

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 his April 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 crusade to 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 15 other cities and taking pickets into the home towns of Congressmen for protests before their homes and offices.

Dr. King held meetings with two different groups last night, the first with top SCLC and SNCC staff members—including Chairman H. Rap Brown—at the Pitts Motor Hotel, and the second at a rally in the Vermont Avenue Baptist Church, 1630 Vermont ave. n.w., with about 1000 persons attending.

Dr. King said 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 Federal District Court for 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 the rally on Vermont Avenue, Dr. King was applauded and cheered throughout his 35-minute talk. A large minority of white persons attended.

Dr. King said it is long past time for

America to get concerned over the Negroes' economic and social plight.

"Freedom is not something the oppressor will give to the oppressed," he said. "Freedom is something the oppressed must demand from the oppressor . . . We will come to Washington in April not to beg, but to demand justice and demand that they grant us what is truly ours."

Hosea Williams, one of Dr. King's aides, said, "We want to make it clear we are not building any coalitions."

Yesterday black power militant Stokely Carmichael, who met with Dr. King on Tuesday night along with 100 other Washington Negro civil rights activists, indicated that he will not overtly interfere or oppose the SCLC plans for "militant nonviolence."

Carmichael, commenting yesterday on his discussion with Dr. King, summed it up this way:

"I said we have to accept each other's ideology whether we disagree with it or not."

Carmichael added that "any black man who would blast Dr. King would be totally irresponsible."

But Carmichael, who is trying to pull together a Washington Negro coalition under the name of the Black United Front, added that it will be up to each organization in the Front to decide what its role will be in King's nonviolent campaign.

His individual role, he indicated, will be governed by what his Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee decides.

At a press conference yesterday, Dr. King was asked whether Carmichael and SNCC black power militants would agree to accept the "discipline of nonviolence" if they join the camp-in.

Dr. King said that he was certain Carmichael believes that people committed to nonviolence should be allowed to practice their philosophy.

The SCLC head called the press conference yesterday to unveil some of the specific legislative demands that his poor people's army will carry to Congress.

In answer to a reporter's question, he said a bill introduced by Rep. John Conyers Jr. (D-Mich.) comes "close to what we're talking about."

Conyer's "Full Opportunity Act," co-sponsored by nine other House members, calls for spending \$30 billion a year for a massive attack on city slum problems. It would provide job training, a \$2-an-hour minimum wage, housing, family allowances and aid to education.

As an "absolute minimum," Dr. King said, his poor people's mobilization would demand a full employment bill, some kind of guaranteed income, and housing legislation to provide at least 500,000 units a year for low-income families.

As to the tactics of his spring campaign, Dr. King said the first two weeks or so will be spent in peaceful protest "within the First Amendment" with the aim of educating the "Nation to its grave problems."

But Dr. King did not rule out—as a "last resort"—tying up traffic on the bridges of Washington.

"If it is necessary to tie up traffic, however inconvenient, the result is not as inconvenient as the conditions poor people live in," he said.

He also underlined the political leverage of his 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 been driven out." He pointed out 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. Monday next.

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. Batrus, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, 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 13: 11.

Eternal Father, strong to save and eager to help, who art always speaking to man and revealing Thy way to him, speak Thou to us this moment and make known Thy will as we pray that Thy spirit may live in our hearts.

Make us great in our devotion to truth, 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. Strengthen our people that with genuine faith, humble spirit, and patriotic fervor 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 amendments of the House to the bill (S. 5) 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. PROXMIER, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER to be the conferees 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.

NATIONWIDE EMERGENCY TELEPHONE NUMBER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, we hear so much these days concerning the crime which is running rampant in this Nation of ours. We hear it from the press, from the radio and TV media. We heard it in the President's message.

We see bills concerning the subject of crime pending before the Congress.

I believe the simple idea which I have advanced—that is, the use of a uniform nationwide telephone number for reporting emergencies such as crime and fire—is one which will make a meaningful contribution toward helping combat this problem.

Today I am pleased to announce that my hometown of Huntington, Ind., has decided to use the telephone number 911 as its emergency telephone number. This means that Huntington, Ind., will be the first city in the Nation to adopt 911 as its emergency number. The city of New York is also contemplating this. The city of Gary, Ind., is considering the use of this number as its emergency number. I hope that this will be the start of the adoption of this number throughout the rest of the Nation as the emergency number for the purpose of reporting fire, crime, and other emergencies.

ALTERNATIVE TO THE TRAVEL TAX

Mr. HAYS. 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. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, it is my present intention not to vote for any travel tax. When I oppose a measure I usually have a reason and an alternative. I would suggest that one of the ways to save some dollar outflow would be for the Secretary of State and the heads of all the other departments of Government who have people overseas and who transport their cars back and forth to issue a directive that from now on no cars will either be transported overseas or back from overseas unless they are American automobiles. This will save in the next year, it is estimated, about \$200 million, which is a big chunk of the \$500 million that the President says he wants to save. I think it will do nobody any harm.

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, at 10 a.m. in room 2141, Rayburn 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 me 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.

A CIVIL AIR PATROL

Mr. PETTIS. It is a stirring tribute to the patriotism of my colleagues to see their names as volunteers in the new Congressional Wing of the Civil Air Patrol—an auxiliary of the U.S. Air Force.

These forwardlooking, responsible Members of this House see the opportunities for aiding the development of tomorrow's leaders, our 45,000 cadets. The CAP inspires young men and women, and as my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, Col. LESTER WOLFF, commander, said this morning:

The CAP is an answer to crime on the streets and many other problems facing our Nation.

The CAP also gives all of us an extra opportunity to serve our country as search and rescue pilots, instructors in a variety of activities important to our Nation's well-being and in the development of aerospace aviation.

We urge our colleagues from both sides of the aisle to enroll with us, in an opportunity for service that is inspiring and extremely valuable to our Nation. Please see Col. LESTER WOLFF or me, and give us an opportunity to explain fully the activities of the CAP.

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.

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

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 nonflying en-

thusiasts of aviation, consider joining this squadron.

Mr. Speaker, the Civil Air Patrol, as many of 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 who are interested in aviation.

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 after 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 that the Members of the Congress 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. McCLODY. 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. McCLODY. 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, as 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 for over 20 years enslaved all 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 attempt 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 caliber 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 boatowners 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 saw 1,400 boaters killed.

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.

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—before the problem becomes much 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. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the President's crime message. The escalation of the crime rate in recent years is indicative of the necessity for early enactment of Federal programs which can reverse this trend. Due to the sophisticated and extensive nature of many criminal activities, local law enforcement agencies are unable to cope with this problem. The lack of resources, facilities, techniques, and training of local law enforcement

agencies requires the immediate attention of the Federal Government. Consequently, I am particularly gratified by the President's emphasis upon grants to State and local governments to meet the existing deficiencies.

The States are waging a valiant but unsuccessful war to reduce the crime rate. The President is not proposing a national police force or the merger of local law enforcement agencies. Law enforcement will remain the responsibility of State and local governments. However, effective assault on the national problem requires the assistance of the Federal Government. Our streets must be safe for the vast majority of Americans who are decent, law-abiding citizens. Criminal conduct cannot be excused or justified.

The President's proposals are timely and appropriate. I ask my colleagues in the Congress to give them prompt and serious consideration.

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 menace 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 repels the efforts of 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—that is, 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 beginning February 19, 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 of 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 1968; 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 22.

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.

DISPENSING 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 rule 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

1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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 telegram 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 magicians.

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 with 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, go blithely on their devious ways 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 many of us 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 crime 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.

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

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 375 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 from every pore, 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, 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 narcotics 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 types 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 engaged 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-

munity, drug abuse, and firearms control. It would provide a comprehensive and effective means of staging a combined Federal-State attack on crime.

Unquestionably adequate Federal gun control laws are necessary in order to permit the States to control these tools of the criminal. The present indiscriminate mail-order sale of handguns and other lethal weapons permit them to be acquired easily by anyone including criminals, juveniles, narcotic addicts, mental defectives, and others whose possession of such weapons is a significant factor in the prevalence of lawlessness and violent crime in the United States.

The lack of adequate Federal controls over the traffic in firearms prevents effective action by the States to control such traffic within their own borders. It is a common practice for a resident of a State having strict controls over firearms to go to an adjoining State having little or no controls, purchase whatever weapons he desires, and thus effectively evade the laws of the State of his residence. The administration's gun legislation would provide the necessary Federal controls over interstate traffic in firearms so that the States could exercise such controls as the people of the State feel are necessary.

TATE, OF PHILADELPHIA, PROPOSES URBAN COALITION TO AVOID "HOT SUMMER"

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, Mayor H. J. Tate, of Philadelphia, has been actively fighting the conditions of poverty during his career of public service. Philadelphia has been a front-runner among cities in efforts to improve the living and working conditions of its residents. Much has been undertaken and accomplished in the great city of Philadelphia since James Tate entered the office of mayor in January 1964.

Yesterday the mayor announced another step in the efforts to solve the problems of poverty. He announced plans for the creation of an Urban Coalition for Philadelphia to bring business, education, religion, and civil rights into the fight against poverty. He said:

A partnership between government and the private sector is essential if we are to achieve the most rapid solution to our problems.

Accordingly, the mayor has invited 225 such leaders to a 2-day conference on the coalition for February 15 and 16. It is proposed that a steering committee will be formed at this meeting to lead the private sector of the Philadelphia community in a new commitment to help in the solution of pressing urban problems. The mayor estimated it would cost \$100,000 in private funds for the work of the urban coalition with the city of Philadelphia providing the staff.

This proposal will unite the efforts of the private sector of the Philadelphia

community, which in a number of instances has illustrated its concern with urban problems. Such a course, followed by government and the private community and supported by the citizenry, can greatly alleviate conditions which might contribute to a "hot summer."

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL SALARIES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 225(b), Public Law 90-206, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries the following members from private life: Edward H. Foley, of the District of Columbia; William S. Spoelhof, of Michigan.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President of the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Presidential messages are enlightening to all of us. I believe that a quorum of the Members should be present here to dispose of these messages.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 24]

Abbutt	Gettys	Rostenkowski
Andrews,	Green, Oreg.	Roudebush
N. Dak.	Gude	Rumsfeld
Ashley	Gurney	St. Onge
Bolling	Hansen, Idaho	Schweiker
Broyhill, Va.	Hébert	Selden
Burleson	Herlong	Skubitz
Clark	Holland	Smith, Okla.
Clausen,	Jones, Mo.	Snyder
Don H.	Jones, N.C.	Springer
Cleveland	Kluczynski	Talcott
Corman	Mathias, Calif.	Teague, Tex.
Cramer	Moss	Utt
Cunningham	Nichols	Wampler
Davis, Wis.	Patman	Watkins
Dawson	Pollock	Watts
Devine	Pucinski	Wilson,
Diggs	Rees	Charles H.
Edwards, La.	Reinecke	Wyatt
Everett	Resnick	Zwach
Foley	Rivers	
Ford,	Rooney, N.Y.	
William D.	Rosenthal	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall, 371 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

OUR FOREIGN AID PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 251)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will read the message from the President of the United States.

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 maimed 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 seige.

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 power of man's oldest enemies. 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 \$2.5 billion.

—A military grant aid appropriation of \$420 million.

—New and separate legislation for foreign military sales.

—A five-year program to develop and

manufacture low-cost protein additives from fish, to help avoid the tragic brain damage now inflicted on millions of 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 contribution 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.

—A 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 pledge to the Congress and to 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—who 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 by nearly 50 percent 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 financial problems. 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 affiliate 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 wealthy nations of 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 education needs, while work proceeded 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 made its first loan.

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 in the private market, 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 \$612 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.

B. The Asian Development Bank.

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 minority share of the total fund, and if it did not adversely affect our balance of payments. I urge that the Congress take prompt and favorable action on this request.

C. The African Development Bank.

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 year 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, innovative 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 have the money to buy 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 growth 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 1970 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 eliminate the need to 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 fishing methods.

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

But food is 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 tell any government or any parent how 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 position.

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 in 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 few 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 of employees 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 Corps operated 300 projects in which experienced American businessmen counseled local executives.
- Nearly 3,000 American scientists and engineers shared their know-how with developing countries under the auspices of VITA Corporation, a private U.S. non-profit organization.
- More than 120 American colleges and universities contributed to AID technical assistance programs.
- Thirty-three American states supported development work in 14 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 American Presidents 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, in health, and in education. They moved to bring the blessings 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* increased food production by 10% in 1967 and achieved an overall real economic growth 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. Trade among 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 \$706 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 in so doing 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 a dramatic 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 which would double or triple his yield 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 few 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 in eleven more countries in the following year.
- 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 250 million people has set out with determination on the long road to development. We intend to help them.

