection to the quorum of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was none.

The excerpts referred to follow:

I. ORGANIZED CRIME

A. Electronic surveillance—a bill which outlawed all wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping by federal, state, and local government officials under Court approval and continuous Court supervision during national security investigations and investigations of certain organized crime type cases. The Task Force believes that enactment of this legislation would be the single most important step in combating organized crime. The McCulloch­Bord bill (H.R. 13376, October 3, 1967), co­sponsored by the Task Force, follows the blueprint of such legislation fashioned by the Supreme Court in the Berger­Bord case.

B. Witness immunity—a bill to expand the power of the Government to compel the testimony of witnesses, but to protect them from prosecution when they plead the Fifth Amendment during the investigation and during the trial of certain organized crime cases. The Criminal Procedure Revision Act (H.R. 11268, June 29, 1967), co­sponsored by the Task Force, provides:

C. Money laundering—a bill which would make it a federal crime to launder money which has been derived from illegal activities. The bill was first proposed by Rep. William Cramer (R.-P.I.), a Task Force member, in 1960, and is contained in Title I of the Criminal Procedure Revision Act.

D. False statements—a bill which makes the rules of evidence in perjury prosecu­tions applicable to false statements. This is contained in Title II of the Criminal Pro­cedure Revision Act and was recommended by the Katzenbach Crime Commission.

E. Profits from Criminal activities—a bill which makes it a federal crime to invest money which has been derived from illegal activities in legitimate enterprises. This is the Criminal Activities Profits Act (H.R. 11296, June 29, 1967) co­sponsored by the Task Force.

F. Funds unreported for tax purposes—a bill which makes it a federal crime to invest money which has not been reported for federal income tax purposes. This is H.R. 11296, co­sponsored by the Task Force, and principally aimed at organized crime.

II. CONGRESSIONAL CRIMINAL PROCEDURES

1. Motion to suppress—a bill creating in the Government a limited right to appeal to a higher Court the granting of a defendant's motion to suppress confessions and other evidence. This is H.R. 11296, co­sponsored by the Task Force, and principally aimed at organized crime.

2. Joint Congressional Committee on Organized Crime—a bill creating a permanent bi­ partisan Committee of both Houses of Congress to investigate organized crime and report its extent, impact and effect to the American public. This is H.R. 6054, first proposed by Rep. Cramer.

III. THE POLICE

1. Survivorship and disability benefits—a proposal to provide Federal survivorship and disability benefits for local police and nonfederal law enforcement officials who are injured or killed in the line of duty or who are forced to retire because of serious injury or illness. The President did not take a position on this proposal.

2. Supervisor and Sheriff's deputies—a bill to provide Federal survivorship and disability benefits for local law enforcement personnel. The President did not take a position on this proposal.

3. Federal Magistrates—a bill to abolish the present U.S. Commissioner system and to appoint federal magistrates, who are empowered to handle minor trials and otherwise perform routine Court functions that presently are performed by the Law Enforcement and Judicial Officers, U.S. Magistrates, who are required to handle minor trials and to otherwise perform routine Court functions that presently are performed by the Law Enforcement and Judicial Officers.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, these bills, we think, enjoyed a large measure of support from every echelon of Government and the entire community which deals with the problem of criminal justice in America. The subjects they address in­clude the prevention of crime, methods of apprehension, arrest, interrogation and prosecution of the suspect, and rehabilitation of the convicted criminal.

We suggest that the President and his advisers will want to examine this list of bills and hopefully give bipartisan support to those which they consider meritorious.

Further emission in the President's message. I believe, will be under­scored. First of all I was disappointed to learn that the President did not take the opportunity to endorse the legislation which passed the House last year on June 6, 1967. That legislation originally was a proposal to create a Federal agency and to provide for personnel to supervise the activities of defendants released on personal recognizance prior to trial.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, these bills, we think, enjoyed a large measure of support from every echelon of Government and the entire community which deals with the problem of criminal justice in America. The subjects they address in­clude the prevention of crime, methods of apprehension, arrest, interrogation and prosecution of the suspect, and rehabilitation of the convicted criminal.

We suggest that the President and his advisers will want to examine this list of bills and hopefully give bipartisan support to those which they consider meritorious.

Further emission in the President's message. I believe, will be under­scored. First of all I was disappointed to learn that the President did not take the opportunity to endorse the legislation which passed the House last year on June 6, 1967. That legislation originally was a proposal to create a Federal agency and to provide for personnel to supervise the activities of defendants released on personal recognizance prior to trial.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, these bills, we think, enjoyed a large measure of support from every echelon of Government and the entire community which deals with the problem of criminal justice in America. The subjects they address in­clude the prevention of crime, methods of apprehension, arrest, interrogation and prosecution of the suspect, and rehabilitation of the convicted criminal.

We suggest that the President and his advisers will want to examine this list of bills and hopefully give bipartisan support to those which they consider meritorious.

Further emission in the President's message. I believe, will be under­scored. First of all I was disappointed to learn that the President did not take the opportunity to endorse the legislation which passed the House last year on June 6, 1967. That legislation originally was a proposal to create a Federal agency and to provide for personnel to supervise the activities of defendants released on personal recognizance prior to trial.
ment of a national police state, and all patriotic Americans abhor that possibility. It was because we have such fears that the Cahill amendment was attached to the safe streets bill.

The original safe streets bill, the Members will recall, vested complete authority in the Attorney General of the United States to administer the funds authorized and appropriated by Congress under this legislation, and to allocate money among the several States, or communities in the States, as he in his sole discretion saw fit.

The Cahill amendment, on the other hand, conceived with a block-grant approach, returned primary control of the funds and operation of the program to the State and local authorities where it belonged.

Mr. MacGregor. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

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

Mr. MacGregor. Mr. Speaker, I would like to subscribe to and endorse the most excellent summary made by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, regarding the law enforcement and criminal justice assistance act passed by the 90th Congress of Representatives in August of last year. I am sure the gentleman joins with me in deploiring the fact that this excellent legislation, commended by the National Association of Attorneys General, by virtually all agencies concerned with law enforcement and criminal justice, this excellent House bill, has languished without effective action in the U.S. Senate.

One further point I deem it most important to make here: I regret that the President in his crime message has charted a course of retreat in support for law enforcement and criminal justice instrumentalities.

The President a year ago in February of 1967 indicated in his crime message to the Congress of that date that:\n
Our best estimate is that the federal investment under this act--\n
The Crime Control Act--
in its second year would be approximately $300 million.

Then Attorney General Ramsey Clark, in testimony on March 15 of 1967, before the House Committee on the Judiciary, said:

For fiscal year 1969 $800 million will be asked to commence a sweeping action program.

It was with great disappointment that I found the President in his state of the Union message, and again in his crime message reiterating from $300 million to $100 million in his recommended support of the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act for its second year of operation.

Mr. Poff. I thank the gentleman for his most meaningful contribution.

Mr. Gerald R. Ford. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Poff. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Gerald R. Ford. Let me say most emphatically that certainly the country is the beneficiary because the Republican task force on crime is headed by the gentleman from Virginia, I, and my colleagues, are grateful for his many contributions and his leadership.

I also would like to add, I am now reliably informed that 49 of the 50 Governors have endorsed the House version of the anticrime bill that was passed in 1967. This is the legislation which grew out of the Cahill amendments to the crime bill. This endorsement by 49 out of our 50 Governors should insure the support of the administration for this legislation.

Mr. Poff. The gentleman has anticipated my speech and put it infinitely more pungently than I could.

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

Mr. Poff. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MacGregor. I would like to give credit at this time to some of the very capable supporters of the efforts and leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Cahill), specifically to Republican Congressman Biester of Pennsylvania, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Biondi), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McClory), who were the prime architects in supporting the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Camm.) in developing and gaining support from Republican and Democrat alike for the excellent Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1967.

Mr. Poff. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Taft. I would like to ask the gentleman a question with regard to the Law Enforcement Assistance Act—or, if you want to call it, the safe streets bill. I think there may be a lack of understanding as to the impact of this bill.

The impact of this bill, as I understand it, is one of funds—the funds that go to the training of law enforcement officers; how those funds are distributed, and how they can be most effective.

I certainly share the gentleman's assessment of the Cahill amendment and the direction that we hope any final legislation will take.

I think there is in the minds of the public a concept that there is something over and beyond mere assistance in the financing of police training and other law enforcement activities and research. I think we should point out that the very guts of the bill is what we are talking about here.

The impact of the bill. There is a special activity or special magic that the Federal Government brings to this situation.

Mr. Poff. I am glad the gentleman has brought that point. All those who are aware of the original Safe Streets Act of 1967, and this includes the President's own crime commission, that the chief need is improved training and better and more police officers at the State and local levels. This is exactly the target of this legislation.

Continuing now, if I may briefly, Mr. Speaker, to comment upon the more conspicuous omissions in the President's crime message, a similar amendment to that just discussed was offered in the Juvenile Delinquency Act adopted in the House last year and again that amendment was of Republican origin.

I hope that the President did not mean, to disavow or reject that amendment to that legislation.

Another measure that the President did not mention is the amendment adopted by an overwhelming vote in the House only last week while the House was debating the truth-in-lending bill. That amendment, as you will recall, was aimed at organized crime involvement in the nefarious practice of loan sharking.

I am hopeful that the President's failure to mention this amendment was intended to indicate his support of that amendment.

Mr. Smith of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. Smith of New York. I would like to bring to the attention of the House that it was through the efforts of the gentleman in the well that the amendment which make loan sharking a Federal crime was added to the truth-in-lending bill. This amendment by 49 out of our 50 Governors should insure the support of the administration for this legislation.

Mr. Poff. The gentleman has anticipated my speech and put it infinitely more pungently than I could.

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

Mr. Poff. I yield to the gentleman.
I was pleased to note the President's comments about the so-called safe streets bill and his hope that the Congress would address itself to a resolution of the impasse which resulted from the Senate's, and, unwillingness to accept the House version, at least as it appears to the present time. I know that with the weight of the President behind a resolution of this impasse, we are going to make some progress, although it appears to be delayed.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the President's message and his great emphasis on the fact that the Attorney General is the man to call if one is concerned about crime indicates also that we will find a new vigor in the expressed attitudes of the Attorney General toward the problems of organized crime, particularly in the wiretapping area. Many of us have been concerned about where we were headed there. Certainly, organized crime is one very legitimate concern of the Federal Government.

It involves a network, a countrywide network, and one which is interstate or interstate in most nefarious areas.

We look forward to some new approaches, to some new vigor in the fight against organized crime, if the President does not pass a resolution of the impasse, we are going to make some progress, although it appears to be delayed.

I hope that the President's message and his great emphasis on the fact that the Attorney General is the man to call if one is concerned about crime indicates also that we will find a new vigor in the expressed attitudes of the Attorney General toward the problems of organized crime, particularly in the wiretapping area. Many of us have been concerned about where we were headed there. Certainly, organized crime is one very legitimate concern of the Federal Government.

I know the Republican task force on crime will indicate its efforts and its best efforts and its most important efforts last year, the bill that was passed by the House of Representatives, in September of last year, the Attorney General of the United States, the President and the Congress, and I only hope I can deserve the tribute that I have heard today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that the gentleman from Minnesota would be welcome on the Republican task force on crime. It involves a network, a countrywide network, and one which is interstate or interstate in most nefarious areas.
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The House Republican Policy Committee urges the enactment of H.R. 421. This Republican sponsored legislation (the Cramer bill) would impose criminal penalties upon the facilities of interstate commerce with the intent to incite a riot.

Last year in response to a growing public demand for criminal justice and law and order in the streets and urban centers of our land, Republican antiriot legislation was adopted in the House of Representatives, as an amendment to the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966, by a vote of 389 to 25. That legislation was permitted to die in the Senate. Now, as a result of continuing pressure and leadership by Republican Members, this vital legislation is being brought to the House for consideration and measure.

The proposed legislation represents the legitimate exercise of Federal criminal power under authority based on the commerce clause. It is intended to prevent, in certain types of conduct that have been prohibited by Federal Statute when the facilities of interstate commerce are used. For example, there is no restriction upon the interstate transportation of strike breakers, the Federal Kidnapping statute and the Anti-Racketeer Act.

H.R. 421 is not intended to and does not limit the right of dissent and peaceful demonstration. Legitimate activities by those who participate in public gatherings or other lawful demonstrations are not affected. However, those persons who use facilities in interstate commerce with the intent to incite or attempt to incite riots, violence, looting, vandalism, arson, bombing, and physical assaults would be subject to prosecution.

This bill would supplement, not supersede local law enforcement. Certainly, it makes sense to provide a new and effective law enforcement weapon in riot situations like those that have occurred in Cleveland, Cincinnati, Dayton, Boston, Buffalo, and Waterloo. Many of the summer time riots have been traced to troublemakers who travel about this Nation inciting riots. It is imperative that we rid interstate commerce of these agitators and riot-mongers. The law-abiding citizens in the area where the riots occur may suffer grievous personal injury and un­told property losses. The adoption of this additional protection is afforded them.

One of the primary duties of Government is to establish and maintain law and order. Our very survival as a free and effective society depends upon how successfully we are able to implement this basic concept.

In the first session of the 90th Congress, Republicans sponsored and supported legislation that must be enacted if we are to win the battle against crime. A bill that would establish a Federal program to provide assistance to local law enforcement agencies was passed by the House with the overwhelming support of the Republican Members. Similarly, the Open-End Authorization for Local Law Enforcement Program would impose criminal penalties upon persons traveling in, or using the facilities of interstate commerce with the intent to incite a riot, was also passed by the House.

Unfortunately, this essential legislation was not adopted by the Senate during the first session. We are hopeful that, with the new-found interest and support of the President, this legislation will be enacted into law without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record at this point the House Republican policy committee statements of July 12, 1967, and August 2, 1967, that deal with this important legislation. As chairman of the policy committee, I believe that these statements carefully set forth the need for this legislation and the reasons we urge its early enactment.

The statements referred to follow:

HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON THE ANTI-Riot LEGISLATION, H.R. 421, JULY 12, 1967
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Unfortunately, this essential legislation was not adopted by the Senate during the first session. We are hopeful that, with the new-found interest and support of the President, this legislation will be enacted into law without further delay.
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The President desires controls on the hallucinatory drug, LSD—a measure first suggested by my Republican colleague from Nebraska [Mr. Connelly].

The President also asks for riot control legislation—legislation which my Republican colleague from Florida [Mr. Cox] and many other Republican Members, including myself, have been urging for years.

The President wants to make it a Federal crime "to engage in gambling as a substantial business affecting interstate commerce." I refer him to the legislation first sponsored by my Republican colleague from Virginia [Mr. Poff]—and others—which would accomplish precisely this.

The President wants legislation to permit the Federal Government to appeal pretrial orders granting motions to suppress evidence. I suggest that he examine a bill first introduced last session by my colleague from Illinois [Mr. Railsback].

As you will note, Mr. Speaker, many proposals made in the President's crime message reveal a decidedly Republican attitude on the subject of crime.

If imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, the Republicans modestly accept the role of pacemakers for the present administration. But we are not "being deceived" nor will the American public be deceived.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that in this election year of 1968 the President has suddenly awakened to a national crisis in crime. He is even prepared to share the blame for this disgraceful crisis.

He implores that it not be made a partisan issue in the forthcoming election.

His wish is understandable! But the escalation of crime in this country is an issue.

Not because anyone makes it an issue. But because the senseless, spiraling, rise of crime in this land has struck fear and frustration into the hearts of the good men and women of this Nation.

It is an issue because the present administration has failed to comprehend and cope with it.

It is an issue and a culpability the administration cannot escape or share.

The people of this country know who was manning the watch when the ship of state ran aground on this rocky shoal.

The President's election year message is a sorry excuse for the dangerous course he has charted and is pursuing with the good men and women of this Nation.
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The President calls for legislation to reduce bank crimes

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in 1963

when the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations was reestablished, one of the most serious crime problems facing the Nation was the continuing rise in crimes against banking institutions. Embezzlements committed within banks had, for years, been increasing both in the number of offenses and in the amounts stolen from banks. In addition, and even more serious, those institutions were increasingly being subjected to robberies and burglaries.

It is an obligation of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee to evaluate the present status of the economy with which agencies under its jurisdiction conduct their operations. All of the Federal banking supervisory agencies are within the subcommittee's oversight jurisdiction. As chairman of the subcommittee, I therefore directed that a study be made of the operations of the supervisory agencies, as they related to the bank crime problems. That study resulted in a report, entitled "Crimes Against Banking Institutions," by the Committee on Banking and Currency, 1966, 89th Congress, second session.

That report contained the following recommendations:

RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to combat the rise in crimes against banking institutions it is recommended:

1. That the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board notify the Department of Justice, through the FBI, the presence of and attempt the apprehension of any criminal suspects in connection with violations of banking laws.

2. That in establishing such guidelines the supervisory agencies consider the adequacy of the institution's security features banking institutions and have provided to guard against robberies and burglaries. The agencies attempt to ascertain and advise on any security deficiencies in institutions they supervise, thus arming them with some means of excluding underworld elements from taking over the institutions.