VIETNAM

I recommend a program of \$480 million to carry forward our economic assistance effort in Vietnam. This effort will be intensified by 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.

Since 1965, when galloping inflation loomed and continuity of government was repeatedly destroyed, the people of Vietnam have achieved two major civil victories which rank with any gallantry in combat:

—They have written a Constitution and established representative local and national governments through free elections, despite a concerted campaign of terror, assassination and intimidation.

—Runaway inflation has been averted, 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.

In the coming year, we will:

—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.

—Concentrate our educational effort 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 coming 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 ultimate success.

EAST ASIA

I recommend \$277 million for East Asia.

For twenty years resistance to attack and subversion has been current and urgent business for the nations of East Asia. The United States has helped to make this resistance effective. We must continue to do so, particularly in Laos and Thailand.

But this year the larger portion of our aid to East Asian countries will be focused directly on the work of development. Asians know—as we do—that in the long run, economic, social and political development offer the best protection against subversion and attack. Despite communist pressure, they are getting on with the job. For example:

—For the last three years, the Korean economy has grown by a phenomenal 10 percent per year; domestic rev-

enues have doubled since 1965; exports have grown tenfold in the last seven years. Population growth has fallen from 2.9 percent in 1962 to 2.5 percent today, and a strong national population program is contributing to further reductions. We are now able to plan for orderly reduction of U.S. economic aid 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 be—maintained.

—Indonesia has stepped away from the brink of communist domination and economic chaos. She has undertaken the hard course of stabilization and rehabilitation and is moving toward development. 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 overwhelmingly 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 nations on the perimeter 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 Free World 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 resisted 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 this problem. In addition, we will explore 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 cash and credit sales. I will submit separate legislation to authorize necessary military sales and provide for credit terms where justified.

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 no less.

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

The internal peace and order of this steadfast ally is once again threatened from the North.

These threats summon Korea to strengthen further her defenses and her capacity to deter aggression.

We must help.

I propose that Congress appropriate immediately an additional \$100 million for military assistance to the Republic of Korea.

This can be accomplished within the authorizing legislation already enacted.

With this additional help, the Armed Forces of the Republic of Korea can gain new strength through the acquisition of aircraft and anti-aircraft equipment, naval radar, patrol craft, ammunition and other supplies.

AMERICA'S CHOICE

Foreign aid serves our national interest. It expresses our basic humanity. It may not always be popular, but it is right.

The peoples we seek to help are committed to change. This is an immutable fact of our time. The only questions are whether change will be peaceful or violent, whether it will liberate or enslave, whether it will build a community of free and prosperous nations or sentence the world to endless strife between rich and poor.

Foreign aid is the American answer to this question. It is a commitment to conscience as well as to country. It is a matter of national tradition as well as national security.

Last year some Americans forgot that tradition. My foreign aid request, already the smallest in history, was reduced by almost one-third.

The effects of that cut go much deeper than the fields which lie fallow, the factories not built, or the hospitals without modern equipment.

Our Ambassadors all over the developing world report the deep and searching questions they are being asked. Has America resigned her leadership of the cause of freedom? Has she abandoned to fate the weak and the striving who are depending on her help?

This Congress can give a resounding answer to these questions by enacting the full amount I have requested. I do not propose this as a partisan measure. I propose it as an extension of the humane statesmanship of both parties for more than twenty years.

I said in my State of the Union address that it is not America's resources that are being tested, but her will. This is nowhere more true than in the developing countries where our help is a crucial margin between peaceful change and violent disaster.

I urge the Congress to meet this test.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 8, 1968.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

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

It is a modest program requesting \$2½ billion for foreign economic assistance and \$400 million of 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 such as Public Law 480 food aid, our 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 U.S. 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 this 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)

I. SIZE OF PROGRAM

\$2.9 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 \$1.9 billion for FY 1968.

The A.I.D. request, together with other foreign aid activities such as PL 480 food aid, contributions to multilateral institutions (IDA, IDB and the Asian Bank), and Peace Corps, represents about 0.5% of U.S. GNP—only half as much as the target of 1% of GNP set by the UN and OECD. In 1949 the United States put 2% of its GNP into foreign economic aid.

II. CONCENTRATION

Countries: The FY 1969 proposed A.I.D. program is heavily concentrated in key countries—15 countries will receive nearly 90% of all country program funds: India, Pakistan, Turkey, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Peru, Tunisia, Indonesia, Korea, Laos, Thailand, Vietnam.

Nine of these will get about 85% of development loan country programs: India, Pakistan, Turkey, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Peru, Korea, Indonesia.

Four will get 95% of Supporting Assistance country programs: Vietnam, Korea, Laos and Thailand.

Agriculture: About \$800 billion of A.I.D. funds will be used in FY 1969 for agricultural development and increasing food production.

III. REDUCED COST TO U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Ninety-two percent of A.I.D. funds in FY 1969 will be spent on purchases of U.S. goods and services. In 1963 the dollar outflow re-

sulting from A.I.D. operations was over \$600 million. In 1967 this dropped to about \$270 million. In 1968 it will be reduced to less than \$170 million. Repayments of over \$200 million on outstanding aid loans will more than offset this outflow.

Ending foreign aid would not, therefore, significantly improve the U.S. balance of payments. But it would adversely affect the U.S. industries, workers and farmers who are manufacturing, producing and exporting aid-financed goods.

IV. OTHERS SHARE THE BURDEN

United States leadership in the aid field has declined. We are now only *fifth* among DAC donors in share of national income devoted to official aid: *eighth*, when private investment in Less Developed Countries is included.

Despite fiscal and other economic problems, a number of other countries—Japan, Canada, Netherlands, West Germany—are increasing their aid programs. Britain is maintaining its aid budget levels.

V. SPECIAL MILITARY ASSISTANCE FOR KOREA

A special supplementary appropriation of \$100 million will be requested in FY 1968 for additional military aid to Korea, to supply aircraft, anti-aircraft equipment, naval radar, patrol craft and other supplies. This appropriation request will be made under the existing FY 1968 military assistance authorization.

FISCAL YEAR 1969 APPROPRIATION REQUEST AND PROPOSED PROGRAM UNDER THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT (In millions of dollars)

Assistance category	Fiscal year 1969 appropriation request	Fiscal year 1969 proposed program ¹
Economic assistance:		
Development loans.....	765.0	850.3
Technical assistance.....	235.0	253.0
Alliance for Progress.....	625.0	685.2
Development loans.....	515.0	567.2
Technical assistance.....	110.0	118.0
Supporting assistance.....	595.0	629.5
Contingency fund.....	45.0	50.0
Contributions to international organizations.....	154.3	154.3
American schools and hospitals abroad.....	15.1	15.1
Surveys of investment opportunities.....	1.5	2.0
Administrative expenses:		
AID.....	58.8	61.4
State.....	3.9	3.9
Total economic assistance.....	2,498.5	2,704.6
Military assistance².....	420.0	503.5
Total.....	2,918.5	3,208.1

¹ The fiscal year 1969 proposed program is the total amount of funds that would be available to carry out programs under the Foreign Assistance Act. The proposed program consists of the new appropriations requested and additional funds available for use in fiscal year 1969 such as repayments on prior loans, reimbursements, and uncommitted or deobligated funds from prior years.

² Excludes appropriations of \$120,000,000 to be requested in a separate military sales act.

Mr. BOGGS. 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 message 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.

Encouragement of private enterprise has two facets. It takes the form of encouraging American private industry, nonprofit organizations, universities, and State and local governments to participate as widely as possible in overseas development. It also takes the form of conducting programs directly aimed at strengthening private enterprise already doing business in developing countries.

So-called program loans finance a wide range of development commodities purchased in the United States and ultimately distributed overseas through private channels. Our technical assistance, meaning AID-financed American advisers who themselves are often drawn from private enterprise, encourages private sector growth overseas. Private American organizations also play a prominent role in helping the poor countries benefit from American experience with cooperative endeavors—credit unions, cooperatives for marketing or farm credit, rural electric cooperatives, and savings and loan institutions.

The President, in his message, takes note of the critical role of private enterprise in all this work. Private enterprise and public governments—working in partnership—can together best help the people of the poor nations realize their hopes for a better life in freedom. Which, after all, describes the only kind of world in which American business can long prosper.

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

Chief Justice Holmes once said that taxes are the price we pay for civilization. The same could be said, I believe, of foreign aid.

If, as the President notes, men can foresee only lives of torment and back-breaking toil, our world will wallow in senseless barbarism. Civilization may well recede—as has happened before in world history.

The cost of foreign aid to our Nation—in the recommendation of the President—would be \$2.5 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.

It is to those Members that today I urge a close and careful reading of the President's message on foreign aid, and

equally careful study of the line-item presentation book when it is made available to all Members.

It is my hope that they will restudy their position not only 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 Bible 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 behoves 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 in an effort 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 dulled 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.

The plain facts are, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot spend billions on war and de-

struction 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 here today contains great potential for worldwide progress. Let us all give it the attention it deserves—and let our consciences be our guides.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it may often seem to us that the nations of the world are growing 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 shows 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 lower Mekong River, which flows through Thailand, Laos, Vietnam and Cambodia.

The Inter-American Development Bank, a kingpin of the Alliance for Progress, requires expansion of its capital and additional guarantee funds.

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 these promising 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 a no-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 \$8 for every dollar received in U.S. aid. Some contribute even more.

Colombia, for example, invested \$980 million in fiscal 1966 on development operations. This amounted to 16 percent of its gross national product. Compare Colombia's share to 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 completing a necessary project on 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 Bank was held up until 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 AID's major operating 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. As the President says this institution is at the very center of the Alliance for Progress.

Second, we must authorize a contribution of \$200 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.

Third, 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 resources commonly held with others 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. It is something to be energetically 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. RESNICK. 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 \$8 for every dollar received from our aid program.

Outstanding examples of how self-help pays off can be cited in the cases of Iran and the Republic of China—Taiwan—countries have graduated from the aid program and 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 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 foodstuffs rather than an importer.

When the President speaks of America helping those and only those who help themselves, I am certain that he has in back of his mind these examples. While AID must be tailored to countries' needs, so must their own self-help efforts if they are to move away from their less-developed status.

Mr. Speaker, I recently completed a 5-week factfinding mission which took me through nine countries in Southeast Asia. This trip reaffirmed my belief that this is the best possible way we can help lesser developed countries. And, at the same time, we are helping ourselves. For by showing these countries the path to social and economic stability, we are enabling them to afford to help us, as well. Thailand's support of our effort in Vietnam is a case in point.

I have long been a staunch supporter of foreign aid and I shall continue to be one, for I firmly believe that there is no greater gift that we can give to lesser developed countries than the wherewithal to help themselves.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I am vitally interested in the war on

hunger aspects of our foreign aid program. It is not just idle supposing that we will be faced with the prospect of a world food shortage unless all the nations of the world cooperate in an extensive effort to meet the food needs of tomorrow. Already, over one-half of the world is hungry, and the population explosion is adding to the hungry half of the world each day.

The problem is of such proportions that it can no longer be solved by sharing the surplus of productive nations with countries unable to feed themselves. It must be attacked through programs of agricultural development, research in the field of nutrition, and emphasis on family planning.

Last year, President Johnson made agriculture a primary concern of our foreign aid program, and I am happy to see that his foreign aid message this year again stresses the importance of bringing world food production and population growth into balance.

The President has directed the Agency for International Development to increase its 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 severely limit mental, as well as 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 know-how 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 aid program?" 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 merit our close attention and support.

Events of recent weeks show that America must be flexible in our relations with other nations. Flexibility demands that other countries 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—he outlined 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 goals are also 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 economic well-being through trade and their ability to resist Communist aggression or subversion.

Some countries, however, have turned their backs on us, and have formed or joined alliances contrary to our interests. In those specific cases I have 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 starving millions 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. It is true that our foreign aid program has done much to give this Nation the acknowledged leadership of the free world. All of us as Americans can be proud of this position of leadership.

The rebuilding 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 nations of Western Europe have remained strong allies against the threat of Soviet expansion. Only France has taken a position apparently based on extreme nationalistic pride, rather than gratitude for our past assistance. 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 adjust itself to changing relations among nations—both friendly and unfriendly.

Our foreign policy should be conducted first and foremost in our own interest. I do not believe that it would contribute to our own 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 inevitably affect for better or worse our destiny as a free nation.

Mr. FRASER. 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 assistance efforts.

Third, regionalism: Neighboring nations must cooperate to develop shared resources.

Fourth, priority for agriculture, health, and education: The critical areas of want must be relieved 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.

Foreign aid is a vital investment in the security of the United States, and I believe these six principles will adequately protect that investment.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, one recent trend that has improved the effectiveness of our foreign aid program is the growing proportion of assistance being distributed through institutions and mechanisms supported by many nations besides the United States. We should be delighted that this multilateral approach is still an article of faith with the President and his aid planners.

For a long time, we have believed in cooperation with other free world nations that help the less developed countries, whether through contributions to international development institutions or through close coordination of our own AID program with those of other aid-giving countries. We have also believed in promoting cooperation among the less developed nations themselves to further their common development.

There are examples of how effectively this is working all over the globe. In East Asia, we have supported the Asian Development Bank and the Mekong Basin program. The Mekong River flows through many countries of Southeast Asia, and for more than 10 years we have acted in concert with others to

control its floods, irrigate surrounding land and improve navigation. In Africa, as much of our aid as possible is going to 10 nations where development prospects are best in cooperation with other aid donors and under leadership of international organizations. In Latin America, the whole of our AID program rests on the actively multilateral foundation of the Alliance for Progress.

It is not always possible to establish multilateral institutions as the channel for our aid because to succeed they must have the meaningful cooperation of other aid giving nations—and some are reluctant to cooperate. But it is nonetheless gratifying to see the steady progress being made in this field.

Now the President has called upon us to consider joining with other nations to expand the International Development Association, the development lending branch of the World Bank; to enlarge the resources of the Asian Development Bank for agriculture, transportation, and other vital projects; to continue our support of the Inter-American Development Bank; and to make a modest contribution to a new Special Fund of the African Development Bank.

The President's message notes that in 1968, 80 percent of our AID loans were made as part of international arrangements through which all carry their fair shares of the common burden.

I, for one, will continue to support this respect for and use of international institutions which, in the President's words, "build the peace."

Mr. OTTINGER. 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 stability. 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 encouragement, support and strengthening of voluntary family planning programs in the developing countries.

AID has in various ways 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—not our programs. Furthermore, we should assist only when the developing country, having decided on the types of programs appropriate to its requirements, allows individuals freedom of choice to participate or not, as well as a choice of means.

For these reasons, I would urge the

Congress not to try to dictate the amount of money to be spent on population 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 these countries themselves recognize their needs.

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

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

Nations and their leaders press forward. Farmers on the edge of survival have begun to leave their old ways and embrace the technological advances introduced with our help. 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 reverse themselves, and quickly. Indian agriculture, for example, is still the puppet of undependable 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. 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."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

REPORT FOR FISCAL 1967 OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the Annual Report of the National Endowment for the Arts for Fiscal Year 1967—the first full year of its existence.

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 has:

- 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 enhance the environment of American cities with outstanding works of sculpture in outdoor public places;
- Created a new program to aid American composers and symphony orchestras;
- Stimulated the production and nationwide distribution of programs on the arts for educational television;
- Rendered financial and technical assistance to agencies for the arts in 50 States, and District of Columbia, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico enabling them to implement 295 new or expanded arts projects.

Throughout Fiscal Year 1967, the National Endowment for the Arts worked closely with private foundations, organizations and individuals, seeking to increase appreciation and support of the arts in the United States.

Since the Endowment was created, Federal grants totaling \$10.5 million have been made. These Federal grants have been supplemented by nearly \$16 million in contributions from States and cities, and from private agencies and individuals—dramatic evidence of the widespread support which now exists for those whose talent and genius enrich the life of our country.

The National Endowment for the Arts has made great progress toward realizing the mandate given it by the Congress to improve the quality of American life.

I transmit with pride this report of the Endowment's first full year of activities and urge the Congress to act promptly to extend the authorization for the National Endowment for the Arts.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 8, 1968.

The message, together with the accompanying papers, was, without objection, referred to by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 11284, THE FIRE RESEARCH AND SAFETY ACT OF 1967

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call

up House Resolution 926 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 926

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11284) 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. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and 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. After the passage of H.R. 11284, it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1124 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 11284 as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 926 provides an open rule with 1 hour of debate for consideration of H.R. 11284, a bill to authorize a fire research and safety program. The resolution further provides that, after passage of H.R. 11284, it shall be in order to take S. 1124 from the Speaker's table, move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 11284 as passed.

The purpose of H.R. 11284 is to provide a national fire research and safety program and to create a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control in order that more effective measures may be taken against the hazards of death, injury, and damage to property resulting from uncontrolled fire.

In 1965, some 12,000 lives and \$1.75 billion were lost to fire. Our per capita death rate through fire was about four times as great as that of the United Kingdom and—hear this—over six times as great as that of Japan, the so-called "land of paperhouses."

H.R. 11284, the passage of which was requested by the President in his state of the Union message, will set up a comprehensive fire research and safety program within the Department of Commerce to be administered by the National Bureau of Standards. The 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.

The bill under consideration provides that the National Bureau of Standards

will work in-house and by contract or grants, on a number of important existing research projects which should have been started long ago. These projects have been sadly neglected because of insufficient funds and the limited authorization provided in the original Organic Act.

Passage of this bill would mean that research can and will be conducted for a better understanding of the nature and causes of fires.

Another research project would have as its goal the improvement of firefighting equipment. In this age of technological advancement, it is known that much of our firefighting equipment is operationally inadequate. Also included would be developmental studies by firemen into improving environmental protection and communication systems, and research to find safe ways of identifying the actual location of a fire.

The National Bureau of Standards has demonstrated its ability to correlate, evaluate, and disseminate data expeditiously. For this reason, it can be expected to provide an efficient and comprehensive method of acquiring fire data from local, State, and Federal sources.

Under the provisions of the bill, the Secretary of Commerce will establish a fire research and safety center to carry out the purposes enumerated in the bill, including appropriate fire safety liaison and coordination.

One new activity authorized by H.R. 11284 is the demonstration projects on fire prevention and control. It would permit ideas to be tried in actual use. The ideas could come from the fire services, from industry and others in addition to those suggested by the results of the National Bureau of Standards fire research.

H.R. 11284 will establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control. This Commission will undertake a thorough study and investigation for the purpose of reducing the destruction of life and property caused by fire in our cities, suburbs, and communities.

Under the provisions of the bill, the Bureau will undertake or support programs in research, training and information services where clear problems already exist for the use of State and local governments, fire departments, and other organizations interested in fire protection. At the same time, the Commission will determine whether or not additional problems exist that warrant attention at a national level such as fire department personnel problems, the need for standardization of equipment, the adequacy of building codes and construction methods, and the consideration of fire protection in urban planning.

Mr. Speaker, the discovery of fire by primitive man marked the crucial beginning of his civilization, and yet fire, by its very nature, portends his very end when unharnessed and uncontrolled. The adoption of House Resolution 926 will be a step toward a better harness and a more effective control of fire, to make it a true servant of man in his constant quest for a better life in a greater society.

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

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 reserve the balance of my time.

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 1 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 of losses;

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

This part of the 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 averaging \$200,000 a 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 estimated cost of this Commission for the next 2 years is \$665,000.

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 Federal Government that so participated: The Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Defense, the Office of Civil Defense, 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 in the National Bureau of Standards to the tune of \$10 million.

What has been going on in private industry? We have millions of dollars being spent by private industry in this very same field, and being spent effectively. 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 happen to know 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 purposely set it on 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 fireproof materials that J-M had developed stopped the spread of the fire.

Many other companies in the building material industry—Ruberoio, 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 this field both 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 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.

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:

In all but the imperative necessities, we ought 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 line. Hold the line at the present level—make do with what we have. Reject the unnecessary. Defer the desirable. Minimize the essential. All it takes is good old-fashioned will—and a majority vote.

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 before us is a new 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 on increased expenditures. Today—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 nine Federal programs we have 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 and 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.

I should like to give a little history 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 identically 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 laboratories and colleges—opposing the plan because it was overlapping, because dual work was being done, and because it was not feasible.

That 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 order to get support for this plan there are 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 dollars, because it duplicated 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 not 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].

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 to establish a National 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, local and national, 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 more than 60 years. Nevertheless, the per capita 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. We 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, as well as new methods for fire prevention 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 constitute these 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 hold hearings. Why do we 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 the presentation before 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 with 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 efficient 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, to make that sufficiently clear.

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 colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUBEUSH], 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. ROUBEUSH's 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 fiscal year will be spent. That is 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.

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 employees 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 53, which grants an exception from 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 for this 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. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

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

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield further to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. It is in order that there will not be a delay as the result of obtaining people under the classified system, and have such delay require, I would judge, some 6 to 9 months. With the work of this Commission ending at the end of the 2-year period, the civil service people involved would then be necessarily on our hands to apply for activities in the other agencies of the Government; there would be an obligation to them. It would 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. I agree, I would like to point out, however, that the language which appears on page 12 of the report of the committee states the following:

The committee believes that by adding a Commission to this bill it will tie the fire legislation into one package instead of two fragments going off in different directions.

When the Commission is being established under civil service, why not have a Commission as well tied into the operations and rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors,

the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 332, nays 21, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

YEAS—332

Abernethy	Felghan	McClure
Adair	Findley	McCulloch
Adams	Fino	McDonald,
Addabbo	Fisher	Mich.
Albert	Flood	McEwen
Anderson,	Flynt	McFall
Tenn.	Foley	McMillan
Andrews, Ala.	Ford, Gerald R.	Macdonald,
Annunzio	Fountain	Mass.
Arends	Frelinghuysen	MacGregor
Ashley	Friedel	Machen
Ashmore	Fulton, Pa.	Mahon
Aspinall	Fulton, Tenn.	Malliard
Ayres	Fuqua	Marsh
Baring	Gallfanakis	Mathias, Md.
Barrett	Gallagher	Matsunaga
Bates	Gardner	May
Battin	Garmatz	Mayne
Belcher	Gathings	Meeds
Bell	Giaino	Meskill
Bennett	Gibbons	Miller, Calif.
Betts	Gilbert	Miller, Ohio
Beyvill	Gonzalez	Mills
Bingham	Goodell	Minish
Blackburn	Goodling	Mink
Blanton	Green, Oreg.	Monagan
Blatnik	Green, Pa.	Montgomery
Boland	Griffiths	Moore
Bolton	Gross	Moorhead
Brademas	Grover	Morgan
Brasco	Gubser	Morris, N. Mex.
Bray	Hagan	Morse, Mass.
Brinkley	Haley	Morton
Brock	Halleck	Mosher
Brooks	Halpern	Murphy, Ill.
Broomfield	Hamilton	Murphy, N.Y.
Brotzman	Hammer-	Myers
Brown, Calif.	schmidt	Natcher
Brown, Mich.	Hanley	Nelsen
Brown, Ohio	Hanna	Nix
Broyhill, N.C.	Hansen, Wash.	O'Hara, Ill.
Buchanan	Hardy	O'Hara, Mich.
Burke, Mass.	Harrison	O'Konski
Burton, Calif.	Harsha	Olsen
Burton, Utah	Harvey	O'Neill, Mass.
Bush	Hathaway	Ottinger
Button	Hawkins	Passman
Byrne, Pa.	Hays	Patman
Byrnes, Wis.	Hechler, W. Va.	Patten
Cabell	Heckler, Mass.	Petty
Cahill	Helstoski	Perkins
Carey	Henderson	Pettis
Carter	Herlong	Philbin
Casey	Hicks	Pickle
Chamberlain	Hollifield	Pike
Cohelan	Holland	Pirnie
Collier	Horton	Poage
Colmer	Hosmer	Poff
Conable	Howard	Price, Ill.
Conte	Hull	Price, Tex.
Conyers	Hungate	Pryor
Corbett	Hunt	Purcell
Corman	Hutchinson	Quie
Cowger	Ichord	Quillen
Curtis	Irwin	Randall
Daddario	Jacobs	Rarick
Daniels	Jarman	Reid, N.Y.
Davis, Ga.	Joelson	Reifel
de la Garza	Johnson, Calif.	Reuss
Delaney	Johnson, Pa.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dellenback	Jonas	Rhodes, Pa.
Dent	Jones, Ala.	Rivers
Derwinski	Karsten	Roberts
Dingell	Karth	Robison
Dole	Kastenmeter	Rodino
Donohue	Kazen	Rogers, Colo.
Dorn	Kee	Rogers, Fla.
Dow	Keith	Ronan
Dowdy	Kelly	Rooney, Pa.
Downing	King, Calif.	Roth
Dulski	King, N.Y.	Roush
Duncan	Kirwan	Roybal
Dwyer	Kleppe	Ryan
Eckhardt	Kornegay	St Germain
Edmondson	Kupferman	Sandman
Edwards, Ala.	Kyl	Satterfield
Edwards, Calif.	Kyros	Saylor
Ellberg	Leggett	Scherle
Erlenborn	Lennon	Schneebeli
Esch	Lloyd	Schwengel
Evans, Colo.	Long, La.	Scott
Evins, Tenn.	Long, Md.	Shibley
Fallon	Lukens	Shriver
Farbstein	McCarthy	Sikes
Fascell	McClory	Sisk