The agencies also have increased the instruction given their examiners on the perils of bank crimes, and have sought through instruction and moral persuasion to convince banks and bankers to better protect their institutions against crimes. However, they have not done enough—the easy test of that fact is that it is almost impossible to pick up a newspaper on any day without reading about a current bank robbery. External crimes against banks have continued to increase, and they increased particularly sharply in the past year.

In 1966 these crimes against financial institutions protected by the Federal bank robbery statute reached an all-time high of 1,871. Figures recently made available by the Federal Bureau of Investigation indicate that the total reached 2,551 in 1967—reflecting approximately a 30-percent increase.

The dollar amounts stolen from victimized banks are staggering. Data compiled by the American Bankers Association show that losses to federally insured banks, alone, resulting from robberies committed from January through June 1967, totaled $3.3 million, compared with $1.3 million in the same 6-month period of 1966. Additionally, large losses were suffered due to burglaries.

These statistics do not reflect the cost of investigating these crimes by law enforcement agencies.

As our report pointed out, of even greater concern than the dollar losses, is the peril to human lives as bank robberies represent. Bank officers and employees, customers, and police of-
Although size and air pollution do not necessarily coincide, New York City has the most potential to become the worst offender in the Nation. It is also the largest city. We have both the resources and technologies to insure clean and healthy air now in all our cities. Our failures are simply failures of will and administration.

Unfortunately, the New York City administration has been providing the worst administration of air pollution control efforts of any major city in America. Although faced with almost certain air pollution disasters, the city administration has failed to establish an essential emergency plan to ward off such disasters which have occurred.

For more than a year, the city administration has failed to use available Federal funds for air pollution control. The Federal Government has had to extend the grant.

The administration is the city's worst polluter by far. It is also the city's worst violator of the air pollution law and its worst scofflaw. It is scoffing at State law, which requires it to use fuel burning. It is scoffing at its own law governing municipal and apartment house incinerators. It has encouraged landlords to scoff at the laws. The Conference has confirmed the facts of my testimony before the Conference about its failures.

A new city law, local law 14, had required upgrading of incinerators in large apartment buildings by May 20, 1967. In testimony on February 1, 1968, the New York City commissioner of air pollution control, Austin N. Heller, confirmed that the administration's own ruling that buildings constructed before 1961 would not have to upgrade incinerators "was the final 'coup de grace'" to the law.

Although city law required an end to open burning by May 20, 1967, Commissioner Heller stated that open burning had been permitted "until November of this past year."

Although municipal incinerators violate the present code, and city law requires upgrading of all municipal incinerators before 1969 le. the commissioner confirmed that —

It now appears unlikely that all the municipal incinerator furnaces will be able to comply with this deadline.

Although the law required upgrading of incinerators in some 9,000 large apartment houses over seven stories by May 20, 1967, the commissioner admitted in his testimony that less than 2 percent or some 150 upgraded on-site incinerators have received certificates of operation since the effective date of the new law.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I asked the Conference to make part of the public record a list of the major particular polluters in the area. On February 1, 1968, the Conference released a list of 144 point sources emitting more than 100 tons per year of particulate matter. The point source report reveals that New York City's municipal incinerators produce 17,223 tons per year of particulate matter. On the basis of a 6-day week this is 83.6 tons per day. The figure used in my testimony, which was obtained from the New York City Department of Air Pollution Control, was 15,000 tons per year, which is probably worse than the city's own estimate.

I asked the Conference to require that New York City—

Immediately develop a workable automatic emergency plan to prevent the next pollution disaster.

Comply immediately with the 1967 Conference recommendations for the sulfur content of fuels;

Set requirements that those who burn coal and fuel oil use fuel which generates less particulate matter or install adequate control and collection equipment;

Enforce the ban on open burning;

Immediately enforce upgrading or shutting down of all private incinerators along with necessary steps to handle the additional refuse;

Upgrade the municipal incinerators and install precipitators or bag filters; submit monthly reports and comply by a deadline of no more than the end of the year; and

Immediately make actual use of granted Federal funds.

I urged the Conference to require New Jersey to comply immediately with last year's Conference recommendations for the sulfur content of coal.

I pointed out that the use of coal should be reduced because of its particulate-producing effects.

I called upon the Conference to make specific recommendations to deal with the dangerous problem of particles which are smaller than 5 microns.

I urged the Conference to prepare a comprehensive emergency plan for the entire New York-New Jersey 17-county area, to be implemented by phase as the level of pollutants rises.

Finally, I asked that the Conference remain in continuing session and that regular reports be submitted to the presiding officer. If air pollution is to be significantly reduced, then the Conference's continuing jurisdiction is required.

I include at this point in the Record my testimony on January 30, 1968, before the second session of the New York-New Jersey Air Pollution Abatement Conference;

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM F. RYAN BEFORE THE SECOND SESSION, NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT CONFERENCE AT NEW YORK UNIVERSITY ALUMMEN HALL, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 30, 1968

This Second Session of the Interstate Air Pollution Abatement Conference is investigating particular pollution which endangers health and reveals that gas in the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area.

But this session also has another stated purpose, to evaluate just what action has been taken since the first session one year ago to control sulfur dioxide pollution.

When I testified at the first session in January 1967, I pointed out that the problems of pollution are so large. We know its costs and its damage to health and property. We have the power, the funds and the knowledge to solve the problem.

"The need today," I pointed out then, "is not primarily for more discussions, new technologies or even new laws. The need today is action."

This Conference made recommendations that forced action.

New York State has complied generally with the recommendations. New Jersey has
followed some of the recommendations. The Consolidated Edison Company has taken major steps...

But New York City, despite its highly publicized promises, has acted not for strict control. The actions of Consolidated Edison and the City are much less strict than we expected. This lack of control is due to the City's failure to have clear and enforceable rules for pollution control. The City's regulations are not well enforced, and the City's inspectors are often too lenient. This lax enforcement has allowed pollution to continue unchecked.

Today I am testifying more in sorrow than in anger. I am testifying to New York City's ineptitude, broken promises, and shocking failures.

New York City has the most polluted air in the nation. We pump more poison per square mile into our air than any other major city, some 9,000 tons a day. New York City's air is not the dirtiest simply because the city is the largest. San Francisco, for instance, ranks seventh in the nation in population but it ranks 35th in terms of pollution. Wilmington, Delaware, ranks 84th in population but 14th in terms of pollution. New York City's pollution is almost 10 times that in the remainder of the New York metropolitan area.

The Administration of air pollution control efforts in New York City by the Federal government has failed to establish an adequate essential agency with legal authority to control pollution. New York City has failed to obtain necessary power to manage air pollution control efforts. It has not been able to bring to bear the necessary resources to manage air pollution control efforts. It has had a large budget for air pollution control efforts, but it has not been able to make significant progress on pollution control efforts.

The New York City Board of Estimate, appointed by the mayor and confirmed by the city council, has failed to adopt the necessary policies and programs to control air pollution. The Board of Estimate has not been able to allocate sufficient resources to air pollution control efforts. It has not been able to provide the necessary leadership and direction for air pollution control efforts. It has been unable to achieve the necessary coordination and cooperation among the various agencies and programs involved in air pollution control efforts.

The Consolidated Edison Company has de-
declared its intention to "cooperate with Federal, State, and local officials in every way to attain the goal of clean air for New York." Chairman Charles F. Luce formally supported this goal on March 20, 1969.

By last December, Con Edison had switched to fuel oil of one per cent sulfur. By April, 1969, it proposed to meet the one per cent standard.

As a past critic of Con Edison's failures in air pollution control, it is a pleasure to comment on the company's progress. Con Edison's actions alone prove the soundness of the Conference approach.

However, in the fight against air pollution, New York City Administration has taken its stand with the pollutants and against clean air.

Neither New York's Local Law 14 nor proposed additions to the law comply with Conference recommendations or with New York State Rule 200. The City law would permit use of more sulfur-rich fuels for longer times.

(Provisions of Local Law 14, coal and residual oil is limited to 2.5 per cent sulfur. On May 20, 1969, it would be limited to 2 per cent and on May 20, 1971, to 1 per cent. Under the proposed amendment to Local Law 14, Number 4 oil would be limited to 1.25 per cent and Number 4 oil and 1.75 per cent sulfur. On May 20, 1969, Number 4 oil would be limited to 1.6 per cent and on May 20, 1971, Number 4 oil would be limited to 1 per cent.)

Studies have shown that the worst recorded concentrations of sulfur in the heart of Manhattan, around the 121st Street air pollution sampling station. At the first session of this Conference, William F. Meggers, Administrator of Health, Education, and Welfare reported that an 8 per cent reduction of sulfur dioxide pollution would be needed to meet the maximum standards around the 121st Street station.

In its summary report of the first session, the Conference stated that to bring air pollution under control, sulfur dioxide would "require an overall reduction in emissions of slightly more than 80 per cent."

When the New York State Air Pollution Control Board held hearings on Rule 200, the New York City Administration defended the rule as necessary to control sulfur-rich fuels.

The Commissioner of Air Pollution Control, Austin Heller, testified against the rule and pleaded for the continued use of more sulfur-rich fuels.

Commissioner Heller has made clear the City Administration's objective—not cleaner air but cheaper costs for polluting landlords and lower costs for our largest polluter, New York City.

At the Rule 200 hearing, he said, "An 80 per cent reduction may not be necessary to achieve our air quality objective."

He said, and these are his words, "It is incumbent upon us to examine the economic implications of the proposed rule and suggest modifications."

Commissioner Heller pleaded for a system of interruptible gas and Number 2 fuel oil, which up to now have stated would not necessarily meet the standards. He has said that, if the regulations were relaxed and this system were used, "It would be far less expensive."

Presumably by "us" he meant the real estate lobby and the City Administration's friends in the City Council.

On the one hand, the City Administration says cost is not a factor. Clean air is cheaper. On the other hand, it pleads for less effective and less expensive solutions.

As I said at the time of the Rule 200 hearings, the Administration has given a shocking defense of go slow abstention and continued air pollution.

NO WORKABLE EMERGENCY PLAN

With present levels of sulfur dioxide, carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide and particulate pollution, New York City still faces the threat of an air pollution disaster. Holding down the poisons to create a pollution disaster. The Public Health Service has warned of such episodes.

In its Phase II report for this Conference, the Public Health Service warns: "Based on past records, the New York Metropolitan Area is likely to experience epis­odes per year. In one-half of the years an episode will occur in September or October and one-third of the episodes will persist seven days or longer. The remainder of the episodes are most likely to occur in the fall."

In a recent letter to me, Dr. John T. Middi­foster, Director of the Public Health Service's National Center for Air Pollution Control, wrote: "We share your great concern of the possi­bility—indeed, the probability—of another air pollution episode in the New York-New Jersey area."

In testimony before this Conference last year I noted that New York City had suffered an inversion which brought a near disaster during Thanksgiving, 1968. I pointed out that the episode of November 24, 1968, also during the inversion build up on Wednesday, No­vember 23rd, at 12:07 P.M., but did not issue an official alert until Friday, November 25th, at 1:15 P.M.

I called for the immediate establishment of an adequate air monitoring network to provide an automatic warning system. Further, I noted, "This system must involve a mandatory shutdown of major pollution sources."

As an inversion occurs, and pollution builds up, such an emergency action plan would provide for the automatic shutdown of selected sources of pollution, thus preventing the killing disaster.

The Federal Weather Bureau warns localities of inversions and the threat of air pollution disasters. It has made clear the need for an automatic warning system. It pointed out that Los Angeles has a workable action plan. It has inspired the nation, including $3 billion in grants for the 121st Street Health Administration's Air Pollution Disas­ter Prevention Plan.

But such action is not enough. It is necessary to be prepared for the next pollution disaster. It is necessary to know when the disaster will occur. Yet New York has not made a start. However, the New York City Administration has opposed adequate regulation, failed in enforcement and failed to prepare for predicted pollution disasters.

PART II—PARTICULATE POLLUTION

Danger to health and property

This session of the Conference is investigat­ing particulate pollution.

The Conference has already determined that particulate matter is critical, not just by itself, but as the carrier of damaging and deadly pollutants.

At last year's conference, Dr. Richard A. Wilson, assistant surgeon general and director, Bureau of Disease Prevention and Environmental Control, Department of Health, Edu­cation, and Welfare, said that the greatest danger in aerosols is the SO2, that rapidly oxidizes to SO3, which combines with moisture to form sulfuric acid mist. The membranes and tissues of the respiratory system are more de­trimental to health than to damage to property. The lungs would supply this moisture if SO2, adsorbed on particulates, is breathed and carried deep into the respiratory system. Then the lungs would fill with small particulate matter, smaller than 5 microns in diameter, which are expelled, smaller particles—those less than 5 microns in diameter (approximately 56% or 156,000 tons per year)—remain airborne indefinitely; they are small enough to be in­spected deep into the human respiratory sys­tem.

Fine particulates accompany coarse emis­sions (such as from coal burning, incinera­tion, and such) and are included in the smog. They emanate from the burning of natural gas, fuel oil and vehicular fuels. Even when particulates are stringently controlled, these particulates still escape the net. Their size is an order of magnitude smaller than those of most particulate pollution. A solution must be found for this danger to human health. I urge that the Conference make specific recommen­dations to deal with this problem.

Greatest densities of all types of par­ticulate pollution are found in highly popu­lated business districts of large cities. The 121st Street air pollution episode in Manhattan, as in 1968, is an example. Values in Manhattan range from 3.7 tons per square mile on a minimum heating day to 6.4 tons per square mile on a maximum heating day. Average particulate pollution densities are more than three times greater than those of Hudson County, the next most con­taminated area.

Six of the square-mile zones in New York City have emission densities exceeding 10 tons per day. On a maximum heating day in New York City, particulate emissions have reached a level of 479.4 tons. These figures reflect the greater quantities of refuse incinerated and the greater concentration of power plants in New York City.

Manhattan is also a center of heavy den­sities of settleable particulates (concentra­tions in suspension greater than 35 tons per square mile) and suspended particulates (The 121st Street station rates a measurement of "high pollution") that are not found elsewhere in New York City.

In the book, "Air Conservation," The Amer­ican Association for the Advancement of Science notes that small particles may carry various lethal disease germs, including free radicals and gases. These pollutant particles can induce mutagenic effects similar to those of radiation. The sulfuric acid mist combination of particulates with other pol­lutants, particularly the SO2 which we have in abundance in our ambient air, could be a serious danger to health. Insols to some portion of the respiratory tract by pollutants may alter the receptivity to infection and may cause chronic chronic respiratory disease. This is the part scientists and medical experts are beginning to assign to pollutants in the increase of respiratory ailments.

Another work, "Health, Air Pollution and Control," notes that "sensitivity to effects of sulfur dioxide is markedly increased by cer­tain conditions, which are not yet understood."

In damage to property, particulate matter is a major offender. As noted, we are spending something like $11 billion per year in the nation, including $4 billion a year in the
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17-county metropolitan area, for air pollution damage. Much of this expenditure is for the removal of settled particles from buildings (commercial and residential), clothing, household effects, and building surfaces.

**Major sources**

The pollutants are now pouring a total of about 240,000 tons of particulate matter into the air over the 17-county area. This is about 90,000 tons more than the amount reported in the Phase II Particulate Matter report. This increase is attributable mainly to the New York City municipal incinerators and to rock crushing and burning operations.

Fuel oil and chiefly coal, burned primarily by power plants and residential heating units, contribute 56 percent of the total. Refuse burning contributes about 19 percent. Motor vehicles contribute 14 percent, industrial processes 10 percent, and aircraft and shipping less than one percent.

The major particulate pollutants are those who burn fuel oil, coal, and refuse. They generate three-fourths of all particulate pollution.

New York City installations are a major source of particulates. New York City operates many burning units as well as some 2,666 Housing Authority incinerators and 11 huge municipal incinerators.

Last January I asked this Conference to list major producers of sulfur dioxide pollution. The Conference released a list showing us who is poisoning us and how much.

I understand the Public Health Service has pinpointed some 137 major sources of particulate pollution, each of which generates about one ton of particulate matter per year.

These sources include 26 steam-electric power plants, 78 industrial sites (fuel, process, or incineration combined), 21 municipal incinerators, and 7 miscellaneous coal-burning operations.

On February 8, 1968, I proposed to this Administration that the refuse, oil, and gas burning sources now discharging more than one ton of particulate air pollution each year be considered major offenders. There are more than 12,000 apartment house, flue-fed incinerators, each discharging more than a ton of particulate pollution. Few of the apartment house incinerators and none of the municipal incinerators are meeting the City’s emission standards.

At the present time, with the full knowledge of the Public Health Service, every inch of the Administration is doing nothing to close noncomplying incinerators in New York City. In my view, the Administration is violating the law.

Not only is the Administration not enforcing its own law, it is itself violating the law and in some instances even encouraging landlords to violate the law.

In 1966 the City Commissioners adopted Local Law 14 requiring all private incinerators in buildings over six stories to be upgraded by May 20, 1967, and in other buildings by May 20, 1968.

Upgrading of the incinerators would require two types of proven, available equipment—first, a scrubber to lower burning temperatures to at least 1,400 degrees for minimal efficient burning and a scrubber to trap solid particles before they pour into the atmosphere.

Commissioner Heller estimated the average cost of the upgrading would be $7,000 per incinerator.

The Administration has gone through a series of contradictory statements, retractions, and inter-Administration arguments.

**Health authorities incinerators**

On April 28, 1967, Commissioner Heller proclaimed in the New York Times that the City’s Housing Authority, “has taken all the necessary steps to meet the deadline for upgrading 1,169 of its 2,666 incinerators by May 20, 1967.”

On May 21, 1967, Commissioner Heller made a public tour of the Authority’s Robert Fulton Houses, which had been using upgraded incinerators for three years.

Then apparently the Housing Authority had spent another $25 million—unknown. Although the City had estimated it would cost $7,000 to upgrade each incinerator, the Authority claimed it would cost $19,000, or a total of $23 million.

As of yesterday, the New York City Housing Authority has completely failed to live up to its word work on combustion devices for less than 1/2 (or only 305) of the 1,169 incinerators. It has contracted on, more than one third (or 343) scrubbers. Thus, the Housing Authority incinerators continue in violation of the Air Pollution Code and Local Law 14, although the deadline was May 20, 1967.

Apparently, it has done nothing about the 1,407 incinerators that must be upgraded by May 20, 1967, and yet the Authority now claims it has not even taken steps to reduce particulate emission from oil burning.

**Apartment house incinerators**

Now I ask you to listen to the story of New York City’s upgrading of apartment house incinerators.

On April 20, 1967, Commissioner Heller publicly warned landlords that he intended to close incinerators in apartment houses that failed to meet standards effective May 20, 1967. According to the New York Times, the Commissioner proclaimed: “I am very unsympathetic to the seeming lack of willingness or ability to comply with the standards.”

I am very unsympathetic to the seeming lack of willingness or ability to comply with the financial ability and all the information they need to meet this deadline.

That added up to $25 million a year. Every incinerator that does not have a valid certificate of operation will be served a notice that within five days the incinerator will be sealed or shut down.

But on May 20, when the law went into effect, the Administration jumped several different days, and even months.

Up until 1961 some apartments constructed in New York City were built with incinerators and some without incinerators. In 1961 the City issued a permit for new apartment houses to be built with incinerators. This fact gave the Administration its loophole.

When the new law took effect, Commissioner Heller ruled that owners of large buildings built with incinerators before 1961 would not necessarily have to abide by the law. They could choose whether to upgrade their incinerators or to shut them down.

Mephisto was— and I quote the New York Times of August 5, 1967— ‘to make them even with pre-1951 owners who had selected garbage removal in their buildings.

But on May 21, after the law went into effect, Commissioner Heller permitted them to stay in business, although he had considered the fact that closing incinerators would mean more garbage on the street and more work for the Sanitation Department.

At the same time, however, the Commissioner said 75 inspectors would check more than 50,000 units and informed landlords that in five days inspectors would seal incinerators. Landlords would be fined $25 and billed for additional garbage collection.

But on May 20, 1967, almost 500 out of the 1,169 incinerators in the City were still burning.

In a private warning letter to Commissioner Heller, the Sanitation Commissioner had not talked to the Sanitation Commissioner, who said he was not sure the City could charge for the collection or could handle the added garbage.

If the May 20 deadline passed, landlords were given a $25 mailed notice that the Sanitation Department would seal the incinerator.

In July the Mayor signed a new housing Code which did not require that incinerators be installed in apartment houses. Theoretically, that Code was to take effect after all incinerators had been upgraded.

The City Administration is a member of the same Administration as the Air Pollution Control and Sanitation Commissioners, promptly ruled that because of the new Code the deadline could be extended.

Then the Sanitation Department jumped in and pointed out that, if all incinerators were to be sealed, the City would not possibly handle the garbage increase.

By September, Commissioner Heller had forgotten the old May 20 deadline. Now he promised a three-year program to give landlords the option of upgrading their incinerators, installing compaction equipment or disposing of their garbage by other means.

The Sanitation Commissioner pointed out that all this was predicated on his getting 800 new collection trucks to haul away the garbage. The new trucks were advertised for $11.6 million for 800 new trucks.

But the City Administration and others have introduced amendments to Local Law 14 on incinerators. The Administration proposes three alternatives: upgrading all of them, as the Commissioner Robert Low introduced an amendment which would require all landlords by May 20, 1968, to either upgrade their incinerators or install compaction systems. Neither of the amendments has been passed. It is eight months since the May 20 deadline when all incinerators were supposed to be upgraded.

Open burning

In a similar vein, the City Administration has taken steps to cut down on open burning. This Conference must also recommend revisions in the law, legislation to be passed by the City Council, and an expanded public information campaign, as the limit of the 17-county area.

My resolution is moving forward. I am very unsympathetic to the seeming lack of willingness or ability to comply with the standards.”
With this kind of a record it is essential that this Conference require New York City to upgrade the municipal incinerators and immediately install precipitators or bag filters. This Conference must require monthly reports and an enforcement deadline of no later than the end of this year.

As the City Administration has proclaimed, coal is not a problem. For the citizen, clean air is cheaper. It will cost less than dirty air.

**CONCLUSION**

I ask this Conference to require immediate action by the New Administration to upgrade the municipal incinerators, including the actual use of granted Federal funds; immediate initiation of a workable plan of action for emergencies; upgrading or closing any remaining apartment incinerators; and immediate compliance with last year's Conference recommendations for the sulfur content of fuel.

In addition, the Conference should require New York to comply immediately with last year's Conference recommendations for the sulfur content of coal. Moreover, the use of coal should be reduced because of its particulate-producing effect.

I recommend that the Conference prepare a comprehensive emergency action plan for the entire New York-New Jersey 17-county area. It should be implemented by phases as the level of pollution rises.

Finally, the Conference should remain in continuing session, and regular reports should be submitted. The Conference proved during the past year that it is a crucial vehicle for air pollution abatement in the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area. If it is to function effectively as a pollution abatement agency, it is necessary to continue its jurisdiction.

**Mr. Speaker, on February 1, 1968, Robert T. Walsh, project director of New York-New Jersey Abatement Activity, noted:**

"In the more densely populated portions of New York City, more refuse is burned and more incinerator-related air contaminants are released per square mile than in any other urban area of the country."

Mr. Walsh also confirmed that none of New York City's municipal incinerators "are yet equipped with high efficiency control devices."

I include at this point in this testimony:

**PARTICULATE EMISSIONS INVENTORY**

(By Robert T. Walsh)

My name is Robert T. Walsh. I am a chemical engineer. My position with the Public Health Service is Project Director of the New York-New Jersey Abatement Activity. I will discuss the particulate emissions inventory.

During our recent study, sources of particulate matter air pollution in the 17 counties were located and quantified using the best available information. Personnel of state and local agencies as well as the Public Health Service have participated in the investigation. Much of the information was supplied by industrial and commercial establishments and by governmental agencies.

The particulate emissions inventory is included on pages 45 through 70 of the Phase II Report. Except for small increases in emissions from municipal incinerators and industrial processes, the figures which will follow are the same as those listed in the report. Inasmuch as many of you already have these figures, I shall not reproduce these figures here. This discussion is aimed at areas of greater significance.

For one interested in air pollution, it is enlightening to fly over the study area in a helicopter or light aircraft on a clear day you can't see as far as you'd like but what you can see is a lot of visible particulate...
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matter billowing from boilers, incinerators, industrial processes, and soot. But oil and gas
emissions are less than one percent. The
major fraction is not from stationary
emissions but from the burning of fuels and solid
wastes in conventional power plants.

The particulate matter from these sources includes many small particles that can be seen
as a haze or are emitted as a fine mist. These
visible particulates include smoke and soot from
the incomplete combustion of fuels and solid
wastes. Another form of particulate is generated by coal burning—coal ash, metallic
foundry fume, rock dust, sulfuric acid mist and
petroleum catalyst dust to name a few. These
particulates are measured in the laboratory, con
firmed by aerial observations. Black smoke—
indicating carbonaceous particulates—is observed as a black smoke or mist. Smokeless
white, blue, brown, and grey particulate pollution.

Our engineers observed upwards of 150
emission sites each day on pollution patrol
surveillance flights over the 17 counties. They
couldn't begin to count the sources of lesser
visually perceptible particulates.

But aerial reconnaissance doesn't provide
fine numbers. In order to quantify particulate
emissions you have to contact a large number of
sources directly. For the multitudinous small
sources, estimates have to be based on the
best available information.

The survey showed that approximately
240,000 tons of particulate air contaminants
are discharged to the atmosphere of the
study area annually with 56% attributable to
the various activities.

Minor adjustments have been made to the
particulate inventory based on information
received after the report was printed. Total
particulate emissions were increased from
220,000 to about 240,000 tons per year. These
principally resulted from the upward adjust-
ment of estimates from New York City,
the eight New York counties, industrial
incinerators and rock crushing operations.
The changes have been incorporated
into an updated Table 22 of the report.
Copies of the revised table are available to
interested parties.

Coal and fuel oil are not the all pervading
sources of particulate that they are of sulfur
emissions. If we take our usual arbitrary
emissions limit of 25 pounds of sulfur per
apartment house, it is clear that the
remaining tons of particulate are from sources
other than solid fuels.

We have tabulated emissions in three
general areas—the nine New Jersey counties,
the five boroughs of New York City and the three
outer New York counties, Rockland, Nassau,
and Westchester. In this bar graph we show the
relative contributions of particulate emis-

sions in these areas. It can be seen that sta-
tionary fuel combustion is the largest source
of particulate pollution in each area, although
the percentage contributions vary from county
to county as in New Jersey and New York
City. We also note that industrial processes
are significant in New Jersey while the outer
counties but relatively minor con-
tributors in New York City. The burning of
solid wastes generates considerably more par-

cipulate in New Jersey than in New York.

Some 47,000 tons of particulate are generated in the eight New York counties annually by
the burning of solid wastes. The study area
has about eight times more particulate emis-
sions than in New Jersey. Some 80,000
tons of particulate are generated in New Jersey
in the study area.

One-third of the solid wastes burned are
inhaled in municipal incinerators. The
rest is burned by industrial, commercial,
governmental, and residential combustors.

Almost one-half of the particulate emis-
ings from coal-fired power plants.

The next largest single contributor is a
large industrial establishments located in
New Jersey. In New York, anthracite coal
burning has been the principal source of
particulate pollution.

We also note that industrial processes
are significant in New Jersey while the outer
counties but relatively minor con-
tributors in New York City. The burning of
solid wastes generates considerably more particulate in New Jersey than in New York.

Some 47,000 tons of particulate are generated in the eight New York counties annually by
the burning of solid wastes. The study area
has about eight times more particulate emis-
sions than in New Jersey. Some 80,000
tons of particulate are generated in New Jersey
in the study area.

One-third of the solid wastes burned are
inhaled in municipal incinerators. The
rest is burned by industrial, commercial,
governmental, and residential combustors.

Almost one-half of the particulate emis-
ings from coal-fired power plants.

The next largest single contributor is a
large industrial establishments located in
New Jersey. In New York, anthracite coal
burning has been the principal source of
particulate pollution.

We also note that industrial processes
are significant in New Jersey while the outer
counties but relatively minor con-
tributors in New York City. The burning of
solid wastes generates considerably more particulate in New Jersey than in New York.
is required, almost twice the average quantity of particulate is dumped into our atmosphere.

All particulate matter pollution is not the same either in its human impact or in its ability to remain airborne. For this reason, estimates were made as to particle size ranges of pollutants from different sources. We find that 20% of the area's particulate is greater than 44 microns in mean diameter. The rest is smaller than 44 microns, and hence generally termed "suspended." Much of the latter eventually settles to the ground but its settling velocity is quite low. Of greater significance is the approximately 3,000,000 tons per year which is less than 5 microns in diameter. Besides their tendency to remain airborne for long periods of time, such particles are sufficiently small that they can be inspired into the human respiratory system.

There are no significant differences in particle size distribution of emissions between overall New York and New Jersey areas; however, there is a marked contrast in sources. About 70% of the coarse pollutants generated in New Jersey are due to coal burning. In New York, a comparable quantity of coarse particles is generated by refuse incineration. Richmond County (Staten Island) exhibits the lowest fraction of coarse and the greatest fraction of fines (71%) because of the sparsity of incineration and uncontrolled coal burning.

In summary, an inventory of particulate pollution emissions has been completed and major sources of such pollution have been located. Levels of emissions were found to be much higher in heavily populated areas than in more distant suburban areas.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Recom the particulate emission inventory compiled by the Public Health Service listing 144 point sources emitting more than 100 tons of particulate matter air pollution per year. I believe the public has a right to know who is poisoning the air.

The material follows:
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NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT: SOURCES OF POLLUTANTS MORE THAN 100 TONS/YEAR OF PARTICULATE MATTER—1966 ESTIMATE

The 144 point sources tabulated in the attached table were estimated to emit at least 100 tons of particulate matter air pollution per year. They are situated throughout the 17 county area encompassed by the air pollution abatement activity. Together they discharge over 116,000 tons of particulate annually.

In those sources, particulates are generated by the combustion of fuels, industrial processes, and the burning of solid wastes. The listing was developed from information supplied directly to the project from non-confidential files of the co-operating agencies. Whenever specific emission data were not available, the releases were estimated with the use of generalized emission factors.

A number of the sources have some measure of control, indicating an awareness of the air pollution problem and knowledge of techniques for reducing emissions.

All sources within this area which released 100 tons or more of particulate matter annually are identified in the list. Some of the sources have informed us of operations which have reduced emissions materially below 1966 levels. Wherever such information was available, the list has been annotated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated particulate emissions (tons per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BERGEN COUNTY (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abex Corp., Mahwah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Chemical Corp., Edgewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curless-Wright, Ridgewood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden State Paper Co., Inc., Garfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hills Brothers Coffee, Inc., Edgewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentor, Hackensack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Electric &amp; Gas Co., Bergen plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergen County total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSEX COUNTY (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Chemical Co., Newark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex County Overbrook Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houdaille Construction Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironbound Incinerator Corp., Newark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Electric &amp; Gas Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Can Co., Newark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex County total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUDSON COUNTY (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Can Co., Jersey City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell Foundry &amp; Co., Perth Amboy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Railroad Co., Jersey City service plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Railroad Co., Jersey City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collage-Palmolive Co., Jersey City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corps of Engineers, vicinity of Statue of Liberty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie-Lackawanna Railroad, Jersey City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humble Oil &amp; Refining Co., Bayonne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentor, Bergen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearny Smelting &amp; Refining Co., Kearny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koppers Co., Kearny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell House, Div. of General Foods Co., Hoboken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Glass, Jersey City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monasanto Co., Kearny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owens-Illinois, Inc., North Bergen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Electric &amp; Gas Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Electric &amp; Gas Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearny Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Electric &amp; Gas Co, Marion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington Corp., Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson County total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLESEX COUNTY (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Smelting &amp; Refining Co., Perth Amboy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevron Oil &amp; Refining Co., Perth Amboy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMC Corp., Carteret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hercules, Inc., Parlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hess Electric &amp; Gas Co., Port Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentor, Perth Amboy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearny Smelting &amp; Refining Co., Perth Amboy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey Central Power &amp; Light Co., Sayreville plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson &amp; Johnson Co., North Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey Central Power &amp; Light Co., Werner plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Lead Co., Perk Amboy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Lead Co., Sayreville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Reading Terminal, Port Reading, Marion Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Electric &amp; Gas Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewaren plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seabord Coal Dock Co., South Amboy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Carbide Corp., Bound Brook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated particulate emissions (tons per year) — Continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BERGEN COUNTY (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Gypsum Co., South Plainfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Metals Refining Co., Carteret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex County total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONMOUTH COUNTY (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentor, Red Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestles Co., Freehold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth County total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORRIS COUNTY (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanco Corp., Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew Chemical Corp., Boonton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hercules Inc., Kempton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picatinny Arsenal, Dover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whippity Paper Board Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris County total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAIC COUNTY (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laytham Foundry, Inc., Paterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Rubber Co., Patenalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unialloy, Patenalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaic County total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMERSET COUNTY (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Cyanamid Co., Bound Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanwood Crushed Stone &amp; Uniset Asbestos Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houdaille Construction Materials, Inc., Bound Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns-Manville Refining Co., Metuchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubberoid Co., Bound Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans' Administration Hospital, Lyons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset County total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION COUNTY (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Cyanamid Co., Linden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities Service Oil Refinery, Linden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. I. du Pont de Nemours &amp; Co., Linden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aniline &amp; Film Corp., Linden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humble Oil and Refining Co., Linden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Quartz Co., Railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Electric Co., Linden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Gypsum Co., Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union County total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRONX COUNTY (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Edison Co., Hell Gate Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incinerator, Zerega Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Gypsum Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx County total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINGS COUNTY (BROOKLYN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Edison Co., Hudson Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Edison Co., Kent Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incinerator, Greenpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incinerator, Hamilton Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incinerator, South Shore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incinerator, Southwestern Brooklyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings County hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINGS COUNTY total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND COUNTY (STATEN ISLAND) (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnt Island I. (offshore burning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Edison Co., Arthur Kill plant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Cessing coal burning during 1967, 1968 emissions will be below 100 tons per year. * Cessing operations in November 1968.
A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY, Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the occasion to visit with a colleague from the State of Michigan Congressman MARVIN L. ESRH. We were comparing notes as to the citizen reaction concerning the Pablo Incident and recent developments in Vietnam. As we both have been in our districts recently.