Slack	Teague, Calif.	Whalley
Smith, Calif.	Tenzer	White
Smith, Iowa	Thompson, N.J.	Whitener
Smith, N.Y.	Thomson, Wis.	Widnall
Stafford	Tiernan	Wiggins
Staggers	Tuck	Williams, Pa.
Stanton	Tunney	Willis
Steed	Udall	Wilson, Bob
Stelger, Ariz.	Ullman	Winn
Stelger, Wis.	Van Deerlin	Wolff
Stephens	Vander Jagt	Wydler
Stratton	Vank	Wylle
Stubblefield	Vigorito	Wyman
Sullivan	Waggonner	Yates
Taft	Waldie	Young
Talcott	Walker	Zablocki
Taylor	Whalen	Zion

NAYS—21

Berry	Eshleman	Mize
Bow	Hall	Reld, Ill.
Burke, Fla.	Laird	Schadeberg
Cederberg	Langen	Stuckey
Clawson, Del	Lipscomb	Thompson, Ga.
Denney	Martin	Watson
Dickinson	Minshall	Whitten

NOT VOTING—78

Abbitt	Gettys	Resnick
Anderson, Ill.	Gray	Riegle
Andrews,	Gude	Rooney, N.Y.
N. Dak.	Gurney	Rosenthal
Ashbrook	Hansen, Idaho	Rostenkowski
Blester	Hébert	Roudebush
Boggs	Jones, Mo.	Rumsfeld
Bolling	Jones, N.C.	Ruppe
Broyhill, Va.	Kluczynski	St. Onge
Burleson	Kuykendall	Scheuer
Celler	Landrum	Schweiker
Clancy	Latta	Selden
Clark	McCloskey	Skubitz
Clausen,	McDade	Smith, Okla.
Don H.	Madden	Snyder
Cleveland	Mathias, Calif.	Springer
Cramer	Michel	Teague, Tex.
Culver	Moss	Utt
Cunningham	Nedzi	Wampler
Davis, Wis.	Nichols	Watkins
Dawson	O'Neal, Ga.	Watts
Devine	Pepper	Wilson,
Diggs	Pollock	Charles H.
Edwards, La.	Pool	Wright
Everett	Pucinski	Wyatt
Ford,	Rallsback	Zwach
William D.	Rees	
Fraser	Reinecke	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Cramer.
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. McDade.
 Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
 Mr. Gettys with Mr. Kuykendall.
 Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Latta.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Gude.
 Mr. Boggs with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Pollock.
 Mr. Madden with Mr. Gurney.
 Mr. Moss with Mr. Rumsfeld.
 Mr. Rees with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Mathias of California.
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Clancy.
 Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Nichols with Mr. Roudebush.
 Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Cleveland.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Ruppe.
 Mr. Wright with Mr. Rallsback.
 Mr. Burleson with Mr. Cunningham.
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Diggs.
 Mr. Everett with Mr. Schweiker.
 Mr. Resnick with Mr. Ashbrook.
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Riegle.
 Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. McCloskey.
 Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Springer.
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Reinecke.
 Mr. Watts with Mr. Skubitz.
 Mr. Abbott with Mr. Smith of Oklahoma.
 Mr. Culver with Mr. Snyder.
 Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Utt.
 Mr. Selden with Mr. Wampler.
 Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Watkins.
 Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Wyatt.
 Mr. Pool with Mr. Zwach.

Mr. Devine with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Andrews of North Dakota with Mr. Blester.

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 appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PATMAN, BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Messrs. REUSS, ASHLEY, MOORHEAD, WIDNALL, FINO, and Mrs. DWYER.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

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 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1058

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 25) 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. After general debate which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue 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 read for amendment under the five-minute 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 five-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, and 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 amend-

ment 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 [Mr. QUILLEN] and, pending 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, a bill 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 project to be undertaken on Long Island, N.Y. The estimated additional cost to the Federal Government for the Long Island project is \$510,500 over a 5-year period, assuming maximum Federal participation will be 50 percent of total costs.

The Nation's estuarine areas are rapidly being destroyed in many areas by pollution. The study and inventory authorized by H.R. 25 would be the basis for determining appropriate means of preserving or restoring these areas.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that the dis-

tinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] made a very excellent statement before the Committee on Rules outlining the purport and intent of this particular legislation. This legislation certainly seems to be in the best interest of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1058 in order that H.R. 25 may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] has stated, House Resolution 1058 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 25, making the committee substitute in order as an original bill.

H.R. 25 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a 2-year study and inventory of our estuaries and the waters of the Great Lakes and report its recommendations to the President and the Congress by January 30, 1970. The bill further provides for the Secretary, together with the State of New York or any of its subdivisions, to enter into an agreement for the management and development of estuarine lands on Long Island, N.Y. The costs are to be equitably apportioned.

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

Estuarine areas are coastal lands where salt and fresh water meet. The pressures of our expanding industrial Nation are rapidly polluting and destroying many of these, and the results can be serious. About two-thirds of the seafood consumed depends in a major degree on estuarine areas for their existence in American waters.

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. The committee 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.

Departmental 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 have no further requests for time.

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 House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11284) 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.

The SPEAKER. 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. DADDARIO] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] 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 Pennsylvania?

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, when in that 10-year period, total property losses were reported to be \$16.7 billion, 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 cite 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.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose and aim of this legislation is 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.

Title I of the bill before you authorizes 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 materials and the causes of fire. 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 knowledge and 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. BARRETT]. 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 is that it will allow the people who are most concerned with the causes and nature of fires—people who represent the building material industry, people who build firefighting apparatus, local firefighters and the like—they 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. MOSHER], the provision 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 are particularly important because 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 Government. This is true, and we 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 moneys 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—to the peculiar type of activity which is encompassed in the mission objective of the agencies within which these expenditures are taking place.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 11284, the fire research and safety bill, represents one

of the consumer protection bills that President Johnson requested in his message to Congress on February 16, 1967. In his message, President Johnson 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 due to 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 property losses. We have had no success in reducing the death rate from fires. The number of fires has gone up, and property damage also has risen. This lack of progress must be viewed against the efforts of many 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 destruction caused by fires 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 there are 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 we can turn our attention away from the problem of fires, we do so at the risk of great peril to the lives and to 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. At the same time, the subcommittee also considered House Joint Resolution 498, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] to establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control. Fourteen witnesses testified at 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 losses due to fire, and that the proposed 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. 11284 seeks to meet these two needs.

Title I of H.R. 11284 authorizes a comprehensive fire research and safety program, within the Department of Commerce, and administered 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 and control fires;
- 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. Improved 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 also 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 will make a thorough study of the national fire problem and will make recommendations for future action. The Commission will have 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 industries which have a 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 House of 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 local responsibilities which cannot, 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 bill, 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. ROUBE-BUSH].

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 the support for this bill has 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 equally 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 who conduct fire protection 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 National Fire Protection Association, a trade organization whose principal function is the dissemination of information conducive to fire safety. A representative 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, which appears to me to be somewhat inconsistent 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 stand of the AFPA 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 just 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 which was investigating the tragic fire that took place at Brooks Air Force Base in Texas in connection with a special atmospheric demonstration being carried on 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, our country was sadly unprepared.

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 beforehand 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 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 properties of fabrics in fire situations, 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 wholehearted 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 it. The incidents which the gentleman 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 fire situation together 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.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I think he is absolutely correct. We did do 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 the committee the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

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 that 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 propagate it and get it out into the fire-fighting establishments throughout the country.

I, too, wish to compliment the gentleman who headed the subcommittee, the gentleman from Connecticut, 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 most active 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, as a result of the passage of this bill, of a centralized research center will be one of the biggest contributions that can be made in a greatly needed area.

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 subcommittee 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. ECKHARDT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from Connecticut for his pioneering work on this subject. I am particularly interested in the matter of fire and 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 officer 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 disaster. It was in 1947 that Texas City was rocked by a chain of explosions set off by an explosion on the French ship *Grandchamp*, which was loading ammonium nitrate; 576 persons were killed, 4,000 injured, and \$67 million of property damage occurred. At the time, the handling of ammonium nitrate was not considered dangerous nor the substance particularly flammable.

Then on November 8, 1959, 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 \$3½ 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 there remained an explosive mixture 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 legislation.

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 dan-

gerous 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 tale, we refer back to the Chicago 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 in construction or 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 slum conditions, and they lost their lives in a fire.

We can do better than this, and 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 so 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 Fighters, and 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 debate on the rule by 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 \$10,298,000, at a cost of over \$7 per person. This is, therefore, a problem limited by no means to the big cities. 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 research 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 control is attested to by the 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; is necessary for the better protection of the American people.

The National Fire Protection Association reports that in 1966 there was a 24-percent increase over 1965 in fires in the United States and Canada killing three or more persons; and that the number of fires causing \$250,000 or more 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 afford to 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. They report a fiscal year 1966 fire loss of \$235 million, 323 deaths, and 1,452 injuries. This includes the loss experience of 58 Federal departments and agencies, controlling approximately 99.9 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 desired improvements.

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 methods of firefighting, fire 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 Safety Act of 1967.

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 fire research, educate and train in 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.

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 up-to-date information, equipment 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 estimates available indicate that in 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, 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 put forth 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 the field of fire safety. The International Association of Fire Chiefs, the National Fire Protection Association, and others have endeavored to combat the problem. Without their efforts, the situation today would no doubt 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 two universities 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 service.

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

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 burns and 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 now to protect our present and 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.

In conclusion I wish 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 John O'Hagen and Gerald Ryan, president of the Uniform Firemen Association, and John Carhin, on behalf of the fire officers group, have been most helpful.

As good firemen they have been mindful of the fire tragedies of the past which have caused severe casualties and loss of life.

In one holocaust, traceable to faulty drafting and enforcement of building codes, 12 firemen were killed.

With the passage of this bill I hope we can begin to move to prevent the recurrence of such losses.

I strongly urge the passage of this bill.

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 taxpayer's 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 leading steel 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 roofing 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, if it comes up with safer products 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.

I should like first 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 Pennsylvania [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 a degree of 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 \$20 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 2½ 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 over 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 four times that of England.

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 can 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 reasonable, well-thought-out piece 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. FULTON 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 upon his very excellent statement. Further, I wish to compliment him for his study and the magnificent job which the gentleman has performed during the consideration of this question.

Mr. Chairman, one of the great benefits gained by any particular Member as the result of service in the House of Representatives is to find individuals who take upon themselves these responsibilities, such as the distinguished gentleman from California has done.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], upon his leadership and his contributions to this most necessary field of endeavor.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. What happens at the end of the 2 years to all the wonderful research that is to be carried on? What happens to the end product of this research at the end of the 2 years?

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished gentleman from Iowa will note, there are two titles contained within the provisions of this bill. One of the requirements, title II, is the setting up of a commission to perform a broad-gauge study of the Nation's problems with reference to fires. That Commission at the end of 2 years, will complete and terminate its function, after it has made a report to the Congress of the United States.

Title I involves research to be made by the National Bureau of Standards, which effort will continue.

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

Mr. BELL. I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. So, there is to be established a center; is that right, after the life of the Commission expires?

Mr. BELL. The life of the Commission will continue for 2 years, and then 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 this legislation dealing with the Commission involves a separate title—title II—and is not 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, if the gentleman will yield 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 will 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 rise in wholehearted support of H.R. 11284 and wish to compliment 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, that one cannot 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 alongside the fact of the efficiency of the fire department of the city of Philadelphia. Yet, 98 lives were lost and there was 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 thousands of lives every year.