At that time, Congressman ESRH told me of a special letter he sent to the President yesterday. In reading over a copy of that communication, I felt that other Members would appreciate the opportunity to see it too. I am certain that we will hold even greater interest in the reply that Congressman ESCR receives in response to his 14 key questions on what he has called "a crisis of confidence in the administration's handling of foreign policy."

Congressman ESCR's complete letter to the President follows:

The President,

The White House,

Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: I write to you today as a concerned citizen and as a Congressman—concerned over the crisis of confidence so evident in our nation today. Mr. President, the confidence of the people of my District, and indeed throughout the country, reflect the doubt and the concern of a people who are willing to believe, yet do not know what to believe. Certainly this country is willing to support their Chief Executive in a time of grave international conflict, yet the people are losing faith confidence in the face of great differences between what is said and what appears to be happening.

It is in this context that I write, urging you to give an immediate and fully reply to the questions below. These questions reflect communications and statements by members of the Defense and State Departments and White House officials. They arise not only out of the seizure of the Pablo, but also the increased activity, the nature and strength of the widespread enemy attacks in South Vietnam. To this date, neither the Pentagon nor the State Department has been able to provide satisfactory information. Moreover, the private briefing which was afforded to members of the House by the Department of State on January 31 was a sham.

Although many inquiries have been answered in a piecemeal fashion, during the past few days, I firmly believe that clearly

...
men in Vietnam who have consistently main-
tained that the casualty figures were actual
and not our best estimates under
environmental conditions? If there has been a
direct effort to minimize the civilian casualties
during the past several years, then the proposed
action is being taken to relieve the suffering and hardships of South
Vietnamese and restore the confidence of the people in the ability of the
government to defend them?
12. The summary trial and execution of a
non-uniformed Vietnamese shown on Ameri-
can television last week, was as an indisputable
violation of the Geneva Convention arti-
cles for the national defense and for
the war in Viet-
nam. Spending requests for the non-
defense or domestic portion of the
budget also show an increase. The vari-
ous subcommittees of the House Appro-
priations Committee will soon be engaged
in intensive review of these requests.
13. Reports of widespread corruption, ex-
tensive blackmarket dealings and failure of the
government to provide the needed reforms are
commonplace and have not been
denied. There is also deep concern about the failure of the Thieu government
to control corruption and the
extensive practice of South Vietnamese young
men avoiding military duty by bribing their way
out of the draft. I have grave doubts
about the character of our forces,
not better, through the four years of the
war. What, if any, action has the South Viet-
namese government taken to correct these
deprecated situations?
14. Are we, or are we not, continuing pri-
ate negotiations with North Vietnam regar-
ding possible settlement of the Vietnam
conflict? The statement by the Secretary of
State on February 4 implies that we have
broken off all diplomatic contact with the
North. Is this a correct assumption?
Mr. President, while 500,000 American
young men serve their country in the cause of
freedom in Vietnam, the events of recent
days raise serious questions as to the reasons
for which they serve. If the cause for which
they are fighting has not brought about the beginning
of peace and free Vietnam
from corruption, free from fear, and free
from authoritarian executions—they surely serve in vain. If the South Vietnamese
do not have the will to survive as an independ-
ent nation, surely our defense of that inde-
pendence is in vain. If our government
cannot give the American people the com-
munications to the world and to its people,
then surely our troops serve in vain.
Such a crisis demands an answer. I await
your response.
Respectfully,
MARVIN L. EICH, Member of Congress.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-
marks at this point in the

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President
has returned to the Congress his
proposals for Federal expenditures for
the coming year. As has been the case in
the past few years, the proposed expendi-
tures are, of course, the national defense and for
the war in Vietnam, the largest single category. Forty-three cents
out of every dollar proposed to be spent in
the coming fiscal year will be directed to
national defense and the war in Viet-
nam. Spending requests for the non-
defense or domestic portion of the budget also show an increase. The vari-
ous subcommittees of the House Appro-
priations Committee will soon be engaged
in intensive review of these requests.
12. The summary trial and execution of a
non-uniformed Vietnamese shown on Ameri-
can television last week, was as an indisputable
violation of the Geneva Convention arti-
cles for the national defense and for
the war in Viet-
nam. Spending requests for the non-
defense or domestic portion of the
budget also show an increase. The vari-
ous subcommittees of the House Appro-
priations Committee will soon be engaged
in intensive review of these requests.
13. Reports of widespread corruption, ex-
tensive blackmarket dealings and failure of the
government to provide the needed reforms are
commonplace and have not been
denied. There is also deep concern about the failure of the Thieu government
to control corruption and the
extensive practice of South Vietnamese young
men avoiding military duty by bribing their way
out of the draft. I have grave doubts
about the character of our forces,
not better, through the four years of the
war. What, if any, action has the South Viet-
namese government taken to correct these
deprecated situations?
14. Are we, or are we not, continuing pri-
ate negotiations with North Vietnam regar-
ding possible settlement of the Vietnam
conflict? The statement by the Secretary of
State on February 4 implies that we have
broken off all diplomatic contact with the
North. Is this a correct assumption?
Mr. President, while 500,000 American
young men serve their country in the cause of
freedom in Vietnam, the events of recent
days raise serious questions as to the reasons
for which they serve. If the cause for which
they are fighting has not brought about the beginning
of peace and free Vietnam
from corruption, free from fear, and free
from authoritarian executions—they surely serve in vain. If the South Vietnamese
do not have the will to survive as an independ-
ent nation, surely our defense of that inde-
pendence is in vain. If our government
cannot give the American people the com-
munications to the world and to its people,
then surely our troops serve in vain.
Such a crisis demands an answer. I await
your response.
Respectfully,
MARVIN L. EICH, Member of Congress.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-
marks at this point in the

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President
has returned to the Congress his
proposals for Federal expenditures for
the coming year. As has been the case in
the past few years, the proposed expendi-
tures are, of course, the national defense and for
the war in Vietnam, the largest single category. Forty-three cents
out of every dollar proposed to be spent in
the coming fiscal year will be directed to
national defense and the war in Viet-
nam. Spending requests for the non-
defense or domestic portion of the budget also show an increase. The vari-
ous subcommittees of the House Appro-
priations Committee will soon be engaged
in intensive review of these requests.
12. The summary trial and execution of a
non-uniformed Vietnamese shown on Ameri-
can television last week, was as an indisputable
violation of the Geneva Convention arti-
cles for the national defense and for
the war in Viet-
nam. Spending requests for the non-
defense or domestic portion of the
budget also show an increase. The vari-
ous subcommittees of the House Appro-
priations Committee will soon be engaged
in intensive review of these requests.
13. Reports of widespread corruption, ex-
tensive blackmarket dealings and failure of the
government to provide the needed reforms are
commonplace and have not been
denied. There is also deep concern about the failure of the Thieu government
to control corruption and the
extensive practice of South Vietnamese young
men avoiding military duty by bribing their way
out of the draft. I have grave doubts
about the character of our forces,
not better, through the four years of the
war. What, if any, action has the South Viet-
namese government taken to correct these
deprecated situations?
14. Are we, or are we not, continuing pri-
ate negotiations with North Vietnam regar-
ding possible settlement of the Vietnam
conflict? The statement by the Secretary of
State on February 4 implies that we have
broken off all diplomatic contact with the
North. Is this a correct assumption?
Mr. President, while 500,000 American
young men serve their country in the cause of
freedom in Vietnam, the events of recent
days raise serious questions as to the reasons
for which they serve. If the cause for which
they are fighting has not brought about the beginning
of peace and free Vietnam
from corruption, free from fear, and free
from authoritarian executions—they surely serve in vain. If the South Vietnamese
do not have the will to survive as an independ-
ent nation, surely our defense of that inde-
pendence is in vain. If our government
cannot give the American people the com-
munications to the world and to its people,
then surely our troops serve in vain.
Such a crisis demands an answer. I await
your response.
Respectfully,
MARVIN L. EICH, Member of Congress.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-
marks at this point in the

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President
has returned to the Congress his
proposals for Federal expenditures for
the coming year. As has been the case in
the past few years, the proposed expendi-
tures are, of course, the national defense and for
the war in Vietnam, the largest single category. Forty-three cents
out of every dollar proposed to be spent in
the coming fiscal year will be directed to
national defense and the war in Viet-
nam. Spending requests for the non-
defense or domestic portion of the budget also show an increase. The vari-
ous subcommittees of the House Appro-
priations Committee will soon be engaged
in intensive review of these requests.
12. The summary trial and execution of a
non-uniformed Vietnamese shown on Ameri-
can television last week, was as an indisputable
violation of the Geneva Convention arti-
cles for the national defense and for
the war in Viet-
nam. Spending requests for the non-
defense or domestic portion of the
budget also show an increase. The vari-
ous subcommittees of the House Appro-
priations Committee will soon be engaged
in intensive review of these requests.
13. Reports of widespread corruption, ex-
tensive blackmarket dealings and failure of the
government to provide the needed reforms are
commonplace and have not been
denied. There is also deep concern about the failure of the Thieu government
to control corruption and the
extensive practice of South Vietnamese young
men avoiding military duty by bribing their way
out of the draft. I have grave doubts
about the character of our forces,
marks at this point in the Recess and inclu­
des extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 1, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS), was honored at a civic dinner in Tampa. The House, of course, knows that Sam GIBBONS is just such a leader. He is one of the out­
standing members of the Committee on Education and Labor and has played an im­
portant part in the enactment of many of the landmark education bills of the past several years. It is a natural sequel of his scholarly face, his warm manner, and his close association with leaders in education, that the Honorable John W. Gardner, the Secretary of Health, Edu­
cation, and Welfare, made the major ad­
dress at the dinner in honor of our colleague, Mr. GIBBONS.

I believe the House will be interested in the Secretary's remarks on this oc­
casion and I include the text thereof:

REMARKS ST JOH N W. GARDNER, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EPUCA TION, AND WELFARE

It is a privilege for me to have a part in this dinner honoring my good friend, Sam GIBBONS.

This is a time in our national history when we stand in need of the ablest, most responsible leaders we can find.

Sam GIBBONS is just such a leader. I have seen him in action. I have seen him at work on the great legislative tasks and achieve­
m ents that have made the last few years so momentous for our community, and for the whole nation.

In short, the first step for every citizen is to acknowledge that the problems are real and complex. We must then face the fact that they cannot be solved by hatred or rage or cyni­

cism, or by the side of any of us.

We must face the fact that they demand the quality and the courage and the steady­
ness of purpose of any serious leader.

So I shall be happy to participate in this tribute. I am proud to do so.

Sometimes I think we haven't taken to heart all the implications of self-govern­
ment. When we were children we learned from our storybooks that a kingdom suffered when it came under the hand of a bad king. If he was cruel or lazy or corrupt, the consequences were inevitably bad.

In free societies we don't have kings. We have government by people. But the con­
sequences of bad governing are unchanged. If the American people refuse to face the problems that hatred and anger will solve those problems, or if they lack strength and courage under stress, then they will govern badly.

In short, the first step for every citizen is to acknowledge that the problems are real and complex. We must then face the fact that they cannot be solved by hatred or rage or cyni­

cism, or by the side of any of us.

They will yield only to unceasing effort by people who have the stability and steadiness of purpose to tackle our toughest social problems effectively.

Millions of Americans are engaged in that work today—and the man we are honoring tonight is one of those so engaged. The din of controversy has all but obscured the constructive efforts of such people, and I want to say a word about those efforts.

My job has enabled me to see a side of our national life that gives one hope for the future.

We have spent my days with people in and out of government who are concerned with education, health, social services, rehabilitation of the handi­
capped, education of gifted children, the problems of the cities and so on. The people I have seen in my travels are the teachers, social workers, nurses, doctors, businessmen who serve on school boards, housewives who volunteer in their local hospitals, college students who tutor slum children, and others.

I believe, an extraordinary rise in our con­
cern for individual freedom and fulfillment

The idea of the worth and dignity of the

In free societies we don't have kings. We

have government by people. But the con­
sequences of bad governing are unchanged. If the American people refuse to face the problems that hatred and anger will solve those problems, or if they lack strength and courage under stress, then they will govern badly.

In short, the first step for every citizen is to acknowledge that the problems are real and complex. We must then face the fact that they cannot be solved by hatred or rage or cyni­

cism, or by the side of any of us.

They will yield only to unceasing effort by people who have the stability and steadiness of purpose to tackle our toughest social problems effectively.

Millions of Americans are engaged in that work today—and the man we are honoring tonight is one of those so engaged. The din of controversy has all but obscured the constructive efforts of such people, and I want to say a word about those efforts.

My job has enabled me to see a side of our national life that gives one hope for the future.

We have spent my days with people in and out of government who are concerned with education, health, social services, rehabilitation of the handi­
capped, education of gifted children, the problems of the cities and so on. The people I have seen in my travels are the teachers, social workers, nurses, doctors, businessmen who serve on school boards, housewives who volunteer in their local hospitals, college students who tutor slum children, and others.

In field after field, in health, in education, in rehabilitation, I have found people work­ing with great energy on programs that weren't even in existence a half dozen years ago.

This is partly explainable in terms of a great increase in resources. Federal expendi­
tures for education and for health have both tripled in the last decade. President Johnson has been in office, the great pro­
grams enacted into law by Sam GIBBONS and his fellow Members of Congress have had a profound impact.

But the new burst of activity is more than a response to increased resources. It reflects, I believe, that we are now in our over­
turn for these fields, and a remarkable in­
crease in our commitment to certain goals.

The quality of the government of the individual is thousands of years old. But embedding that idea in social and political institutions has been a painfully slow proc­
ess. It is widely shared understanding

It's hard to visualize what this can mean in human terms.

Some time ago, a boy who lives not far from where I live in Washington was injured in an accident that resulted in am­
putated above the knee. When the wound was healed he was fitted with his first artifi­
cial limb. The doctor walked 15 feet down the room and said "Now walk to me!" The boy hesitated and then came forward. With each step he gained new confidence. As he reached the doctor, he said "Now, run!" and then a nudge "Now, run!" And the boy ran the length of the room.

Not too many years ago that boy would have hobbed along clumsily with an empty trouser leg until he was grown. We just didn't make artificial limbs for children. Now, with the help of HEW grants, there is a chain of limb centers across the country. I could give you many similar examples involving blind children, deformed children, children born with brain damage, and so on. We
nation. As a result, youngsters who have made a major effort to correct that injustice, could fulfill the promise that was made, and live their lives in dignity.

Every individual is of value. That defines the purpose of our efforts. That’s the purpose of our society. It’s to enhance the individual human being. That’s the star by which we navigate, by placing before him the maximum amount of freedom to grow and develop, to choose and to be what he has in him to be. That’s the star by which we should set our course. That’s what our Nation is about.

CONTROVERSY IN DISTRICT OF COOLUMBIA POLICE DEPARTMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently a good deal of attention has been given to what appeared to be a controversy within the Police Department of the District of Columbia. This has disturbed many Members of Congress. It is of grave concern to us all that the public and Federal officials should be of best and in all cases harmony should prevail in order that the Federal interests be properly protected. I received a copy of a statement by Commissioner Walter Washington and a copy of a news release by Director of Public Safety Patrick Murphy and Chief of Police John B. Layton. I wish to insert these into the Record for the information of my colleagues.

Statement by Mayor Walter E. Washington

I highly approve of the accompanying joint statement by Public Safety Director Patrick V. Murphy and Chief of Police John B. Layton.

I am delighted they have pledged a team effort to serve the city and fight the menace of crime in our community.

Unity is all important in the Police Department’s job of combating the District’s appalling crime rate.

The citizens can be reassured that the job of protecting the community is in the hands of a strengthened police department, which now has the combined experience of Public Safety Director Murphy, Chief Layton and Assistant Chief Jerry V. Wilson, in his new role as head of Field Operations.

Our three top officials are together in their resolve to fight the common enemy—crime in our city.


The following statement was released by the Washington Office of Public Safety, Patrick V. Murphy, and Chief of Police John B. Layton.

The appointment of Jerry V. Wilson as Assistant Chief for Field Operations in no manner diminishes the authority and functions of the Chief of Police, John B. Layton. Chief Layton continues as the operating head of the Metropolitan Police Department.

Assistant Chief of Police Howard V. Covell continues in his position in the Department, Executive Officer.

Assistant Chief Wilson has filled one of the four Assistant Chief positions and will be responsible for the four major functions of the Department.

The Director of Public Safety, Patrick V. Murphy, is responsible for policy formulation and program development in the Police Department, as well as in the Fire Department and Office of Civil Defense, the three agencies of the District which are responsible for the Department in the Mayor’s Office to speak for it on important policy questions, such as budget requests, manpower and equipment needs, salary and working conditions and other matters.

Director Murphy stated: “I repeat what I have said publicly many times since my appointment. I would not have accepted this position if I did not consider Chief Layton an able, experienced and dedicated police chief. He has been of great assistance in familiarizing me with the operations of the Police Department. We have worked closely together in economic and other matters. The cooperation of the Director of Public Safety has strengthened and facilitated police operations throughout the Department.”

In the course of this address, which was inserted in the Congressional Record on September 14, 1967, by the Delegate from the District of Columbia, Mr. HAYS, Mr. Speaker, I asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks to a point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on Labor Day, September 8, 1967, Hon. W. A. Boyle of the United Mine Workers of America made an important and challenging speech in which he said:

“The government-subsidized atomic power industry is a threat to the security of life and the health of all Americans. It should be stopped.”