This bill is a key part of the drive in this 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 aging, 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 to establish a 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 made up of 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 the Congress. Each of us 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 the statements on the floor 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 answer the call of duty 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. PETTIS. 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 conflagrations in this country cost the American people. He 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 call for the establishment of a 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 solutions 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 firefighters 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 approaches to urban planning. 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 prevention of property and most importantly, lives.

I think in H.R. 11284 is an excellent example of progressive action that can be taken by the House to overcome a serious situation that yearly threatens the welfare of thousands of Americans.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOSHER].

Mr. MOSHER. 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 engage in types of fundamental 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 a matter of record, for example, 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—35 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 "electrical" or "flames 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 only to identify long range and future needs in the matter of fire research, but to develop recommendations concerning other phases of the overall problems, such as improving equipment, analyzing

administrative difficulties affecting fire departments, and assessing the administrative handling of fire prevention by local, State, and Federal Governments.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUNT].

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise not actually in opposition to H.R. 11284, but rather to ask the House to reflect upon the real need for this legislation.

I keep asking myself, and I think everyone here should ask himself the same question; do we really need this legislation which involves an expenditure of \$10 million for this activity?

Now, I realize that in the judgment of some Members, who might make a comparison to some of the budgets and figures we will be considering on the floor in the upcoming weeks and months ahead, \$10 million is a comparatively small sum. I cannot bring myself to view \$10 million as insignificant.

We are talking about investing \$10 million to create a fire research and safety program, to establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control to work within the National Bureau of Standards.

First, I do not think there is any mystery connected with how fires start, what causes them and how to put them out. Every city and town, every professional and volunteer fire department has undoubtedly a considerable amount of experience with regard to the nature of fires and how they are initiated.

There are in the United States today many, many programs of research into conflagrations, both large and small, and into the development of new technologies to bring them more quickly under control.

Many Federal agencies are conducting right now a wide variety of research programs into the prevention and control of fires. The Department of Defense is spending \$1,745,000; armed services, \$2,105,000; Department of Agriculture, \$3,358,000; Atomic Energy Commission, \$100,000; the Commerce Department, \$265,000; Health, Education, and Welfare Department, \$388,000; the Department of Housing and Urban Development, \$100,000; Interior Department, \$660,000; National Aeronautics and Space Administration, about \$1,000,000; National Science Foundation, \$227,000; and the Transportation Department, \$1,211,000. The moneys involved here total more than \$11 million, and in terms of research of this nature, that is a significant total.

Now again I say, do we really need this legislation? Do we really want to set up a new organization which, although it is presently planned to place it under the aegis of the National Bureau of Standards, could eventually develop, as all such inevitably do, into a whole new governmental agency.

Every Member is aware of the extremely difficult budgetary burden this country will bear for the coming fiscal year. We all know of the austerity that has been forced upon many Government departments allegedly because of the costs of Vietnam.

One of my main concerns is that the American people are not further bur-

dened by a multitude of relatively minor authorizations and appropriations which would eventually total an enormous amount of money. This bill incorporates one of those minor authorizations.

I believe that the same result proposed by this bill could be achieved with little or no expenditures of moneys by the administration through the proper organization of resources already available within the Federal Government. It appears to me to be a matter of establishing the proper organizational setup which would result in the centralization of knowledge gained from Federal fire research programs already in existence. This, in turn, would make it possible for State and local governments to take advantage of this knowledge.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I ask, do we really need this legislation? We should, when the time comes to vote on H.R. 11284, have thoroughly resolved the answer to that question.

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

Mr. HUNT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I have been very much interested this afternoon in some of the arguments being advanced for the passage of this bill.

The Apollo disaster was conjured up as one of the reasons apparently as to why the legislation should be enacted.

I think anyone conversant with even a few of the facts of life should have known that nylon is a flammable material—long before the Apollo disaster occurred; and that the use of 100 percent of oxygen in a capsule of that size, in combination with nylon, created a highly dangerous situation.

Reference was made to the Houston ship channel as being a torch. Well, as long as gasoline and oil is dumped into the Houston ship channel, it will be something of a torch and the passage of this bill will not make any difference.

Then the Texas City disaster has been referred to. If memory serves me correctly, and this was a long time ago, this involved the mishandling of nitrate or some other explosive and flammable product.

I doubt very much that the passage of this bill, with the creation of another 18-member Commission in the Government, to be financed by our already overburdened taxpayers of this country, is going to solve many of the problems that have been mentioned here this afternoon.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his remarks.

This was one of the reasons, as expressed by the gentleman from Iowa, that I thought it would be more feasible to incorporate the various agencies that we have now and use some of the money that we spend, that is allocated to them, rather than to set up a new agency for the same purpose.

It is my hope, ladies and gentlemen, that you will examine this thoroughly before you cast your vote.

There is a need for a channelization. There is a need for consolidation. But I question whether or not this is the proper organizational way to do it.

The \$20 million figure is entirely too much for this project. I have recommended to the House Members that it

should be reduced by at least \$15 million for the 2-year life of the Commission. I am hopeful the Members will support my views.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ECKHARDT].

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa mentioned my district, and the cause of the fire, the imagined cause of the fire, in the Texas City disaster.

I happen to know about that incident very well because at the time I prepared a bill for the Texas Legislature to try to meet that cause. The cause of the disastrous holocaust in Texas City was the storage of certain chemicals within the hold of a foreign ship in port, which stood by like a fuse which blew up that city.

It is true that nothing likely could have been done at that time to prevent the fire because the fire was caused by the storage of chemicals in a ship. But it is also true that research of the type that this bill calls for might well have devised means by which ships containing such admixtures and such combinations of chemicals would not have been permitted to remain at a position close enough to the explosive industries in the area to cause that sort of holocaust.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this is an excellent example pointing up the need for the type of research that this bill calls for.

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

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LUKENS].

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Chairman, I simply rise in support of the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from California to H.R. 11284. I am of the firm belief that this Nation has to do basic research and development in the area of fire research and safety. Although I think much argument can be made for the point that we cannot avoid many of the fires that occur every day through human negligence and ordinary carelessness, there are many technical situations which have never been investigated let alone looked into. I think this is the time to move. What we are asking is a nominal amount. I appreciate the opportunity to support the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] to H.R. 11284. I believe that \$2.5 million for 2 years is a nominal amount, one which will allow us to move forward in this direction.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, while not opposing in principle the worthiness of the Fire Research and Safety Act, I will vote in opposition to it as a measure low on the priority list of necessary legislation and spending at this time.

In my report to the people of my district at the close of the first session of the 90th Congress I told them I thought it was my responsibility to examine closely any new legislation proposed in the second session from the standpoint of urgency against the pressing fiscal needs in Vietnam and in other areas of Federal spending.

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 desires 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 Nation and that in view of our 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 am proud of 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 depth of suppression strength within the Forest Service, for example, was amply demonstrated in the recent Idaho forest fire emergency.

I understand that in 2 or 3 days' time the equivalent of an army division of firefighters was mobilized from throughout the Nation.

The State forester of California, Francis Raymond, is doing a magnificent job through his organization in providing

fire protection to privately owned forest lands and many of the small communities in my district.

This effort is supported by the Federal funds and technical assistance that have been available for over 40 years under the Clarke-McNary Act.

This program is one of the most outstanding examples of Federal-State partnership in a critically important endeavor.

While stronger support is needed, and forest fire problems in California not yet solved, there is no comparison between today's situation and that of 20 years ago.

In several counties in California the county and city fire services are responsible for wildland fire suppression as an integral part of their structural fire operations.

Opportunities which H.R. 11284 will present to determine needs and direction and ultimately increased fire protection capability for these organizations will be of great importance.

It is my understanding that this bill will further the liaison established between on-going wildland firefighting organizations and urban and suburban fire suppression activities.

I understand also that some of the gaps in information and in fire suppression technology will be filled by this legislation. I urge its passage.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman I rise in support of H.R. 11284, the bill under consideration today. This bill is designed to authorize a fire research and safety program under the direction of the National Bureau of Standards, and to establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control.

Fire is indeed a grave national problem. In 1966 fire claimed the lives of 12,000 men, women, and children. The direct material loss of property exceed \$1.8 billion. These statistics become even more alarming when we realize that the annual loss by fire amounts to approximately \$9 per person in the United States. The total loss to our national picture is, of course, beyond calculation.

The fire research and safety program would provide the strengthening, expansion and voluntary coordination of the already significant efforts of the many private organizations and individuals as well as the local, State, and Federal organizations active and competent in the field. The provision of Federal funds, through contracts and grants, will assist these groups to establish a broader financial base and, thereby, to increase their effectiveness and extend the scope of their activities in behalf of public safety. The participation of the Federal Government is expected not only to widen the technical and financial base, but to increase public awareness of the seriousness of the problem.

The National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control would study all aspects of the national fire problem. It would report to 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 first 2 years. Its interim 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 recall such recent tragedies 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 confident that my esteemed colleagues will join me in support of this bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. There 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 PROGRAM

DECLARATION 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, 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 comprehensive fire data; a comprehensive fire research 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 should 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. 271-278e), 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, 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) encourage avoidance of such hazards and use of such techniques;

"(4) fire information reference services, including the collection, analysis, and dissemination of data, research results, and other information, derived from this program or from other sources and related to fire protection, 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) the capability of controlling unusual fire-related hazards and fire disasters; and

"(6) projects demonstrating—

"(A) Improved or experimental programs of fire prevention, fire control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage.

"(B) application of fire safety principles in construction, or

"(C) improvement of the efficiency, operation, or organization of the fire services.

"(b) Support by contracts or grants the development, for use by educational and other nonprofit institutions, of—

"(1) fire safety and fire protection engineering or science curriculums; and

"(2) fire safety courses, seminars, or other instructional materials and aids for the above curriculums or other appropriate curriculums or courses of instruction.

"Sec. 17. With respect to the functions authorized by section 16 of 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 centum 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 purpose 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 Virgin Islands, Guam, the Canal Zone, American Samoa, and 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 16 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. 529).

"(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 is authorized to cooperate with the Secretary and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such materials to the Secretary. The Secretary and the heads of other departments and agencies engaged in administering programs related to fire safety shall, to the maximum extent practicable, cooperate and consult in order to insure fully coordinated efforts.

"(e) The Secretary is authorized to establish such policies, 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 which—

"(1) provide that a grantee will from time to time, but not less often than annually, submit a report evaluating accomplishments of activities funded under section 16, and

"(2) provide for fiscal control, sound accounting procedures and periodic reports to the Secretary regarding the application of funds paid under section 16."

NONINTERFERENCE WITH EXISTING FEDERAL PROGRAMS

SEC. 103. Nothing contained 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

SEC. 104. There are authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this title, \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for

each of the following four fiscal years, and such appropriations are authorized to be made without fiscal year limitations.

TITLE II—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 201. The Congress finds and declares that the growing problem of the loss of life 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 an increasing proportion of the population resides but it is also of national concern in smaller communities and rural areas; that as population concentrates, the means for controlling and preventing destructive fires has become progressively more complex and frequently beyond purely local capabilities; 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 commission to undertake a thorough study and investigation of this problem with a view to the formulation of recommendations whereby the Nation can reduce the destruction of life and property caused by fire in its cities, suburbs, communities, and elsewhere.

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 twenty members as follows: the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and eighteen members appointed by the President. The individuals so appointed as members (1) shall be eminently well qualified by training or experience to carry out the functions of the Commission, and (2) shall be selected so as 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, laboratories, 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.

(b) The Commission shall have four advisory members composed of—

(1) two Members of the House of Representatives who shall not be members of 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 advisory members 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 in 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

SEC. 203. (a) The Commission shall undertake a comprehensive study and investigation to determine practicable and effective measures for reducing the destructive effects of fire throughout the country in addition to the steps taken under sections 16 and 17 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (as added by title I of this Act). Such study and investigation shall include, without being limited to—

(1) a consideration of ways in which fires can be more effectively prevented through

technological advances, construction techniques, and improved 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 housing and in the redevelopment of the Nation's cities and communities;

(3) an evaluation of existing fire suppression methods and of ways for improving the same, including procedures for recruiting and soliciting the necessary personnel;

(4) an evaluation of present and future needs (including long-term needs) of 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;

(6) an analysis of the administrative problems affecting the efficiency or capabilities of local fire departments or organizations; and

(7) an assessment of local, State, and Federal responsibilities in the development of practicable and effective solutions for reducing fire losses.