In the course of this address, which was inserted in the Congressional Record on September 14, 1967, by the Delegate from West Virginia, Mr. Byrn, President Boyle called attention to “the unnecessary building
of dangerous, poisonous, radioactive civilian atomic powerplants."

Mr. Speaker, along with some 25 other Members, I have joined the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Saylor) in introducing a joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 889, to create a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the Government's civilian nuclear program. I have also joined the Congressional Record that as of the first of this year there were 15 operating power plants in the United States, 21 others under construction, firm orders placed for another 28, and plus 13 more in the planning stage. In the light of these figures there is an urgent need, Mr. Speaker, for an early review of this program as provided in the joint resolution.

EXCISE TAX ON ELECTRIC ENERGY PRODUCED WITH NUCLEAR POWER

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks into the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Saylor)?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on page 81 of Pennsylvania's white paper entitled "Fuel Polity" published last November is this paragraph:

"As regards the Atomic Energy Authority's research and development expenditure, the royalty at the rate of 0.14¢ per kwh to be paid by the generating Boards to the Atomic Energy Authority on AGR's in the situation, the nuclear power program has rested primarily on the assumption that they will show a cost advantage over alternative methods of generation. This royalty will not recover all the past costs of the development of the Magnux and AGS systems, but it is expected to cover, in a short time, all available costs likely to be incurred by the Atomic Energy Authority in further development work for the second nuclear power program.

Based on this unique plan to recoup a portion of Federal expenditures that have already been made into the development of nuclear reactors, and mindful of the enormous Government investment that will be required if the Atomic Energy Commission's proposed breeder reactor program is to be carried out, yesterday I introduced legislation to provide for an excise tax on electric energy produced in this country's nuclear power plants.

The tax rate of 0.14¢ per kilowatt hour in my proposal is identical to that imposed in England at the devalued pound equivalent of $2.40. My colleagues will be interested to note that if the amount of atom-produced electricity follows predictions of the AEC, Government revenue from this assessment would amount to $147 million in 1980 although the cost to the average household using power from nuclear reactors would be less than 76 cents a year.

Actually, with the Federal Government subsidizing a high percentage of the limited liability insurance coverage on atomic plants, the utility companies themselves should absorb the tax at no additional charge whatsoever to home-owners.

By contributing less than one and one-half tenths of a mill per kilowatt-hour on electric power that comes from atom plants, the private utilities enjoying the consequences of research subsidized by the Federal Government will still be far in arrears with the advent of the 21st century, particularly if an additional $2 billion is to be taken from the U.S. Treasury for development of a breeder reactor as envisioned by the AEC. Nevertheless the British tax plan is a step in the right direction and should be welcome here in an era of dangerously unbalanced budgets.

H.R. 15199 reads as follows:

H.R. 15199

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1964 to provide for an excise tax on electrical energy produced in nuclear power plants.

BE IT ENACTED by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Internal Revenue Code of 1964 is amended by adding thereto the following section:

"Sec. 4108. Tax on electrical energy produced in nuclear power plants. There is hereby imposed an excise tax at the rate of 0.14¢ per kilowatt hour on electrical energy produced in nuclear power plants and sold by the producer thereof for domestic or commercial consumption a tax equivalent to 0.14¢ per kilowatt hour to be paid by the producer under such rules and regulations as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe."

REPORT OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE 90TH CONGRESS

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Speaker, there was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. Speaker, the first session of the 90th Congress which has recently concluded has gone a long way toward reviving the classic principle of American Government—namely, that the President proposes and the Congress disposes. The President upon electoral energy produced in nuclear powerplants takes no objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have tried to outline our main objectives and the accomplishments of our party.

As a Republican Member of Congress, I would like to talk to you today about this first session of the 90th Congress, as I viewed it and give you my assessment of it.

First, let me note that during the preceding Congress, the 89th, when the President had massive majorities from his party in both the Senate and the House, many lawmakers on Capitol Hill rightly believed the President had the bumper "rubber-stamps." The President could practically snap his fingers and his party members in both Houses of Congress would jump.

This year, following the 1966 elections some balance has been restored in the House, many lawmakers on Capitol Hill rightly believe the President needs the "rubber-stamps." The President could practically snap his fingers and his party members in both Houses of Congress would jump.

This year, following the 1966 elections some balance has been restored in the House, many lawmakers on Capitol Hill rightly believe the President needs the "rubber-stamps." The President could practically snap his fingers and his party members in both Houses of Congress would jump.

The record of House votes in this past session points up just who were the so-called "big spenders" in Congress and who were not. For instance, on 23 key votes, an average of 85 percent of Republicans in the House voted for cuts in spending while the majority of Demo­crats voted against those cuts.

In fact, Democratic voting for economy averaged only 17 percent.

But even though it is important to halt bad legislation, it is also necessary to support good legislation. I believe my record in this regard has been a constructive one.

Perhaps one of the most important of things accomplished is this: The majority of the Republican Members of Congress, I believe, let the country know, beyond any shadow of a doubt, where we stand on the important issues that face America today. And our actions have shown that we know what we say, that because we believe in fighting forces in Southeast Asia and our Armed Forces elsewhere in the world.

We have fought for legislation to make our streets and homes safe again.

The continuing transfer of governmental authority, responsibility, and power to local governmental units and individual communities is another of our chief objectives, as is the reorganization and reform of Congress so that it may better and more swiftly serve the needs of the American people.

We have also fought for campaign reforms to assure clean and orderly elections for 1968.

I have tried to outline my main objectives and the accomplishments of our party. But some of our failures may have been as important to the country as our successes. For, although on occasion we may have been voted down, we have pointed out the way. We have shown what our party and must be done.

In many respects, this year has been a year of education for the American people and we are convinced that coming events will prove them to be correct.

THE STATUS OF THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues in the House to a problem which, before too long, will be
The situation which confronts us in the developing world is vastly different from that which existed in Europe at the end of World War II. The countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are not in the same position as were the recipients of Marshall plan aid, and consequently the role which we need to play is of a different nature. In many of them, there is a serious lack of development in the human infrastructure. The level of development of political life, education, industry, and commerce is in its early stages. In countries which are experiencing a process of economic development has been and will be impeded unless new approaches are made. This does not mean that we should abandon foreign aid; to the contrary, it means that we must address ourselves to new dimensions of foreign aid.

Mr. Speaker, with these objectives in mind, I am introducing today a concurrent resolution identical to that which was submitted by the scholarly gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scowr] in the other body, on January 24, 1959. The purpose of this resolution is to authorize the joint consideration of a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Aid, to consist of seven Members of the House and seven Senators. Membership from the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would be limited to four each so that the joint committee can have a balanced representation.

The main purpose of the joint committee would be to undertake a thorough and comprehensive study and revaluation of foreign aid with a view toward reworking the current systems for reshaping foreign aid as it deems appropriate. The committee would be directed to consider such basic and important factors as: the nature and objectives of foreign aid and their relation to vital U.S. interests; the organizational and operational relationships among the U.S. Government agencies and other organizations—private and international—which are in the business of dispensing foreign aid, and the relations by which existing foreign aid programs might be improved to insure their efficient, economical, and effective administration and operation.

The joint committee would submit an interim report of its findings as soon as practicable and a final report with its recommendations no later than the end of the year. The committee's study would include a consideration of the ongoing activities of the Agency for International Development. Further, the committee would disband upon completion of its assignment.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is an urgent need for a critical reconsideration of the aid program and I think that it is absolutely necessary that interested and knowledgeable Members of Congress, as representatives of the people, participate in such a creative review of foreign aid. There is no question in my mind that such a reexamination is imperative. Meaningful development assistance is a basis for our peace and security; indeed, we address ourselves now to a thorough evaluation of the problems involved in such a program, we will find ourselves lacking in both direction and support for this much-needed effort.

VETERANS' AND SERVICEMEN'S BENEFITS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last year the Senate passed by a vote of 79 to 5 in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967. This legislation has run into considerable difficulty in the House. It was referred to the House Rules Committee on March 9, 1967. After some hearings were held, the bill received no action whatever for the ensuing 10 months. The bill is still in the Rules Committee. The outlook is not reassuring. Along with several of my colleagues here in the House, I am very disappointed that the Democratic leadership does not seem to be enthusiastic about bringing this legislation to the floor of the House for our consideration and subsequent action.

There is a critical need for such legislation, Mr. Speaker. It is no secret that the esteem in which the Congress is held by the American people at large is mighty low. How can we expect to do a job for the people of this country if we do not have their respect and confidence? The passage of this legislation, and the implementation of the reforms which it would enact, will go a long way toward the rebuilding of that respect and confidence.

Mr. Speaker, I submit here an information comparing sections 103 and 164 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, S. 355, and other similar bills. This
material contains a careful explanation of what is involved in the relevant sections of the bill and I think it merits our careful attention.

**SECTION 103 (A)("a", PUBLIC NOTICE OF OPPORTUNITY TO HEAR OR TESTIFY)**

S. 355— Requires each standing committee (except Appropriations) to give public notice of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be held before the committee begins unless the committee determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing at an earlier date.

Bolling— Provision deleted. Reid—Same as S. 355. Print No. 3—Same provision as S. 355. Original language of bill provided for two weeks’ advance notice of the time and place of the hearings but S. 355 requires only that notice be given to the public “in advance of the commencement of the hearing.” Time was reduced to 1 week by adoption of Senate Amendment No. 55—See Congressional Record, volume 113, part 2, page 5224.

**SECTION 103 (A)("b", OPEN HEARING; BROADCASTING OF HEARINGS)**

S. 355— Requires committee hearings (except Appropriations) to be open to the public unless the committee determines that testimony to be taken may relate to a matter of national security, may tend to reflect adversely upon the character or reputation of any witness, may be deemed confidential under other provisions of law or Government regulation, provides that open hearings may be broadcast and telecast under such rules as the committee may adopt.

Bolling—Deletes provision for broadcasting and telecasting. (New subsection “a” in Bolling bill.) Reid—Same as S. 355. Print No. 3— re Open Hearings, adds to existing provisions of S. 355 the language “or except when the committee determines that, for any other urgent reason, such hearings should not be open to the public.” “Broadcasting, there is some convoluted language here to the effect that if a hearing is open, such hearing (of a House committee) may be broadcast and telecast if the House, in advance of such broadcast, has approved such broadcast by the adoption of a resolution providing for prior approval. If the House, by resolution, grants permission to broadcast such hearings, we have a public service, without commercial sponsorship, and further provided that the bill language should be limited to the broadcasting of his own testimony.

Original bill language conformed to mandatory language of Final Report recommendation (page 11), as follows: “18. Daily summaries of testimony shall be prepared by the staff of the committee for the use of members and, after approval by the chairman and ranking minority member, may be printed in committee hearings on approval of chairman and ranking minority member.”

Bolling— Provision deleted. Reid—Provision deleted.

Original bill language conformed to mandatory language of Final Report recommendation (page 11), as follows: “19. Committee shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearings to be held before the committee begins unless the committee determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing at an earlier date.”

Time was reduced to 1 week by adoption of Senate Amendment No. 55—See Congressional Record, volume 113, part 2, page 5224.

**SECTION 103 (A)("c", STATEMENTS OF WITNESSES)**

S. 355— Requires a witness to submit a written statement of his proposed testimony 1 day in advance of his appearance before the committee unless chairman and ranking minority member determine that there is good cause for not complying with the requirement. If so requested by committee, staff shall prepare a digest of such statements for use by committee members.

Bolling— Provision deleted. Reid—Deletes provision for preparation of digest of statements.

Print No. 3— Adds following language to subsection “a”: “Each such standing committee shall, so far as practicable, require all witnesses appearing before it to file in advance written statements of their proposed testimony, and to limit their oral presentations to such written statements. The staff shall prepare digest of such statements for the use of committee members.”

See Senate Amendment No. 55, Congressional Record, volume 113, part 3, pages 3224-3225.

**SEC. 103 (A)("d", SUMMARIES OF DAILY TESTIMONY)**

S. 355— Provides that upon conclusion of a hearing, by majority and minority leaders or their representatives, shall be permitted to conduct hearings during floor sessions by obtaining consent of the majority and minority leaders of their respective chambers.

Sec. 104 was amended on Feb. 1 (Congressional Record, vol. 113, pt. 2, pp. 2247-2249) and Feb. 7 (Congressional Record, vol. 113, pt. 2, pp. 2830-2836); both amendments affected only Senate.

**FIVE CONGRESSMEN CALL FOR END TO "DRAFT CONFUSION" FOR NONDEFERRED JUNIOR COLLEGE AND GRADUATE STUDENTS**

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues, Congressman Richard S. Schweiker, of Pennsylvania; Congressman Garner E. Shervey, of Kansas; Congressman Robert T. Stafford, of Vermont; and Congressman John M. Whalen, of Ohio; and myself, I call upon the administration to end the unnecessary delay in providing draft classifications for students in junior colleges and graduate schools.

There are hundreds of thousands of students who are waiting for the President to take some specific action to end the confusion surrounding deferments for this year. The Executive Director of the Selective Service System, for example, has suggested that at the end of this academic year, some 274,000 men will become eligible for the draft by graduating from college, finishing a master's degree or completing the final year of graduate school. This excludes, she notes, some 421,000 students who are over age, veterans, or who will be deferred for other reasons or who will volunteer.

The complications resulting from the administration's failure to take action does not stop there. The universities are also in the difficult position of having to plan staffs, budgets, curriculums, and
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housing for a student body which may consist of no more than women, veterans, those over 26, and those physically unacceptable to the military. There have been repeated attempts by private institutions and some collegiate associations to prod the administration into action.

Under the law which took effect last July, the National Security Council is to send a list to the Selective Service System recommending that deferments be granted for certain critical skills and essential occupations—the classifications under which high school seniors or those working toward a baccalaureate degree must come if they are to be deferred. The National Security Council has not yet done this, even though the law has been in effect for 8 months.

Much of the criticism of the draft law has centered on the "uncertainty factor" facing every young man until he is 26. Supposedly, the law passed last year was an improvement on the old system, giving the President more concrete guidelines for deferments of students. Yet the President has only increased the confusion over deferments by failing to promulgate guidelines for new II-A critical skills, deferments.

Furthermore, we hope the President will take full advantage of the new section in the law providing him with the ability to recommend uniform criteria across the Nation for administration of this and other deferment practices. Last July, we filed the Draft Reform Act of 1967 calling for mandatory uniform standards. It is believed that would follow identical classification and deferment policies. This legislation followed an intense study of the draft by my four colleagues and myself. We have since published that study in a book entitled "How To End the Draft."

PROMOTING TRAVEL IN THE UNITED STATES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the dangers of a new wave of isolationism may be increasing in this country, the last thing that Americans need is reduced contacts with people from other nations. The tensions and hostilities of modern life call for more foreign travel, not less.

At the same time, however, the large U.S. payments deficit caused by foreign travel may compromise our international economic position. Because there were many more official visits last year than there were foreign visitors to the United States, tourism represented a net loss of about $2 billion in our world trade accounts.

It is important to recognize that this deficit, which has existed for years, be reduced or eliminated.

But restrictive measures that would discourage Americans from traveling abroad could create more problems than they solve. In addition to fostering international misunderstanding and infringing upon our basic rights as citizens of a free country, such measures might invite negative reactions from other nations which depend on tourism from the United States for a substantial part of their income. The net result could be an even larger payments deficit than we now have.

In the hope of avoiding the necessity for restrictive legislation, I am introducing today a bill that would accomplish the same results by encouraging more Americans to promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally, and by otherwise encouraging and facilitating travel within the United States (including its possessions for the purpose of this Act)."

"Sec. 2. In order to carry out the purpose of this Act the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the 'Secretary') shall—

"(1) formulate for the United States a comprehensive policy with respect to domestic travel;

"(2) develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program designed to encourage Americans to visit and enjoy the United States for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities that will increase the understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and the United States;

"(3) encourage the development of tourist facilities in the United States, and other arrangements within the United States for meeting the requirements of all travelers; and

"(4) ensure the equitable distribution of the benefits of travel at the cheapest rates between foreign countries and the United States, and between the United States consistent with sound economic principles;

"(5) encourage the simplification, reduction, or elimination of barriers to travel, and facilitate travel to and within the United States generally; and

"(6) establish, publish, and provide for the exchange of statistics and technical information, including schedules of meetings, fairs, and other attractions, relating to travel and tourism; and

"(7) establish an office to be known as the Office of Travel Program Coordination, which shall assist the Secretary in carrying out his responsibilities under this Act for the purpose of

"(A) achieving maximum coordination of the programs of the various departments and agencies of the United States Government to promote the purposes of this Act,

"(B) consulting with appropriate officers and agencies of the United States Government, and with private organizations and agencies, with respect to programs undertaken pursuant to this Act, and

"(C) achieving the effective coordination of the Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, and of private organizations and agencies, concerned with such programs.

"(a) by inserting the following at the end of section 3 (b) the following: "and shall not otherwise compete with the activities of any for-profit enterprise.""