(b) In carrying out its duties under this section the Commission shall consider the results of the functions carried out by the Secretary of Commerce under sections 16 and 17 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (as added by title I of this Act), and consult regularly with the Secretary in order to coordinate the work of the Commission and the functions carried out under such sections 16 and 17.

(c) The Commission shall submit to the President and to the Congress a report with respect to its findings and recommendations not later than two years after the Commission has been duly organized.

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 carrying out the provisions of this title, hold hearings, take testimony, and administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or any subcommittee or member thereof.

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

(c) Subject to such rules and regulations as may be adopted 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 the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, shall have the power—

(1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such staff personnel as he deems necessary, and

(2) to procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as it authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 205. (a) Any member of the Commission, including a member appointed under section 202(b), who is a Member of Congress or in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received in his regular employment, but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in connection with the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission, other than those referred to in subsection (a), shall receive compensation at the rate of \$100 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission and shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

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 to carry out this title.

EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 207. The Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after the submission of its report under section 203(c).

Mr. DADDARIO (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 7, strike out lines 5 through 7, and insert the following: "for the following fiscal year."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BELL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BELL: On page 7, strike out lines 2 through 7 and insert the following:

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

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is self-explanatory. As reported to this house, H.R. 11284 would authorize \$10 million for the first fiscal year and such sums as may be required for the following year.

The National Bureau of Standards has estimated that its requirement for the second year would also be \$10 million.

My amendment would reduce this \$20 million total for the 2 years by 75 percent to \$5 million—\$2½ million for the first year and \$2½ million for the second—a figure well below that proposed in the President's budget.

Mr. Chairman, I support the programs and goals outlined by the Fire Research and Safety Act.

But fiscal responsibility forces us to economize wherever and whenever possible.

There is overwhelming evidence to support the contention that the United States has been lax in providing funds for fire research and safety and that the price we have paid for this laxness—both in loss of life and in property damage—has far exceeded the cost of effective research.

It is appropriate that we start now to make up for lost time.

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 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 Bell 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 amend-

ment 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. Chairman, last year in his 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 then, "We can do better, and we must."

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 nature and 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 out the latest information and data 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-

tinguished 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 administer oaths or affirmations to 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 the way a commission should operate. This is not unusual, as I understand it. A commission investigating causes and natures of fires should have the authority to have its witnesses testify under oath, so that proper testimony may be taken. This is not an 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 the legislation, but for this 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 read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 12, 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 empire building by the proposed Commission. I am surprised to see 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. 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 so that they would not be encumbered 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 of permanent 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.

I believe what has been said here is reaffirmation of that. There will not be more than 11 people. They would not be put on the civil service roster after 2 years pass. They are exempt in this particular instance so that they may be hired in an efficient manner, and so that the Commission can get about its work quickly in order to get the job done in 2 years.

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. Brooks, 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. 11284) 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 926, 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 gros.

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 announced 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 notify absent 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. 26]

YEAS—269

- | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Adair | Frelinghuysen | Meeds |
| Adams | Friedel | Meskill |
| Addabbo | Fulton, Pa. | Miller, Calif. |
| Albert | Fulton, Tenn. | Minish |
| Anderson, | Fuqua | Mink |
| Tenn. | Gallifanakis | Monagan |
| Annunzio | Gallagher | Moore |
| Ashley | Gardner | Moorhead |
| Aspinall | Garwitz | Morgan |
| Ayres | Gathings | Morris, N. Mex. |
| Baring | Gialmo | Morse, Mass. |
| Barrett | Gibbons | Morton |
| Bates | Gilbert | Mosher |
| Belcher | Gonzalez | Murphy, Ill. |
| Bell | Green, Oreg. | Murphy, N. Y. |
| Bennett | Green, Pa. | Myers |
| Betts | Griffiths | Natcher |
| Bingham | Gross | Nedzi |
| Blackburn | Grover | Nix |
| Blanton | Gubser | O'Hara, Ill. |
| Blatnik | Hall | O'Hara, Mich. |
| Boggs | Halpern | O'Konski |
| Boland | Hamilton | Olsen |
| Bolton | Hammer- | O'Neill, Mass. |
| Brademas | schmidt | Ottinger |
| Brasco | Hanley | Patman |
| Bray | Hanna | Patten |
| Brinkley | Hansen, Wash. | Pelly |
| Brock | Hardy | Perkins |
| Brooks | Harsha | Pettis |
| Broomfield | Harvey | Philbin |
| Brotzman | Hathaway | Pickle |
| Brown, Calif. | Hawkins | Pike |
| Broyhill, N.C. | Hays | Pirnie |
| Buchanan | Hechler, W. Va. | Poff |
| Burke, Mass. | Heckler, Mass. | Price, Ill. |
| Burton, Calif. | Helstoski | Price, Tex. |
| Bush | Herlong | Purcell |
| Button | Hicks | Qule |
| Byrne, Pa. | Hollifield | Rallsback |
| Cabell | Holland | Randall |
| Cahill | Horton | Reld, N. Y. |
| Carey | Howard | Reuss |
| Carter | Hungate | Rhodes, Pa. |
| Casey | Hunt | Roberts |
| Chamberlain | Ichord | Rodino |
| Cohelan | Irwin | Rogers, Colo. |
| Collier | Jacobs | Ronan |
| Conyers | Jarman | Rooney, Pa. |
| Corbett | Jealson | Roth |
| Corman | Johnson, Calif. | Roush |
| Cowger | Johnson, Pa. | Roybal |
| Culver | Jonas | Ryan |
| Daddario | Jones, Ala. | St Germain |
| Daniels | Karsten | Sandman |
| Davis, Ga. | Karth | Satterfield |
| de la Garza | Kastenmeier | Saylor |
| Delaney | Kazen | Scherle |
| Dellenback | Kee | Schwengel |
| Dent | Keith | Shipley |
| Derwinski | Kelly | Sisk |
| Dingell | King, Calif. | Slack |
| Donohue | Kirwan | Smith, Iowa |
| Dorn | Kupferman | Smith, N. Y. |
| Dow | Kyl | Stafford |
| Dowdy | Kyros | Staggers |
| Downing | Leggett | Stanton |
| Dulski | Lennon | Stevens |
| Dwyer | Lloyd | Stratton |
| Eckhardt | Long, La. | Stubblefield |
| Edmondson | Long, Md. | Sullivan |
| Edwards, Ala. | Lukens | Taft |
| Edwards, Calif. | McCarthy | Teague, Tex. |
| Ellberg | McClory | Tenzer |
| Erlenborn | McCulloch | Thompson, N. J. |
| Esch | McDonald, | Tieman |
| Evins, Tenn. | Mich. | Tuck |
| Fallon | McFall | Tunney |
| Farbstein | McMillan | Udall |
| Fascell | MacGregor | Van Deerlin |
| Feighan | Machen | Vanik |
| Fino | Mailliard | Vigorito |
| Fisher | Marsh | Waggoner |
| Flood | Mathias, Md. | Waldie |
| Foley | Matsumaga | Watson |
| Ford, Gerald R. | May | Whalen |
| Fountain | Mayne | White |

Widnall
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wolff

Wright
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman

Young
Zablocki
Zion

Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Seiden with Mr. Schweiker.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Roubush.

Mr. Burlison with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Don H. Clausen with Mr. Blester.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Rienecke.
Mr. Rumsfeld with Mr. Andrews of North

Dakota.
Mr. Stieger with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Diggs.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 926, I call up from the Speaker's table for immediate consideration the bill S. 1124.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DADDARIO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. DADDARIO: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1124 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 11284 as passed, as follows:

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

"TITLE I—FIRE RESEARCH AND SAFETY PROGRAM

"DECLARATION 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, 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 comprehensive fire data; a comprehensive fire research 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 should 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. 271–278e), 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,

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) encourage avoidance of such hazards and use of such techniques;

"(4) fire information reference services, including the collection, analysis, and dissemination of data, research results, and other information, derived from this program or from other sources and related to fire protection, 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) the capability of controlling unusual fire-related hazards and fire disasters; and

"(6) projects demonstrating—

"(A) improved or experimental programs of fire prevention, fire control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage,

"(B) application of fire safety principles in construction, or

"(C) improvement of the efficiency, operation, or organization of the fire services.

"(b) Support by contracts or grants the development, for use by educational and other nonprofit institutions, of—

"(1) fire safety and fire protection engineering or science curriculums; and

"(2) fire safety courses, seminars, or other instructional materials and aids for the above curriculums or other appropriate curriculums or courses of instruction.

"Sec. 17. With respect to the functions authorized by section 16 of 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 centum 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 purpose 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 Virgin Islands, Guam, the Canal Zone, American Samoa, and 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 16 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. 529).

"(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 is authorized to cooperate with the Secretary and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such materials to the Secretary. The Secretary and the heads of other departments and agencies engaged in administering programs related to fire safety shall, to the maximum extent practicable, cooperate and consult in order to insure fully coordinated efforts.

"(e) The Secretary is authorized to establish such policies, 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 which—

NAYS—78

Abernethy
Andrews, Ala.
Ashmore
Berry
Bevill
Bow
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Burke, Fla.
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cederberg
Clawson, Del
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Denney
Dickinson
Dole
Duncan
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Flynt
Goodling
Hagan
Haley

Halleck
Harrison
Henderson
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
King, N. Y.
Kleppe
Kornegay
Laird
Langen
Lipscomb
McClure
McEwen
Mahon
Martin
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Montgomery
Neisen
Poage
Pryor
Quillen
Rarick

Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Schadeberg
Schneebell
Scott
Shriver
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Stuckey
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Vander Jagt
Walker
Whitener
Whitten
Wiggins
Willis
Winn

NOT VOTING—84

Abbitt
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Battin
Blester
Bolling
Broyhill, Va.
Burlison
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Cleveland
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Devine
Diggs
Edwards, La.
Everett
Findley
Ford
William D.
Fraser

Gettys
Goodell
Gray
Gude
Gurney
Hansen, Idaho
Hébert
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Landrum
Latta
McCloskey
McDade
Macdonald,
Mass.
Madden
Mathias, Calif.
Michel
Moss
Nichols
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pepper
Pollock
Pool
Pucinski
Rees
Reinecke

Resnick
Riegle
Rivers
Rooney, N. Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roubush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schweiker
Selden
Skubitz
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Steiger, Wis.
Ullman
Utt
Wampler
Watkins
Watts
Whalley
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wyatt
Yates
Zwach

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Arends against.
Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Watkins against.
Mr. Kuykendall for, with Mr. Devine against.
Mr. Riegle for, with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin against.
Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Utt against.
Mr. Gude for, with Mr. Smith of Oklahoma against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Rostenkowski 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. Wyatt.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Smith of Oklahoma.
Mr. Everett with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Gurney.

"(1) provide that a grantee will from time to time, but not less often than annually, submit a report evaluating accomplishments of activities funded under section 16, and

"(2) provide for fiscal control, sound accounting procedures and periodic reports to the Secretary regarding the application of funds paid under section 160."

"NONINTERFERENCE WITH EXISTING FEDERAL PROGRAMS

"Sec. 103. Nothing contained 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

"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 the loss of life 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 an increasing proportion of the population resides but it is also of national concern in smaller communities and rural areas; that as population concentrates, the means for controlling and preventing destructive fires has become progressively more complex and frequently beyond purely local capabilities; 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 commission to undertake a thorough study and investigation of this problem with a view to the formulation of recommendations whereby the Nation can reduce the destruction of life and property caused by fire in its cities, suburbs, communities, and elsewhere.

"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 twenty members as follows: the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and eighteen members appointed by the President. The individuals so appointed as members (1) shall be eminently well qualified by training or experience to carry out the functions of the Commission, and (2) shall be selected so as 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, laboratories, 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.

"(b) The Commission shall have four advisory members composed of—

"(1) two Members of the House of Representatives who shall not be members of 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 advisory members 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

in 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

"Sec. 203. (a) The Commission shall undertake a comprehensive study and investigation to determine practicable and effective measures for reducing the destructive effects of fire throughout the country in addition to the steps taken under sections 16 and 17 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (as added by title I of this Act). Such study and investigation shall include, without being limited to—

"(1) a consideration of ways in which fires can be more effectively prevented through technological advances, construction techniques, and improved 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 housing and in the redevelopment of the Nation's cities and communities;

"(3) an evaluation of existing fire suppression methods and of ways for improving the same, including procedures for recruiting and soliciting the necessary personnel;

"(4) an evaluation of present and future needs (including long-term needs) of 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;

"(6) an analysis of the administrative problems affecting the efficiency or capabilities of local fire departments or organizations; and

"(7) an assessment of local, State, and Federal responsibilities in the development of practicable and effective solutions for reducing fire losses.