"(b) by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 4," and by inserting at the end of such section a new subsection as follows:

"(1) The Secretary shall appoint two assistant directors for the purpose of this Act. Such assistant directors shall be compensated and reimbursed on the same basis as GS-18 in the Classification Act of 1949;"

"(c) by redesigning sections 5, 6, and 7 as sections 6, 7, and 8, respectively, and by

The full text of my bill and the New York Times editorial follow:

H.R. 15235

A bill to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote travel in the United States.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the International Travel Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2121-2126) is amended—

"(1) by striking out the first and second sections and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "That it is the purpose of this Act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, to promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by..."; and

"(2) by redesigning sections 5, 6, and 7 as sections 6, 7, and 8, respectively, and by
inserting after section 4 a new section as follows:

"Sec. 5. (a) The Secretary shall establish a National Tourism Resources Review Commission. Such Commission shall be composed of fifteen members appointed by the Secretary from among persons who are informed about and concerned with the improvement, development, and promotion of United States tourism resources and opportunities or who are interested in tourism research, tourism promotion, or planning. The Secretary shall appoint a chairman from among such members. The Commission shall meet at the call of the chairman."

(b) The Commission shall make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of recommending with respect thereto, to the President and the Congress be joined, if the Commission is authorized by section 5 of the National Tourism Resources Review Act of 1961, to the Secretary, the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Commission such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Commerce as the Commission may require to carry out its functions.

(c) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive a rate of compensation that shall be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 8 of the National Tourism Resources Review Act of 1961 (73b-2) for persons in the Government service abroad, adding to the outlay instead of reducing it.

(d) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive a rate of compensation that shall be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 8 of the National Tourism Resources Review Act of 1961 (73b-2) for persons in the Government service abroad, adding to the outlay instead of reducing it.

(e) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive a rate of compensation that shall be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 8 of the National Tourism Resources Review Act of 1961 (73b-2) for persons in the Government service abroad, adding to the outlay instead of reducing it.

(f) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive a rate of compensation that shall be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 8 of the National Tourism Resources Review Act of 1961 (73b-2) for persons in the Government service abroad, adding to the outlay instead of reducing it.

(g) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive a rate of compensation that shall be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 8 of the National Tourism Resources Review Act of 1961 (73b-2) for persons in the Government service abroad, adding to the outlay instead of reducing it.

(h) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive a rate of compensation that shall be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 8 of the National Tourism Resources Review Act of 1961 (73b-2) for persons in the Government service abroad, adding to the outlay instead of reducing it.

(i) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive a rate of compensation that shall be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 8 of the National Tourism Resources Review Act of 1961 (73b-2) for persons in the Government service abroad, adding to the outlay instead of reducing it.

(j) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive a rate of compensation that shall be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 8 of the National Tourism Resources Review Act of 1961 (73b-2) for persons in the Government service abroad, adding to the outlay instead of reducing it.

(k) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive a rate of compensation that shall be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 8 of the National Tourism Resources Review Act of 1961 (73b-2) for persons in the Government service abroad, adding to the outlay instead of reducing it.

(l) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive a rate of compensation that shall be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 8 of the National Tourism Resources Review Act of 1961 (73b-2) for persons in the Government service abroad, adding to the outlay instead of reducing it.

(m) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive a rate of compensation that shall be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 8 of the National Tourism Resources Review Act of 1961 (73b-2) for persons in the Government service abroad, adding to the outlay instead of reducing it.

(n) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive a rate of compensation that shall be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 8 of the National Tourism Resources Review Act of 1961 (73b-2) for persons in the Government service abroad, adding to the outlay instead of reducing it.

(o) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive a rate of compensation that shall be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 8 of the National Tourism Resources Review Act of 1961 (73b-2) for persons in the Government service abroad, adding to the outlay instead of reducing it.

(p) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive a rate of compensation that shall be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 8 of the National Tourism Resources Review Act of 1961 (73b-2) for persons in the Government service abroad, adding to the outlay instead of reducing it.

(q) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive a rate of compensation that shall be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 8 of the National Tourism Resources Review Act of 1961 (73b-2) for persons in the Government service abroad, adding to the outlay instead of reducing it.

(r) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive a rate of compensation that shall be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 8 of the National Tourism Resources Review Act of 1961 (73b-2) for persons in the Government service abroad, adding to the outlay instead of reducing it.

(s) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive a rate of compensation that shall be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 8 of the National Tourism Resources Review Act of 1961 (73b-2) for persons in the Government service abroad, adding to the outlay instead of reducing it.
SECTION 232.—PROXY VOTING—COMMITTEE REPORTS

S. 355: Subsection (a) makes applicable to the committees of the House of Representatives the proxy voting language as that to apply to other committees—see Section 102(d).

subsection (b) requires the committee report accompanying each appropriation bill (in both houses) to include an analysis of the major factors taken into consideration by the committee in reporting the bill and recommending the appropriations contained therein. The report must also state the considerations given to cost-effectiveness analyses or studies relating to programs for which funds are carried in the bill which have been furnished to or made by legislative committees.

Subsection (c) requires that reports accompanying supplemental or deficiency appropriation bills include an explanation of the nature of the request for each supplemental or deficiency appropriation and the reason such request was not made or could not be made for inclusion in the regular appropriations bill for the fiscal year, or could not be withheld for inclusion in the regular appropriation bill for the following fiscal year.

Bolling: No provision. (See new Section 222 of Bolling)

Reid: Same as S. 355. Print No. 3: Provision deleted.

NOTE.—See Final Report page 33: “8. The Appropriations Committees shall examine multiagency programs through review by the full committee or designated subcommittees.”

SECTION 233.—ROLLCALL VOTES ON COMPENSATION OF SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES

S. 356: Requires yeas-and-nay vote on final passage of an appropriation bill in both Houses, and requests the Clerk of the House to cause the roll call to be printed as part of the report on appropriation bills.

Bolling: No provision.

Reid: Same as S. 356. (Sec. 236 of Reid bill).

Print No. 3: Provision deleted.

NOTE.—This provision was added by Senate Amendment No. 88, by Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Congressional Record, vol. 115, pt. 5, pp. 4125-4127, accepted by voice vote.

New provision—Reid bill

New Sec. 335 of Reid bill provides for the establishment of a joint committee to make a study of "means of (1) giving recipients of Federal educational assistance programs assurance as to the amount of funds they will receive in a fiscal year under such programs far enough in advance of the beginning of such year to permit them effectively to plan their participation in such programs for such year, and (2) providing the funds necessary to pay costs that may not be sufficient in the fiscal year to permit the recipients to use the funds effectively and economically.

The joint committee is to report no later than 3 months after its approval and to go out of business on submission of the report.

MAKING 18 YEARS THE ELIGIBLE VOTING AGE FOR FEDERAL ELECTIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a House joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States making citizens who have attained 18 years of age eligible to vote in Federal elections.

As you know, this subject has been before Congress for many years, but for a number of reasons, no positive results have been forthcoming.

Most of the arguments for and against this proposal are well known to all of our colleagues. I shall not go into these longstanding opinions in depth. Instead, I will address myself to the logic, wisdom, and the practicality of the matter as I see it.

The 18-year-old citizen today is better educated and better equipped intellectually and morally than was his counterpart of 20 and 30 years ago. In our schools today, the student is becoming more aware and more interested in government and political activity than was his parent at the same level of education. It is the opinion of many that at age 18 the citizen student may acquire the training and education with which we would like our young people equipped as they become more aware and more interested in government, and with which we have offered the 18-year-olds the right to vote, we will begin to close the "generation gap" we hear so much about today.

The early participation of our younger citizen in voting will do two things. It will broaden the base of our democratic Government by balancing the older voter who is more inclined to be satisfied with the status quo and it will help to bring about an electorate that is better informed and truly interested in the effectiveness and capability of its public servants.

President Kennedy once said and I quote, "The future promise of any nation can be directly measured by the participation of its 18-year-olds in our elections. Participation is increasingly dependent on the opportunities, capabilities, and vitality of those who are soon to bear its chief responsibilities." Professor Clinton Rossiter, "Goals for a New Generation," writes:

The American future rests rather on the quality of our votes—and of our participation of every kind—than it does on the quantity. What America needs is not more voters, but more informed and more active men and women who are informed, understanding and responsible.

Mr. Speaker, we would do well to heed the advice of these two prominent Americans—to have faith in our young who are soon to bear the chief responsibilities of our Government and to involve them at a time when they are enthusiastic and interested in government and politics.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks a copy of the joint resolution I have introduced today, as follows:

H.J. Res. 1078

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States making citizens who have attained 18 years of age eligible to vote in Federal elections

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each)
Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent days there has been much talk about placing higher interest rates on American homeowners.

Much of this talk has come from well-meaning persons who are seeking answers that will revive the Nation's home-building industry and give millions of Americans the opportunity to own and live in decent homes.

All of these proposals are aimed in one direction—to increase the flow of funds into home mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration. This is the big need. There is no disagreement about this.

At first glance, Mr. Speaker, the theory that higher interest rates would accomplish this objective seems reasonable to many. It has been seized on as the panacea, as the only answer.

The history of the flow of new credit into the mortgage market shows conclusively that the flow of funds has often decreased following an increase in the interest rate. A study printed in hearings on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on page 47.

The history of the flow of new credit into the mortgage market indicates that higher interest rates may be ineffective at least as often as they are effective in attracting either a larger total of funds or a larger share of the funds available to all borrowers.

The most recent experiences of HUD bear out this contention. Three times in 1966 FHA raised its interest rates, finally reaching the statutory limit of 6 percent.

The result of these three increases in interest rates was a drop in the total units insured by FHA from 593,000 in 1965 to 470,000 units in 1966—a 20-percent decline. FHA's programs for low and moderate income housing suffered the most, dropping 27 percent despite the interest rate increases.

HUD, itself, concluded in a news release, dated March 9, 1967:

Shortage of mortgage money, higher interest rates since 1966, bore more heavily on those of lower income than on those better able to pay for homes, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development reported today.

In short, HUD's experiment with high interest rates in 1966 brought only higher costs, not an increase in housing mortgage accommodation. There is no evidence to suggest that a new round of FHA interest rate increases would bring any different results in 1968.

Mr. Speaker, all of this points to the fact that housing mortgage paper is in a competitive mortgage market regulated by HUD. If we consider any changes in the FHA interest rates, we must consider this overriding fact.

For example, it must be remembered that mortgaging paper is usually long term. A million-dollar bundle of housing paper involves many owners and many separate pieces of paper. It is obvious that the lender would rather pick up a single commercial note of $1 million than 50 or 60 moderate-income mortgages. The time, trouble, and cost of handling the housing paper is obviously greater. So, given equal or near equal interest rates, the lender will choose the commercial paper or municipal bonds or Treasury bills in preference to housing mortgages.

Also, many lenders are reluctant, particularly in times of tight money, to tie up their money in long-term FHA paper. In such cases it is quite possible participation certificates, Treasury notes, or other prime paper, bearing a shorter maturity date, could outbid 20-year housing mortgages even in the interest rate on the mortgage paper was slightly higher.

So, the question arises and again: To what extent can high interest rates make housing mortgages, FHA or otherwise, competitive? Mr. Speaker, just how high would we have to go to be competitive in this market?

The special nature of the housing market has been recognized for decades by the Federal Government. The existence of the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal National Mortgage Association—Fannie Mae—are the result of specific policies based on the theory that a special stimulant was needed in the current circumstances.

The existence of both agencies is evidence that housing mortgage paper is not and cannot be fully competitive in the money market.

Yet now, we have proposals based on an announced goal of making FHA mortgage paper competitive with all other borrowers in the economy. This is a goal that can be reached only at excessively high costs and with the loss of housing opportunities to particularly low and moderate income units.

Like Fannie Mae and FHLLB, the establishment of FHA was designed to insulate at least part of the home mortgage market from the vagaries of the money markets and to hold down costs to the home buyer. If FHA now converts itself into a vehicle for higher interest rates, and higher housing costs, then its original purpose will have been seriously distorted. If not totally destroyed.

HIGHER FHA RATES WILL COST HOMEOWNERS HEAVILY AND REDUCE HOUSING CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Speaker, these proposals would, overnight, raise the cost of housing at least 11 percent. For the average homeowner, the increased cost over the life of a 30-year mortgage would be between $4,500 and $5,000. Later I will detail all of the additional costs that would be imposed on the homeowner under these increased interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I urge those who are promoting this idea to slow down, to study the facts just will not bear out their contentions that higher interest rates on FHA mortgages are the answer.

Mr. Speaker, let us take the fallacies one by one.

Can housing mortgages be competitive in the money market?

The mainstay of the argument for higher FHA interest rates hangs on the theory that higher interest rates will increase the flow of the money. Thus, these theorists are promoting the idea that housing mortgage paper can somehow be made competitive. Mr. Speaker, all experience indicates that housing paper is the orphan child of the money market. In periods of high interest rates and tight money, it is the housing market which suffers first and the most.

During these periods, interest rates on conventional mortgages rise substantially but the flow of funds continues to drop. In 1966, interest rates on conventional mortgages rose to record highs, but housing starts declined by at least 500,000 units.

If high interest rates do not make conventional mortgages competitive in times of tight money, then why would high interest rates make FHA mortgages competitive?

A study of past changes in the FHA interest rates shows conclusively that the flow of funds has often decreased following an increase in the interest rate. A study printed in hearings on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on page 47.

The special nature of the housing market has been recognized for decades by the Federal Government. The existence of the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal National Mortgage Association—Fannie Mae—are the result of specific policies based on the theory that a special stimulant was needed in the current circumstances.

The existence of both agencies is evidence that housing mortgage paper is not and cannot be fully competitive in the money market.
This would place this type of paper, insured by the Federal Government, substantially above yields for Treasury notes, participation certificates and like securities.

As a result, interest rates on Treasury notes and PC's would skyrocket overnight to compete with the new 7-percent rate FHA paper backed by the Government insurance. We would experience a quick leapfrogging of all Government rates, thus costing the taxpayers billions of dollars in added costs on Treasury borrowings.

After the Treasury notes and PC's have jumped, the FHA paper will again find itself in a disadvantageous competitive position. Once again, the lenders and the homebuilders would seek a new increase in the FHA rate.

The cycle would continue until the FHA had priced millions of homeowners out of the market.

In addition to forcing up Treasury rates, an increase in the rate on insured FHA mortgages would undoubtedly trigger higher mortgage rates on municipal bonds and similar securities. Conventional mortgages likewise would keep pace in front of the FHA rate.

In proposing an increase in the FHA rate, many have argued that this would reduce the number of points or discounts that the borrower pays by 8-percent FHA mortgages. However, Mr. Speaker, I have heard no contention that these points would be eliminated by an increase in interest rates. There have only been reasons that the points would be reduced, possibly to 3 or 4.

In short, it is obvious that we would have FHA mortgages of 7 percent, with points.

In none of these proposals is there a plan to control points either by statute or administration action.

While points have gone down in the past, they have always reappeared in peacetime as quickly as they were bared by post-war experience. It seems likely that points would creep back to the highest levels whatever the interest rates.

In other words, there may be a slight reduction in 6 percent as soon as the interest rate is raised to 7 percent. If general tight money conditions continued, points would go right back up to the same level that exists now with 6 percent FHA mortgages.

The long-range picture is: 7-percent FHA mortgages with maximum points.

InCREASED COST TO THE HOMEBUYER

Without question, the plan to increase the FHA interest rate would mean a massive increase in costs to the homebuyer.

Interest costs are by far the largest item of cost in a house. They far outstrip the total of all other costs including land, material, and labor.

As I mentioned earlier, the removal of the FHA ceiling would approximate an 11-percent increase in the cost of a house.

Quite frankly, millions of American workers cannot afford an 11-percent increase in the cost of housing. An increase in the FHA rate will topple these Americans back into substandard and overcrowded housing. Others will forego proper food, education, health care and recreational opportunities to meet the 11-percent increase in housing costs.

Even substantial middle class families would be hurt badly by such an increase.

Let us compare the cost of a house at 6 percent with that at 7 percent interest.

Under current 6-percent ceiling, a $20,000 home purchased on a 30-year mortgage would actually cost the buyer $43,171.20-$23,171.20 interest.

Under the proposed 7-percent FHA rate, a $20,000 home purchased on a 30-year mortgage would actually cost the buyer $47,845.20-$27,845.20 interest.

Removal of the ceiling would cost the home buyer $4,674, additional, a 17-percent increase in the interest cost.

Paced with the prospect that low and moderate income families could not meet the added interest charges, builders would be inclined to construct more expensive homes. Thus, the shortage of low and moderate income housing would grow rapidly. This would be contradictory to President Johnson's state of the Union message which called for a sharp increase in the construction of this type of housing.

We must face the fact that, overall, a general increase in interest rates would undoubtedly mean a loss in housing starts. For example, Federal Reserve Board Chairman Mears, in a speech September 7, 1967, estimated that a 1-percent increase in interest rates causes a loss of 120,000 housing units at an annual rate.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot escape the fact that an increase in the FHA interest rate would, in effect, be a mandate to the States to raise usury limits. It appears that States with 6-percent usury statutes would be forced to raise the limit immediately or be left out of FHA programs.

Nine States with 26 percent of the Nation's population now have 6-percent usury limits. A 10th State, North Carolina, has 6½ percent. Eight other States have 6 percent. States with 6½ percent are: Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia. Six other States have 6 percent usury, 6 percent for 7 years and 6 percent for 8 years.

States with 6-, 6½-, and 7-percent usury statutes would probably be forced to seek an increase through legislative action. Some States would be forced to call special sessions to deal with the situation forced on them by an increase in the FHA rate.

Unfortunately, Congressional action to remove the FHA ceiling would be interpreted as nothing less than a directive to these States to raise their usury limits. It would mark the first time that the Federal Government had forced up usury rates.

This would be a sad followup to the enactment of the recent Consumer Credit Bill.

In addition, it is my understanding that in some areas, existing mortgages have escalator clauses tied to the usury statutes. In other words, if the usury limit is raised, then the lender has the option of raising the rate on existing mortgages.

Therefore, an increase in the FHA rate could mean a sharp increase in the cost of existing mortgages. This would be a hardship on older citizens and others who have adjusted their fixed incomes to the maximum extent possible to meet mortgage costs.

If such a rate increase in the FHA rate would put pressure on special assistance programs, including housing for the elderly, military housing, cooperative housing, various urban renewal programs, it is possible that higher interest rates would actually wipe out some of these programs—programs that are in the greatest need and the shortest supply.

Mr. Speaker, there are many alternatives to the removal of the FHA mortgage rate. In coming days, I shall discuss these in greater detail. However, I do want to call attention to Public Law 90-597 which gives the Federal Reserve System's Open Market Committee full authority to purchase housing paper from the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board system.

This legislation was passed in the 89th Congress and renewed in the first session of the 90th Congress. It is legislation which has been fully supported by the Secretary of the Treasury, the heads of the Federal Reserve System and the affected Federal agencies. I know of no opposition.

Yet, the Federal Reserve System has failed to carry out this provision in any meaningful fashion. Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that the Federal Reserve System should carry out this congressional mandate fully before the Congress is asked to raise interest rates on consumers.

This is a mandate for the Federal Reserve System to support the housing market, and this, it has not done, in defiance of a law that has twice passed the Congress and twice been signed by the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we have this remedy and we should use it before we say to the American homeowner—"Pay more interest."

Also, Mr. Speaker, we should look at all costs involved in a home mortgage. We should also look at the points, the discounts, the closing charges. If we are talking about raising the cost to the consumer on the interest rate side, then perhaps we should consider adequate protection on other costs involved in the mortgage.

At a minimum, the Congress must know what these costs are before it acts on other interest rates. We cannot leave the consumer—the homebuyer—unprotected on all sides in the purchase of a house. If some people want higher interest rates, perhaps they will have to give up some other charge which they impose on the homebuyer and the homeseller.

LOOKING BACK AT TRUTH IN LENDING

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

Mr. Speaker, pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.
Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, after the passage of about a week since the House considered H.R. 11601, popularly described as the truth-in-lending bill. I take this opportunity to look back with some regret which I feel should be made before consideration by the House-Senate conference.

The first thing is to compliment my fellow Missourian, the gentlewoman from St. Louis, Lyman Sullivan, for her leadership as floor manager of this measure. It was her determination that resulted in the passage of a bill with the meaningful content necessary to afford the greatest protection to the greatest number. While her work was perhaps the sparkplug in the drive that won for the consumers of this country their big victory last week. It was so very interesting to observe that most of those who spoke against the bill and particularly against the amendments to strengthen the bill, once the roll was called, in spite of their negative arguments, could not afford to be recorded as being against either the bill or the amendments. It was important to those who must borrow and those who have to pay for their purchases in installments.

In any comment upon a truth-in-lending bill, we must never forget that the man who started it all was Paul Douglas, then Senator from Illinois, over 8 years ago. He introduced the first bill in the Senate and continued his efforts until his defeat in 1966; one year ago his pioneering bore fruit as the gentlelady from Missouri so ably steered the bill to its passage by the unexpected and unanticipated final vote of 382 to 4. When that vote is recorded in the conference becomes law, it is hoped it will be called the Douglas-Sullivan Act.

February 1 was a bad day in the House for the loan sharks. They have been called names in the privacy of their loan offices which are unprintable. They have even been sworn at in public. But they have never suffered such a hard blow as their defeat of 1 week ago.

Bearing testimony to our judgment upon all those who grant credit and to whom the provisions of this bill apply, we must be careful to note we have not suggested that all creditors or grantors of credit are as a class untruthful. But it cannot be denied that some creditors have abused the loan process and have engaged in practices which make this legislation not only desirable, but necessary.

As I look around the Fourth Missouri Congressional District, I am proud to be able to report that the great majority of banks, lending institutions, and other extenders of credit are ethical and honorable and that "truth in lending" and other similar consumer legislation has not been necessitated by their fair business practices. Notwithstanding, the good people I represent were entitled to and received a new Federal consumer legislation which will protect them from some questionable credit practices by a few unscrupulous places of business and some few loan offices that do prey upon the consumer.

I became persuaded quite some time ago that the consumer all across our country needed the kind of protection this bill will afford from the unscrupulous practices of a few operators in the credit field.

We now have enactments on the statute books which call for the labeling of textiles, furs, and several other items. In our present economy which depends so heavily on property and the maintenance of our high standard of living, it is essential that the labeling of credit terms must also be truthful.

In consideration of specific provisions I think we can all be grateful for the strong provisions contained in the consumer credit protection bill which relate to the advertising of credit terms. Many of the hardships which have been experienced by consumers all over our land have started out with what could be called advertising bait. Misleading advertising has stated credit terms in indefinite and even evasive language. I am certain that when this bill becomes effective, the merchants who in the past may have thought it was all right to advertise credit terms in connection with the merchandise to which their terms apply, will be denied the latitude to state half-truths and even worse, untruths, as they try to seek the patronage of credit customers.

Who among us has not seen the misleading advertisements about "4-per cent financing" on new cars which can be only a half-truth because of the additional and concealed charges which are never stated in the advertising. Such a practice will now be a violation of law.

It was the committee which strengthened by the provision that requires the statement of total finance charges in terms of dollars and cents in the case of revolving credit accounts. It is also beneficial that the requirement for mortgage lending be more specific with respect to advising borrowers just how much their loans will cost.

I would be remiss if I were to neglect to observe that there were, however, some amendments which, while desirable in principle, may be legally questionable if and when put to the test of constitutionality. Garnishment of wages has long been a necessary device to protect legitimate claimants in many places these laws have been used so promiscuously by the unscrupulous and predatory type of credit operator as to strongly suggest the tightening up of these statutes. I voted in support of the amendment to exempt the first $30 from a worker's wages and to limit the remainder over $30 to 10 per cent of the total wages due. But in supporting this provision I realized that this amendment, while it has been a protection to certain wage earners, could and perhaps would in many instances deny State courts the power to enforce their own garnishment laws.

In one of my fellow Southerners, the new Federal provision would affect our State statutes but very little. There would be no substantial change. Again I would be unobserving and careless if I were to omit to point out it is quite open to question or at least an argument has the right to legislate in this area. A rather fuzzy justification for Federal legislation is advanced when it is said this legislation is simply an extension of present Federal legislation in the field of bankruptcy.

The justification for Congress to legislate with respect to the garnishment of wages is placed under the commerce clause as reliance for constitutional authority. I think I strongly favor the reopening of this subject in order that there may be appropriate interpretation of our new act.

One omission which in my opinion should have been made a part of the bill to provide complete protection for consumers in their credit transactions cannot be found in the bill. I refer to the frequent practice of so-called balloon payments encountered at the end of some installment credit contracts. This is a devise which enables the seller of large items of merchandise, such as a major appliance, a suite of furniture, or an automobile to offer a consumer the product for a nominal downpayment plus reasonable and even modest installment payments over a considerable period of time; for example, from 24 to 36 months.

Far too frequently the consumer makes his downpayment and is regular for each of the remaining 23 or 35 payments encountered at the end of this new act can handle such balloon payments administratively or through appropriate interpretation of our new act.

If this does not prove workable or possible, then I strongly favor the reopening of this subject in order that there may be written into law such a prohibition against the use of balloon payments unless in their credit contracts there is a balloon payment. I would propose that such balloon payments be prohibited unless the consumer is advised separately in writing that he will be expected to make a greatly increased installment payment at the end of his time contract.

The amendment which sets a Federal definition for the crime of usury was in my opinion a commendable effort. There are many practices in the field of credit
operations which are less than acceptable. Some are much worse than others. Usury has always been an evil practice. It has been so vicious that history has coined a description for the usurious lender. That description is "loan shark." Unfortunately, that description will always be true of those borrowers who are so desperate that they will agree to pay exorbitant interest rates of almost any amount in order to receive a loan. Most of our States—all but eight or nine—have their own laws to protect the desperate borrower. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Poff) by his amendment places the law-enforcement facilities of the Federal Government at the disposal of the States to enforce their own laws against usury. This so-called "loan shark" amendment will make it a Federal crime with severe penalties to charge interest rates exceeding the maximum allowed under State law in the 43 States which have usury laws. It seems to me that some of the supporters of this amendment who have been so quick to denounce the interest rate ceilings on Treasury bonds or insured mortgages. But to require that the borrower be given information about the true interest charges is quite another matter.

Yes, last week we made quite a stride forward in providing truth in credit transactions. Even now it is hoped no Member of Congress will attempt to dilute the law. The public will merely be naive enough to believe that all efforts at evasion will stop. We cannot let ourselves believe we have eliminated all of those who will try to invent clever means to circumvent the provisions of this act.

I am not very convincing. Just a brief comment on the issue of the amendment which have usury laws. Again, I don't think we should try to enforce interest ceilings on Treasury bonds or insured mortgages. As we would have to do more to aid the American consumer than we have done to this legislation with me.

This legislation represents an effort to achieve the first major overhaul of the Poultry Products Inspection Act since its passage in August of 1957. It includes, in addition to other provisions, amendments to:

- Provide for Federal technical, laboratory, and financial assistance to States setting up poultry inspection systems. If the State does not take steps to set up a poultry inspection program within a maximum of 2 years, the Federal Government would provide inspection in that State.
- Give USDA additional authority and control over marketing channels through which unwholesome poultry could reach the consumer.
- Make additional changes to aid administration of law and strengthen the protection it gives the public against unwholesome, adulterated, mislabeled, or deceptively packaged poultry and poultry products.
- Mr. Speaker, the need for this legislation is not just merely "evident." It demands our attention and our speedy consideration of the legislation just introduced.

Approximately 87 percent of U.S. poultry is slaughtered and inspected by USDA under the Poultry Products Inspection Act administered by C. & M.S. This represents approximately 10.9 billion pounds of poultry which were federally inspected last year. In about 900 poultry slaughtering and processing plants.

The remaining 13 percent—or 1.6 billion pounds—of the Nation's poultry supply are slaughtered and processed in fed­erally inspected plants. Those plants are subject to State and/or local inspection or sanitation re­quirements ranging from full-time mand­atory inspection to spot checks of plants and facilities under provisions of State or local food and health laws.

The following States have a mandatory law requiring inspection of poultry before and after slaughter: California, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Wyoming.

The following States have poultry in­spections on a voluntary basis: Kansas, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Pennsylvania.

The remaining 33 States depend entirely on food and health laws and have no poultry inspection. And what is the situation with regard to Intrastate poultry inspection? Yesterday, the Department of Agri­culture released findings of a survey of 97 plants which were voluntarily inspected. This survey indicates that of the 97 plants checked, only 37 of the plants

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, this week I had the distinct pleasure of joining with three of my colleagues—the gen­
were basically in compliance with sanitation requirements of Federal inspection. In the language of the release, 34 of the plants would need "major" improvements, and 26 others required "moderate" changes.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that one of the leading organizations in the poultry industry, the National Broiler Council, already has announced its support of my bill. I think that this group is favorable in its decision and for its announced desire to obtain speedy and favorable consideration of poultry inspection legislation. I have received indications that other organizations in the poultry field are also favorably inclined toward the measures I have introduced. The support of the National Broiler Council for H.R. 15146 is indicative of the need one major industry source sees to bring under Federal inspection legislation all poultry, most of which is already subject to rigid inspection.

I am very pleased to be associated with my cosponsors, who were active in pursuing the interests of the American consumer. They have done an effusive job in bringing passage of the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967, signed recently into law by the President.

I believe that there now exists the opportunity to make this Congress truly deserve the reputation of being a body that watches out for the American consumer. H.R. 15146 represents the kind of legislation that will achieve this goal, and I hope that my colleagues will join with me in pushing for early passage of this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PREVENTION AND TREATMENT OF NARCOTIC ADDICTION AND ALCOHOLISM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate President Johnson for his great wisdom in sending us legislation for the prevention and treatment of narcotic addiction and alcoholism.

In 1968, alcoholism remains one of the most neglected health problems in America. The need for prompt action to encourage communities to establish comprehensive prevention and treatment facilities for alcoholics increases with the growing recognition that alcoholism is a disease to be treated in the community like other diseases.

The community mental health centers program has proved a concept of comprehensive community care; the Community Mental Health Centers Act provides a model for the administration of care to the alcoholic. This measure was handled by the Joint Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

This program, which has coordinated mental health personnel, general hospitals, health and welfare agencies, and voluntary organizations, is the logical place for the development of comprehensive prevention and treatment programs for the alcoholic.

I support the proposed amendments to the Community Mental Health Centers Act. They will enable us to achieve maximum effectiveness in meeting the needs of alcoholics and narcotic addicts, I urge prompt and favorable consideration of this legislation.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS: THE TRANSPORTATION TOURNIQUET

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, today I join the chairman of our Committee on Merchant Marine and several other colleagues from both sides of the aisle in introducing a concurrent resolution seeking an expression of the sense of Congress that we must address our chronic balance-of-payments deficit. What I and the other cosponsors of this resolution propose is that every effort should be made to encourage American industry and the American public to ship and to travel on American ships, and that all Government agencies should take appropriate measures at their disposal to accomplish this objective.

I earlier recognized the potential role which American shipping could play in remedying our balance-of-payments problem, and on February 18, 1968, during the 89th Congress, I introduced a similar resolution-House Concurrent Resolution 310—which was substantially the same as the one being introduced today. Unfortunately, there was no action taken upon my earlier resolution during the last Congress. The problem of our balance-of-payments payments is, however, still remains with us, and the resolution being introduced today represents one area in which this situation potentially can be improved without incurring any unneeded impact on our economy generally such as may result from certain legislative and voluntary means which have been advanced by the President. I therefore am extremely pleased to lend my support as a cosponsor of the resolution which is to be introduced today.

All too often, the potential role to be played by American shipping in our national economy is overlooked. The fact remains, however, that ocean freight pays a significant negative factor in our balance of payments. This very point was underscored 3 years ago in a 1965 analysis by the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, which noted in part that:

As U.S. trade continues to grow in total amount, failure of the country's merchant fleets to expand significantly in volume and capability carries could balloon the net deficit on the shipping account into a massive factor of imbalance.

This conclusion is as appropriate today as when it was first made in view of the continuing and perilous decline of the American merchant marine.

Indicative of the role which can be played by American shipping, it has been estimated by some that of every dollar spent for ocean freight payments on American cargo ships and on travel aboard American passenger ships 80 cents and 90 cents, respectively, of that dollar is retained in the United States.

A further indication of the contribution which can be made by American transportation generally and shipping in particular to our balance-of-payments problem is to be found in one of several essays prepared by personnel of the Department of Defense and published 2 years ago by the Traffic Service Corp. This essay entitled "Gold Flow: The Transportation Tourniquet" contains the following statement which is particularly pertinent to the sense which we are attempting to express in the resolution being introduced today, and I quote:

True, the U.S. is bleeding gold. But transportation...can play the dual role of setting the proper level balance-of-payments and can play the dual role of setting the proper level balance-of-payments and serving to supply not only a tourniquet but the necessary plasma to overcome our persistent balance-of-payments deficit.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, one of the sad commentaries on the first session of the 96th Congress is the lapse of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress and the failure of the House to act on the proposed Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967 (S. 355). This bill, recommended by the joint committee, is desperately needed as an opportunity to fulfill the longstanding needs of this House for improved practices and procedures.

The various forces which have stalled S. 355 in the House Rules Committee should assume their full responsibility for this unfortunate development. At the very least, the House should have an opportunity to consider the Senate-passed bill and to discuss its various provisions in order to arrive at an acceptable version.

Working through the Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform and Staffing, chaired by my friend and colleague from New Hampshire (Mr. Cray, LAND), members of the task force are attempting to revive an interest in congressional reform. As a part of this effort, I am pleased to insert in the Congressional Record a summary comparing certain sections of title II of S. 355 with the provisions of other congressional reform bills also pending before the Rules Committee. I note with some regret that some of the recommendations which I made in the task force—authorized book, "We propose: A Modern Congress"—McGraw-Hill, 1968. These rec-
omnominations related particularly to enhancing the role of the GAO in the congressional budget process and to the "price tagging" of authorizations.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following in the Record:

TITLE II

PART 4—UTILIZATION OF REPORTS OF GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Sec. 241. Assistance to committees.
Sec. 242. Reports to committees.
Sec. 244. Agency jurisdiction.

PART 5—LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES

Sec. 251. Cost estimates.
Sec. 252. Appropriations on annual basis.
Sec. 253. Committee jurisdiction.