"(b) In carrying out its duties under this section the Commission shall consider the results of the functions carried out by the Secretary of Commerce under sections 16 and 17 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (as added by title I of this Act), and consult regularly with the Secretary in order to coordinate the work of the Commission and the functions carried out under such sections 16 and 17.

"(c) The Commission shall submit to the President and to the Congress a report with respect to its findings and recommendations not later than two years after the Commission has been duly organized.

"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 carrying out the provisions of this title, hold hearings, take testimony, and administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or any subcommittee or member thereof.

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

"(c) Subject to such rules and regulations as may be adopted 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 the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, shall have the power—

"(1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such staff personnel as he deems necessary, and

"(2) to procure temporary and intermit-

tent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

"COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

"Sec. 205 (a) Any member of the Commission, including a member appointed under section 202(b), who is a Member of Congress or in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received in his regular employment, but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in connection with the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

"(b) Members of the Commission, other than those referred to in subsection (a), shall receive compensation at the rate of \$100 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission and shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

"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 to carry out this title.

"EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

"Sec. 207. The Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after the submission of its report under section 203(c)."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO].

The motion was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 11284) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks in connection with the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PRINTING OF REMARKS IN PERMANENT RECORD

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks which appear on page E571 in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 6, pertaining to my visit to Nicaragua, be printed in the permanent RECORD of that date following the last special order of the day.

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

There was no objection.

ESTUARINE AREAS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 25) 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 valu-

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. 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 Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] will be recognized for 30 minutes. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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 were present 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 TENZER, introduced legislation—limited in scope—which would provide for the protection and administration of the estuarine-wetland area of Hempstead-South Oyster Bay, Long Island, N.Y.

Subsequently, I and several other Members of the Congress 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 by three votes.

In January of this past 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 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—to conduct a study and inventory of our Nation's estuaries, including the land and waters of the Great Lakes.

For the purpose of the study, the Secretary would be required to consider, among other matters, first, their wildlife and recreational potential, and fisheries values; second, their importance to navigation and flood control; and third, the value of such areas for urban, commercial, and industrial developments.

The Secretary of the Interior would be required to carry out this study in conjunction with the estuarine pollution study authorized under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as well as other applicable studies in those areas.

In studying such areas, the Secretary would be required to give consideration to whether any land or water area within an estuary and the Great Lakes should be acquired by the Federal Government or by a State or local government, or whether such areas could be adequately protected and preserved through local, State, or Federal laws without Federal acquisition or administration.

Further, this section would require the Secretary of the Interior, no later than January 30, 1970, to submit to the Congress through the President his report and legislative recommendations, including recommendations on the desirability of establishing a system of estuarine areas and the designation of any area which he thinks should be acquired by the Federal Government. However, no land could be acquired until authorized by a subsequent act of Congress.

To carry out the study and inventory, there would be authorized to be appropriated \$750,000 for fiscal year 1969 and \$250,000 for fiscal year 1970.

Section 3 of the bill would authorize the Secretary—based on studies conducted by him in cooperation with the New York State Department of Conservation—which were studied in 1961 and 1965—to enter into an agreement for the permanent management, administration, and development with the owners of certain lands and waters on Long Island, N.Y. The cost of managing, administering, and developing such areas would be shared on an equitable basis between the Secretary and the public owners.

As another method of conserving estuarine areas, this section would authorize the Secretary to also study the desirability of authorizing the Secretary to enter into similar agreements with public owners of areas in other States.

Section 4 of the bill would require all

Federal agencies, in planning uses of water and land resources, to give consideration to the importance of the natural resources of such areas for commercial and industrial development, and all project plans and reports submitted to the Congress shall contain a discussion and recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior on the effects of the projects on estuaries and other resources.

Section 5 of the bill would direct the Secretary of the Interior to encourage the States and their local subdivisions to consider, in their comprehensive plans for Federal assistance under programs administered by the Department of the Interior, the needs and opportunities for 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 Anadromous and Great Lakes Fisheries Conservation Act.

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.

Mr. Chairman, your 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 came 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 and local governments in whose subdivisions the estuarine areas lie should have a strong voice and a definite priority as to their management, conservation, and preservation. In the bill that came before the House near the end of the 89th Congress, I did not think the States were adequately protected and, therefore, I objected to the legislation offered.

The present bill which is being offered today, in my opinion, is a far better bill. It has my enthusiastic support. This legislation reflects a great deal of work and effort by the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]; and by other members of the committee, as well as Members not on the committee, but who have a particular interest in the destiny of our wetlands and estuaries. The gentlemen from New York [Mr. WYDLER and Mr. TENZER] and many others contributed a great deal toward the elimination of the objections which many people had to the legislation offered over a year and a half ago.

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 agreements dealing with the management and responsibility for the conservation practices needed to preserve our wetlands and estuarine areas.

The preservation of our estuarine areas is, as far as I am concerned, without controversy. The marshes, the wetlands, and those transitional areas where the fresh water of our rivers runs into the sea water of our tidal estuaries are a most vital part of our environment.

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 a dynamic ecology. 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 fantastic producer of oysters and clams. 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 we span its surface with bridges, as we reshape its shores to suit the needs of industry or the houses of men—each time, 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 country, the Everglades, Great South Bay, Buzzards Bay, the long coastal waterway of the east coast and gulf coast. In addition to this, we are blessed with the Great Lakes system, its connections and its tributaries. The Chesapeake is but an example.

If man is to survive, and if civilization is to achieve a higher order, the relationship between man and nature must be perfected. If we are to reach for greatness, we must deal not only with our public works, our highways, our transportation, our adventures into space, the physical facilities which house our enterprise—but also with our natural environment. If we fail to develop compatibly with nature, if we fail to conserve and protect the opportunity for wildlife to share this earth with us, if we fail to ensure the integrity of the shorelines of our waterways, if we allow the cleanliness and purity of our great natural environment to become soiled and contaminated by human waste, then we, in the end, as children of God and creatures of nature, will not and can not survive. Were we to describe the

price we have paid to develop our industrial society, to bring about the enjoyment of our materialism, we could well say the price has been paid through the loss of the integrity of our natural environment.

Here in the middle of the 20th century, at a time when we are venturing away from this planet into the mystery of space, we are faced with the fundamental question of our environment and the posture of mankind within the total ecological concept. This bill, though a meager thrust toward the conservation and preservation of areas of biological importance, is timely. It gives recognition to the estuarine areas. It devises means for their preservation and conservation.

The language and spirit of this legislation is designed to bring Federal and State conservation efforts into closer relationship. The purpose here is not to acquire, take over, condemn, or federalize the estuarine areas. The purpose is to study; the purpose is to consult with the States; the purpose is to develop an understanding of the potential of our estuarine areas, to understand their ecology, their contribution to navigation, their opportunities for recreation, and their value as a resource. The purpose is 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 or conflict with other Federal land management systems 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 hope for the preservation and conservation 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 delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Under the definition of terms in this bill, what is an estuary?

Mr. MORTON. An estuary is a body of water, or an area, where the fresh water of the tributaries and the fresh waters of the runoffs meet the tidal waters, or salt waters of the sea.

Estuarine areas are 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 the outflow from springs composed 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. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield on that point?

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

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

If the gentleman will 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. At this point, the river waters, the ocean tides, the coastal currents, and the contours of our shores interact resulting in the depositing of river sediments and sediments washed up by the sea in the estuary.

That is the definition used by the committee, as supplied by the Department of the Interior.

If the gentleman will yield still further, this definition was expanded only by the addition of language making possible the extension of the provisions of this legislation to the Great Lakes.

Mr. KYL. Will the gentleman 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, or 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 concern 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 be specific about this, I will 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.

The report reads as follows:

H.R. 25 and the companion bills are not concerned with the open ocean, nor with the fresh water stretches 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 has to determine that. That is what we are trying to determine—exactly what areas.

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. KEITH].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, my district will be a beneficiary of the research and study—and hopefully the conclusions that 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 which eventually find their way to the marketplace and on to the tables throughout our country.

It is very important that this relationship be understood.

Thanks to 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 to the public which must have the 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 yield for one further question on 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. Is there any obligation in the bill which calls on 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 Michigan, who is the author of the bill. I think he can give you a better answer than I could.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman. First, if the gentleman will refer to page 18, he will find that no interest in land may be acquired by the Federal Government under the bill until such time as a study is completed and until after specific authorization by Congress.

The bill authorizes only a study, and it would authorize, upon completion of the study, that the Federal Government could—except for the Long Island Wetlands area—subject to appropriations and after action by the Congress, enter into agreements by and between the Federal Government and the local units of government which happen to have lands now in public ownership for inclusion of all or such portions of those areas as the Secretary of the Interior, with the concurrence of the President and the local unit of government or State—with the concurrence of the government—would deem appropriate.

Mr. PELLY. Will the gentleman look at page 18, lines 1 and 2:

No lands within such area may be acquired until authorized by subsequent Act of Congress.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Washington yield?

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I would like to revert to the question raised earlier by the gentleman from Iowa and again raised by the distinguished and respected gentleman from Washington. I am not quite clear on how the Great Lakes got into this estuarine bill. I wish to make it clear at the outset that I am a strong supporter of the objectives of the bill, the need for the study, the need for proper management of these estuarine wetlands, and the need for participation by Federal, State, and local interests in a joint effort. But for the record, and also for my own information, after reading all the definitions of "estuary," I found the following definition in the Random House Dictionary, 1967 edition:

Estuary. 1. That part of the mouth or lower course of a river in which the river's current meets the sea's tide. 2. An arm or inlet of the sea and the lower end of a river.

The gentleman from Michigan, the author of the bill, read the definition in the committee's report. It appears at the bottom of page 5:

Estuaries are places where salt water meets fresh water, et cetera.

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 18 it states:

No lands within such area may be acquired until authorized by 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 an estuary.

Mr. DINGELL. 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. Chairman, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. 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 land and waters of the Great Lakes.

So it was the intent of the committee, as I hope it 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 esthetic, 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. DINGELL. 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 very real 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 small amendment 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 will in my view go to correlate studies already in existence. Estuary studies have 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 inland Congressman 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 trust is what was generally 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 serious and important change 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 State and the towns, 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 of 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 felt they were being singled out and made to look like the targets of the legislation. In our meeting we agreed that this would be changed, and neither the State of New York nor the towns of Hempstead or Oyster Bay are any longer mentioned in the legislation, and whatever provisions there are are nationwide.

Of course the towns did not want to be singled out because they consider that they have the very best conservation agreements in the United States of America for the protection of wet lands. They have town-State agreements now in existence, and they seriously question whether they need any improvements of them.

Second, the bill as then proposed would have required the use of old surveys as the basis for wetlands agreements. This would have limited the scope and the area of the wetlands agreements. The State did not want this. The towns did not want this. They wanted new studies which would allow the inclusion of new areas and proper agreements to protect unprotected areas of our wet lands.

It was also possible—and this was a most serious thing, because it would have

affected everyone—under the legislation as then proposed to bypass the State, and for the Federal Government to make agreements directly with localities within the State without the State's concurrence.

All these objections were met by the chairman of the committee in this meeting, and I want to congratulate him on the attitude he took, because through 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 attention.

Mr. DINGELL. 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 improper 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 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 also set the matter straight. With respect to the language contained 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.

The CHAIRMAN. 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, by 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 units of government for management of estuaries which will be completed previous 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 approve 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 a locality in 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 appropriate time I will introduce a letter dealing with this point from the Secretary of the Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. WYDLER. Finally, the question which was raised by the State, as the gentleman will remember, at the conference we held, which is, will 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 of areas between the Department of the Interior and local units of government or the States must take into consideration very clearly the language of subsections 2(a) and 2(b) of the bill and insofar as possible to consult and cooperate with the States and also with the Secretary of the Army and other Federal agencies so as fully to consider the views of the States and the local units of government and other affected Government agencies.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the chairman for that statement. I also wish to thank the gentlemen from New York [Mr. TENZER and Mr. GROVER], who demonstrated such a great interest in the bill. I would also like to put on the record today that we have all agreed, we being the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, myself, Congressman TENZER, and Congressman GROVER, that we will in fact send a proper letter to the Department of the Interior, insofar as we are talking about the Long Island area, requesting them to make any study that they make in the area an areawide study of all the wetlands of both the north and south shores of Long Island.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is fully correct in that last statement and, as he will recall, I sent in all of the corre-

spondence received by me throughout the years, including some concerning the specific questions that the gentleman 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 for yielding this time to me.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 25. In particular 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. WYDLER, GROVER, and TENZER] for their initiative on this vital conservation measure.