Sec. 251. Cost estimates by legislative committees

Sec. 251. Cost estimates by legislative committees

S. 355. Requires the report accompanying each bill or joint resolution reported by any committee which has legislative jurisdiction to contain—

1) estimates, made by the committee, of the cost of carrying out any proposal submitted for the then current and for the next 5 fiscal years (or the duration of the proposed legislation, if less); and of these cost estimates with any cost estimates made by any executive agency, or

2) a statement of the reasons why the furnishing of such information is impractical.

In the case of a measure affecting revenues, such report shall require only an estimate of the gain or loss in revenues for a period of 1 year.

If the report accompanying a bill or joint resolution complies with these requirements, a point of order may be made against it.

Bolling. Same. (Sec. 241 of Bolling bill.)
Reid. No provision.

Print No. 3. Same as S. 355.

Note.—See Final Report page 35: "12(a)

1) Committee jurisdiction shall include a projection of costs for the next 5 years or for the authorized duration of the proposal if these estimates shall include a comparison of the committee’s cost estimate with that of the executive branch. Final consideration of new legislation shall be anticipated by a 30-day order in the absence of this projection."

Section 251 was twice amended by the Senate, as indicated respectively.

Print No. 3. Same as S. 355.

Note.—See Final Report page 35: "12(a)

1) Committee jurisdiction shall include a projection of costs for the next 5 years or for the authorized duration of the proposal if these estimates shall include a comparison of the committee’s cost estimate with that of the executive branch. Final consideration of new legislation shall be anticipated by a 30-day order in the absence of this projection."

Section 251 was twice amended by the Senate, as indicated respectively.

PRINT 262 & 263: Appropriations; grant-in-aid programs; miscellaneous

S. 355. Sec. 252 directs each committee or joint committee which has legislative jurisdiction, when recommending enactment of legislation, to—

1) to endeavor to secure that all continuing Government programs, and all continuing activities of Federal agencies, are appropriated for annually; (subsection a)

2) to review, from time to time, any program under which it is not appropriated for annually to ascertain whether such program could be modified so that appropriations thereof would be made annually; (subsection b)

3) to make a complete review periodically of grant-in-aid programs, (subsection c)


Reid. No provision.

Print No. 3. Modifies all subsections of Sec. 253 to emphasize that the requirements of this section should be stated separately for each program; other provisions as same as S. 356.

PRINT 264: Expanding Committee jurisdiction

Note.—Section not amended by Senate. See Final Report page 35: "12(b) Each legislative committee shall survey fixed obligation programs and jurisdiction to determine which programs could be modified to provide for annual appropriations review by line item." (See paragraph 2 above; subsection b.)

(c) Each legislative committee shall initiate a program for systematic review of grant-in-aid programs under its jurisdiction. (See paragraph 3 above; subsection c.)

(d) Legislative committees should authorize programs in such a manner that they will be subject to annual appropriation review. (See paragraph 1 above; subsection a.)

Sec. 251. Cost estimates by legislative committees

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERIVER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to correct an inequity in the Internal Revenue Code. At the present time any person who has had the misfortune of having their home damaged or destroyed by fire, tornado, hurricane, or other means, and who must temporarily find another residence while his home is being repaired must declare any insurance payments covering the additional living expenses required by this situation as taxable income.

It is obvious that these insurance payments for living expenses which are higher than normal due to circumstances completely beyond the taxpayer’s control are unfairly determined as taxable income because of an unintended loophole in our tax code. After referring several such cases to the Internal Revenue Service for comment, I have received favorable responses admitting that this situation is unfair. However, as the law is now written, the IRS can do nothing but enforce this inequity.

Much of the Fourth District of Kansas is known as the so-called "tornado alley," which has led to many cases wherein homeowners have been burdened with the loss of their homes, only to have the loss compounded by the necessity of paying income taxes on their additional living expenses insurance payments. My bill will exclude from taxable income any insurance reimbursement for living expenses incurred in connection with a casualty loss.

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

Mr. MATTHEWS of California (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for February 7 and 8, on account of official business.

Mr. GORD (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for February 6, 7, and 8, on account of influenza.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MATTHEWS of California (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for February 7 and 8, on account of official business.

Mr. GORD (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for February 6, 7, and 8, on account of influenza.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SIKES, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLYNT, for 1 hour, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIKES, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The following Members (at the request of the Mr. EKELBORG) to revise extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. HALPERN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. POFF, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. BRAY, for 10 minutes, today.
EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania,
Mr. ALBERT in two instances in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter in each instance,
Mr. DEMPSEY in three instances and to include extraneous matter,
Mr. PETTIS to extend his remarks in the RECORD after those of Mr. WOLFF on the Civil Air Patrol.
Mr. CASEY to follow the remarks of Mr. DARDAR.

Mr. RANDALL in two instances.
Mr. PETTIS immediately following Mr. BELL on H. R. 11284.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ERENBORN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHWENDEL.
Mr. CEBBERG.
Mr. ASHBOOK in two instances.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. PELLY in two instances.
Mr. HUNT in two instances.
Mr. ADAIR.
Mr. WHALEN.
Mr. MILLER of Ohio.
Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.
Mr. ZWACH.
Mr. DERWINSKY.
Mr. BROCK in three instances.
Mr. MILLER of Ohio.
Mr. BRAY in two instances.
Mr. COLLIER in two instances.
Mr. GERALD R. FORD.
Mr. BARBER.
Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.
Mr. HARVEY.
Mr. DOLE.
Mr. KUPFERMAN in five instances.
Mr. MCCLOY in two instances.
Mr. MCCLOY in two instances.
Mr. DENT.
Mr. HOLTHUS.
Mr. TAYLOR in two instances.
Mr. DANIELS in three instances.
Mrs. KELLEY.
Mr. BROOKS.
Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee.
Mr. ADAMS in two instances.
Mr. GALLAGHER in four instances.
Mr. SELSEN in two instances.
Mr. FRAKER.
Mr. HOLFIELD.
Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.
Mr. O’HARA of Michigan in two instances.
Mr. TUNNEY in two instances.
Mr. MCCARTHY.
Mr. KIRWAN.
Mr. COGAN.
Mr. DINGELL in five instances.
Mr. CAREY in two instances.
Mr. CHARIM.
Mr. HARDY in two instances.
Mr. FARBSTEIN in eight instances.
Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BOLLING.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.
Mr. RODINO.
Mr. COHLEN in two instances.
Mr. FLOOD in two instances.
Mr. FEHRER in five instances.
Mr. BRYAN in three instances.
Mr. WHITENER.
Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances.
Mr. BARNES.
Mr. SHIPP.
Mr. FRIEDEL.
Mr. ASHLEY in two instances.
Mr. ADDAFFO in four instances.
Mr. PICKLE.
Mr. ST. ONGE in two instances.
Mr. BARTON.
Mr. BARRETT.
Mr. ROSENTHAL.
Mr. HEBERT.
Mr. RAKICK in four instances.
Mr. HENDERSON in two instances.
Mr. YOUNG.
Mr. VAN DERLIN.
Mr. KYROS.
Mr. HATHAWAY.
Mr. HOLLAND in two instances.
Mr. LONG of Maryland.
Mr. DORN.
Mr. HAGAN in three instances.
Mr. TIERNAN.
Mr. WOLFF.
Mr. EDWARDS of California.
Mr. RINSICK.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title, which was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows: S. 2611. An act to maintain and improve the income of producers of crude pine gum, to stabilize production of crude pine gum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon adopted by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 947. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period February 11 through 17, 1968, as "LULAC Week."

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 13004. An act to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 12, 1968, 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:

1485. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on International, Educational, and Cultural Affairs, transmitting the fifth annual report of the Advisory Commission pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87-250 (H. Doc. No. 252); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1486. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examinations of financial statements of the Panama Canal Company, fiscal years 1967 and 1966 (H. Doc. No. 253); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1487. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify and otherwise amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State poultry products inspections programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1488. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each reserve component of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1489. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on the progress of the Army's digitization program for fiscal year 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 2110(b) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1490. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 708(b) of title 10, United States Code, to include the authority to grant a special 30-day period of leave for members of the uniformed services who voluntarily extend their tours of duty in hostile fire areas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1491. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1492. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation providing for death penalties for banks and other financial institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1493. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the highlights and recommendations from the general report of the Advisory Council on Vocational Education, 1968, entitled "Vocational Education: The Bridge Between Man and His Work (Publication 1)" pursuant to the provisions of section 12(c) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1494. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings in procurement of petroleum products for use by Navy contractors, Department of the Navy, pursuant to the request of the Committee on Government Operations.

1495. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1496. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation titled "Alcoholic and Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Amendments of 1968"; to the
REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE VILLAGE 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. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 15219. A bill to authorize the use of the vessel Ocean Delight in the coastwise trade.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1094). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 2192. A bill to authorize the possession of any such drug for one's personal use, or for the personal use of another, and to provide for the civil and criminal penalties for violations of any such law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 15215. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for the manufacture, advertisement for introduction, or introduction into interstate commerce of motor vehicle master keys, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15216. A bill to authorize the Bureau of Prisons to assist State and local governments in the improvement of correctional systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 15217. A bill to permit the release of certain veterans from liability to the United States for the possession, manufacture, or transportation of LSD or other hallucinogenic drugs by unauthorized persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 15218. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prescribe penalties for the manufacture of LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs by unauthorized persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15219. A bill to require persons discharged from the uniformed services before October 1, 1959, who had demonstrated a 100 percent capacity for service, and who have suffered disabilities in the uniformed services as a result of war or national emergency declared by the President, to be given preference in employment and training in accordance with the provisions of the Rehabilitation Act of 1943; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COWGER:

H.R. 15220. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prescribe penalties for the possession of LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs by unauthorized persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 15221. A bill to set forth a comprehensive policy for the development of the United States as a center for the production of the raw materials for national defense; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 15222. A bill to provide that a family separation allowance shall be paid to any member of a uniformed service assigned to a station or ship located in a country or area in which the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Navy determines that the country or area is otherwise entitled to such separation allowance; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15223. A bill to provide for a coordinated national safety program to reduce boating accidents, and deaths and injuries resulting therefrom; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 15224. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 15225. A bill to place in trust certain lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 15226. A bill to establish the Fossil Butte National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 15227. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide a new system of postal rates for postmasters, mail carriers, and other Federal 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. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 15228. A bill to declare and determine the policy of the Congress with respect to the primary authority of the several States to control, regulate, and manage fish and wildlife within their territorial boundaries; to confirm the exclusive primary authority and responsibility with respect to the management, regulation, and control of such fish and wildlife owned by the United States and to specify the exceptions applicable thereto, and to provide procedure under which Federal agencies may obtain regulations for the regulation of local wildlife on such lands; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LAMAR:

H.R. 15229. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the Federal Government to bar the entry to the United States of any alien believed disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. RING:

H.R. 15230. 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.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 15231. A bill to authorize the Committee of the University of California and the General Staff College to award the degree of master of military arts and science; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15232. A bill to authorize the U.S. Customs Court to maintain an office at the city of Los Angeles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15233. 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.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 15234. A bill to direct the Council of the District of Columbia to establish regulations to control radiation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 15235. A bill to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote travel to the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 15236. 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.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 15237. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a comprehensive review of the medical, technical, scientific, and health information agencies which the Nation faces as a result of medical progress toward making transplantation of organs and the use of artificial organs a

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. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 14401. A bill to grant the masters of certain U.S. vessels a
practical alternative in the treatment of disease by an improved public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of regional screening programs for patients with kidney disease and for the conduct of training related to such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENNEY:
H.R. 15258. A bill providing for the addition of the United Nations School to the Home-stead National Monument of America in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN:
H.R. 15239. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of postmasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 15253. A bill to provide for certain minimum payments to States from receipts derived from forested lands within such States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLEMAN of Texas:
H.R. 15266. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:
H.R. 15253. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the elimination of the requirement of service of five years in the active military forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15258. A bill to provide for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:
H.R. 15265. A bill for the relief of certain persons injured or the dependents of persons killed by acts of terrorism; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MESSICK:
H.R. 15251. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDLER (for himself and Mr. Grover):
H.R. 15260. A bill to provide for the relief of the survivors of the Jackson, Miss., Medgar Evers Memorial Hospital for children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 15260. A bill to provide for the relief of certain persons injured or the dependents of persons killed by acts of terrorism; to the Committee on Armed Services.
By Mr. MINSHALL:
H.R. 15278. 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.

By Mr. SHIRER:
H.R. 15290. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income amounts received for additional living expenses arising out of a casualty loss to the Federal government; to reduce certain interest rates on Federal credit for the purpose of releasing a Federal credit for a Federal credit for land; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEILSEN (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. O'KONSKI, and Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland):
H.R. 15300. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Public Education Act; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. STAOGERS:
H.R. 15313. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to make provision for specialized facilities for alcoholics and narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAHILL:
H.R. Res. 1077. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MODER:
H.J. Res. 1074. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HABSHA:
H.R. Res. 1076. 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. MATSUNAGA:

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:
H.J. Res. 1077. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TIERMAN:
H.J. Res. 1078. Joint resolution proposing and authorizing the President to convey to the United States making citizens who have attained 18 years of age eligible to vote in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:
H.J. Res. 1079. Joint resolution to direct the Federal Communications Commission to study the ways in which commercial broadcasters may be required to provide financial support to nonprofit educational radio stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUPPE:
H.J. Res. 1080. Joint resolution to assist veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere in obtaining suitable employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STEPHENS (for himself and Mr. GRETTY):
H.J. Res. 1081. Joint resolution providing, until October 1, 1969, for flexible interest rates for mortgage insurance programs and continuing the low-cost housing assistance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STUCKEY (for himself, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. BRAY, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. DOWREY, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. FUGUA, Mr. BARING, Mr. STURREFIELD, Mr. BERGKAMP of North Carolina, Mrs. HECKER of Massachusetts, Mr. OR-}

TENDER, Mrs. BOLTON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. RAILK, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. HAN-}

NA, and Mr. BEVILLE): H.J. Res. 1082. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STUCKEY (for himself, Mr. REINECKE, Mr. RASSEL, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. EX-}

CEKRO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. VUETI): H.J. Res. 1083. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULSON of Pennsylvania:
H.Con. Res. 1084. Concurrent resolution calling on the Boy Scouts of America to serve the youth of this Nation as required by their congressional charter; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORSE:
H.Con. Res. 1085. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to reexamine the objectives and nature of the foreign assistance programs and the relationship of such programs to vital U.S. interests; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SELDEN:
H.Con. Res. 1086. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that in the interest of peace in Vietnam the Government of the United States should consider further expansions of trade with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites when there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Vietnam have been redirected toward peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:
H.Con. Res. 637. Concurrent resolution to require the collection of the French World War I debt to the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself, Mr. MAULIARD, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. PELLY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MOHIBER, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. GROVER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MOAT-}

ON, Mr. LENSON, Mr. KEITH, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WATKINS of Florida, Mr. REINNECKE, Mr. STURREFIELD, Mr. SCHAEDEBERG, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ST. OMAR, and Mr. ZOLLER): H.Con. Res. 640. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the freedom of the people of American by encouraging American industry and the American public to ship and travel on American ships; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOW (for himself, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. KATH, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. HATH-}

AW, Mr. EDWARDS of North Carolina, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HE-}

STOKS, Mr. GALITZMAN, Mr. LUK-}

ENS, Mr. KYROS, Mr. HARDY, Mr. MAC-}

CHESTER, Mr. FALLON, Mr. GUDE, and Mr. BLANTON): H.Con. Res. 641. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the freedom of the people of American by encouraging American industry and the American public to ship and travel on American ships; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRADEMA:
H.Con. Res. 642. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the freedom of the people of American by encouraging American industry and the American public to ship and travel on American ships; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DARRE:
H.Con. Res. 643. Concurrent resolution calling on the Boy Scouts of America to serve the youth of this Nation as required by their congressional charter; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRASCO:
H.Res. 1089. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to U.S. ratification of the Conventions Governing the Rights of Women, and Freedom of Association; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONYER:
H.Res. 1090. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to U.S. ratification of the Conventions Governing the Rights of Women, and Freedom of Association; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COWGER:
H.Res. 1091. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:
H.R. 15282. A bill for the relief of Rosario Pietrantonio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15283. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Vitala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15284. A bill for the relief of Rose Wilfride Beaulieu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15285. A bill for the relief of Carmela and Salvatore Levante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY (by request):
H.R. 15286. A bill for the relief of Domenico Galliano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15287. A bill for the relief of Stefano Insalaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15288. A bill for the relief of Nino Mastricolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:
H.R. 15289. A bill for the relief of Antonio Corapi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15290. A bill for the relief of Bian-}

djoen Tan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:
H.R. 15291. A bill for the relief of Walter V. Biagliolini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS:
H.R. 15292. A bill for the relief of Bernardino Calamba Sy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:
H.R. 15293. A bill for the relief of Francesco Arditto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15294. A bill for the relief of Habibolah Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:
H.R. 15295. A bill for the relief of Michael Connelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15296. A bill for the relief of Charalambos Stavrakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:
H.R. 15297. A bill for the relief of Mr. Polecarpio DeCarolis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:
H.R. 15298. A bill for the relief of Casmir Greco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDMAN:
H.Res. 1043. Resolution for the relief of Charles J. Culligan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.