This bill enjoys the support of Governor Rockefeller and the New York State Conservation Commissioner, Stewart 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 inventory of the Nation's estuaries and waters of the Great Lakes by 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 not to exceed \$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 management, development, and administration of such areas.

Throughout the Nation, estuarine areas have both conservation and economic value. Estuaries, as marginal sea and land areas, are the environment for many natural resources, including large populations of wildfowl, such as ducks, geese, swans, rail, and snipe. Many of our most valued commercial species of fish spend at least a portion of their lives in estuarine areas, including prawns, menhaden, bluefish, oysters, soft clams, blue crabs, and diamondback terrapins. It is estimated that, in 1960, estuarine-dependent seafood resources supported about 90,000 commercial fishermen at the rate of about 2.8 billion pounds.

Specifically, in terms of the Long Island wetlands, the area comprises extensive marshes and bays some 15 miles long and 3½ miles wide, including Hempstead and South Oyster Bays. The commercial and recreational value of the finfish, shellfish, waterfowl, and shorebirds that inhabit this area is enormous and the demand for these resources is increasing. A report by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service indicates that some 29 percent of the Long Island wetlands have been destroyed between 1954 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 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 required. This legislation is but a first small step—yet, if we postpone even this minimal beginning any longer, the opportunity to preserve these resources may well pass us by.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to join my colleague from Michigan in urging passage of H.R. 25—the so-called estuarine area bill—with the amendment to be offered by the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation.

As has been previously stated, the principal thrust of this legislation is to authorize and to direct the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the States, the Secretary of the Army, and other Federal agencies, to study and to inventory the Nation's estuaries including the Great Lakes area. This study would have to be submitted to the Congress by the President not later than January 30, 1970, together with appropriate legislative recommendations. Significantly, this legislation provides an express prohibition against the acquisition of lands within any subsequently designated estuarine area "until authorized by subsequent act of Congress."

Whereas the bill, H.R. 25, as reported by our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into only an agreement pertaining to certain publicly owned lands on Long Island, N.Y., studied in 1961 and 1965, the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan would so amend section 3 of the bill as to expand this somewhat restrictive authority. It would furnish the Secretary of the Interior permissive authority to enter into an agreement for the management, administration, and development of publicly owned estuarine areas following the completion of a study of such areas and subject to the approval of the President of the agreement.

Most importantly, however, no agreement could be entered into by the Secretary of the Interior with any political subdivision of a State without it first being approved by the Governor of the respective State. The cost resulting from such agreements would be shared in an equitable manner by the Federal Government and the respective State or political subdivision thereof, subject to the availability of appropriations, and State hunting and fishing laws shall be applicable to those areas covered in the agreement. It is my understanding that with this amendment the bill, H.R. 25, satisfactorily disposes of concerns previously expressed by several Members of the House.

As originally introduced, H.R. 25 did

contain several provisions found to be objectionable to various interested parties. However, the chairman of our Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation has taken exceedingly great pains to provide all parties every opportunity to make their views known. Every possible consideration was afforded so 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:

Please all, and you will please none.

Mr. Chairman, fish resources are the economic mainstay of hundreds of our coastal communities and the key to prosperity for many seaside resorts where sport fishing supports the local economy. These same resources provide recreation for hundreds of thousands of our citizens. What H.R. 25 accomplishes is to sound the alarm that these valuable resources are in danger of depletion because of burgeoning community and industrial development, expanding into estuarine areas which are the principal habitat for a large portion of our fish resources.

There exists, therefore, a need for balancing the interest between community/industrial development and the preservation of the habitats of fish. This legislation constitutes an initial step toward bringing these interests into balance. As noted in an editorial appearing in the *Marine Digest* of January 27 on the preservation of estuarine resources, and I quote:

On a citizen level, we feel it makes a lot of sense for men to participate in both conservation and industrial growth activities. Candidly, neither side, because of the motions involved, can be trusted to have just their own way. A compatibility must and can be achieved.

The bill, H.R. 25, constitutes the initial vehicle to achieve this necessary compatibility and I therefore strongly urge the House to pass this legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to our distinguished friend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], the chairman of the full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, such time as he may consume.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, it would be a great tragedy if the United States, the wealthiest and most powerful nation in the world, should permit the loss of one of its most valuable natural resources—the estuarine, or wetland areas.

H.R. 25 is designed to make certain this loss never happens. The bill would do no more than authorize a 2-year study of the wetlands of the Nation—including our Great Lakes area. I join my colleagues in strongly endorsing this legislation.

America's wetlands are the natural habitat and breeding grounds for countless varieties of plant, marine, and bird life, and they form an important link in the delicate balance of nature. For example, oysters, clams, and blue crabs—all of which constitute an important seafood industry in my own Chesapeake Bay area of Maryland—spend their juvenile

stages in the protected waters of the estuarine zone.

Once these wetlands are destroyed, they are gone forever.

I am, of course, just as acutely aware of the importance of these areas to our industrial interests. I know the wetland areas are valuable sites for future industrial expansion.

The interests of the naturalist and the industrialist often conflict, and that is another reason why this bill is important. It does not threaten either interests. What it will do is initiate a study that will enable us to find an intelligent and equitable solution to this important problem.

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. TENZER] who originated the fight to preserve our estuaries.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, 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 for the purpose of seeking 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, 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 requiring 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 unusual 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 some local politicians on Long Island to work together. On three prior occasions bipartisan support was given and then at the last possible moment withdrawn by certain officials 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 has offered 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 been all too fast disappearing and being under foundations of concrete preserved under concrete rather than 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 H.R. 11236, 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 in public ownership—a concept which has remained intact in H.R. 25. This concept is simply that when lands are in public ownership—State or local government ownership—the bill authorizes the Secretary of Interior to enter into voluntary cooperative Federal, State, and local management agreements by negotiation, to preserve these resources rather than requiring the Federal Government to acquire the lands by condemnation or purchase as is presently required.

Under H.R. 25 and under the terms of such an agreement title to the wetlands or estuarine area involved, remains with the State and/or local government. As an example the 16,000 acres of Long Island's south shore wetlands have been estimated to be worth approximately \$25 to \$30 million. Why should the Treasury of the Federal Government be required to transfer huge sums of money to acquire lands already owned by State or local governments? In lieu of acquisition by purchase or proceeding by condemna-

tion, H.R. 25 would authorize cooperative management agreements, under which Federal, State, and local governments would work together to preserve our natural resources while equitably 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 State 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 natural resources.

Throughout the history of the estuarine protection bill many organizations, a number of States and political subdivisions have testified in favor of the legislation. Many individuals have testified at the public 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, Idaho. The bill also has the full support of the Mid-West Fish and Game Commissioners Association, which include representatives from the States of Michigan, Kansas, Indiana, Kentucky, Nebraska, Ohio, Wisconsin, South Dakota, Maryland, Iowa, Colorado, North Dakota, Minnesota and Illinois.

It is important to note that the provisions of section 3 of H.R. 25 relating to cooperative management agreements are completely voluntary. There is no coercion, no Federal control, and no obligation imposed upon any State or political 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 committee hearings in 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 1936 there were 30,000 acres of valuable wetlands but now only 16,000 remain. This bill provides a new way to preserve the remaining wetlands on Long Island and other such valuable resources throughout the Nation.

More and more of our local communities are now realizing the importance of preserving open space and rec-

reational areas. They are recognizing the urgency of providing for expert planning and maintenance of their remaining natural resources. Efforts are now being made in 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 first areas in which a 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 in 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 wetlands and extremely gratified that Chairman DINGELL has with great foresight broadened the battle to preserve the Nation's wetlands.

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—is one worthy of our attention. 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

The bays, estuaries and coastal wetlands where the fresh waters of a river meet the tides of the sea were once crucial in the evolution of man. For other species, they are still the survival zone. Here nearly two-thirds of the nation's commercially valuable finfish and shellfish spawn. Here are found oysters, shrimp, clams and crabs. And here water birds live and migratory birds rest on their journeys.

Human beings, forgetful of their own past and heedless of the welfare of other species, think of swamps and marshes as wastelands. They mistakenly believe that oceans and rivers can absorb an infinite amount of

abuse. So it is that they pollute the waters and destroy estuaries and adjoining wetlands by dredging and filling.

The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries is now considering a bill by Representative Dingell of Michigan to authorize an inventory of the nation's estuarine areas by the Interior Department.

Originally, his bill was more ambitious. It included a requirement that those seeking to dredge or fill would have to obtain a permit from the Secretary of the Interior. But the sand and gravel companies, the real estate developers and the Rivers and Harbors Congress mounted a successful lobbying campaign to insure that their perennial ally, the Army Corps of Engineers, will retain 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.

As 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 interests have the last word on this significant part of man's environment.

[From the Long Island (N.Y.) Press, Dec. 6, 1967]

BOGGED DOWN

The struggle to preserve Long Island's Wetlands has bogged down in a morass of politics and jurisdictional jealousies.

The bill, introduced by Rep. Herbert Tenzer, the Lawrence Democrat, provides for voluntary federal-local agreements for the preservation of the wetlands, so vital to the balance of nature in marine life and so tempting for real estate developers.

When introduced last March, it had wide by-partisan 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—along with the State Conservation Department and Hempstead Town's Republican Supervisor Ralph G. Caso, whose town contains most of the contested areas—that existing state-local agreements are adequate.

Herein lies the nub of the dispute. Mr. Caso, while he says he recognizes the conservation imperatives, 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 precious, irreplaceable acres.

Both Reps. 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 this public treasure can get on the House floor and be passed into law after the new year.

[From Newsday, Jan. 16, 1968]

WETLANDS BILL: PRESERVING OUR RESOURCES

WASHINGTON, D.C.—In a recent letter to the editor (Jan. 3), Hempstead Presiding Supervisor Ralph G. Caso defended his opposition to my wetlands preservation bill by stating: "We want the same study other tidal areas will receive." The Town of Hempstead position is difficult to understand in light of these facts. In 1958 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the New York State Conserva-

tion Department undertook a joint study of 16,000 acres of South Shore wetlands. In 1961 a final report was published calling these wetlands "the most valuable waterfowl area in the North Atlantic States." Recommendations for preservation of the remaining wetlands were also issued.

In 1965, this study was updated. In September of that same year, I introduced legislation authorizing cooperative management agreements between the federal, state, and local government for the permanent preservation of the wetlands. Approximately 14,000 acres of wetlands had been destroyed during the previous 20 years, and my bill was designed to protect the remaining acreage.

The bill was subsequently broadened to include a study of the nation's wetlands. Since L.I.'s wetlands had already been studied over the past seven years—the only such study completed in the U.S.—the legislation included authorization for cooperative agreements covering these wetlands. At congressional hearings, Department of Interior officials stated that prior to any such agreement the L.I. studies would be updated again. It was estimated this would take from two to five months.

After all this, and after publicly supporting the wetlands bill, Mr. Caso—on the eve of House consideration of the legislation—withdraw his support and, together with Rep. John Wydler (R-Garden City) and officials of the State Conservation Department, asked for a delay in House action. The excuse that Hempstead wants additional studies is a "phony."

The bill is completely voluntary, merely authorizing negotiations between the town, the state and the Interior Department. Apparently for political reasons alone, the town has placed every obstacle in the way of congressional action on this legislation. Instead of discussing this bill with its sponsors, the town has conducted an exchange of views through the press.

The town wants to restrict this legislation to a study because it knows that public opinion may force a permanent agreement for preservation of the wetlands. This concept of voluntary cooperative agreements is a new approach to the preservation of natural resources. It would save billions of dollars now spent for purchase of condemnation of land already in public ownership. If these resources belong to the people, they should be preserved without the need for purchase or condemnation.

Mr. Caso also refers to the state-town agreement and the broad conservation program of the town. The state-town agreement is not permanent, and the fact is that until my bill was introduced in 1965 there had been no effort at all to preserve the wetlands though state agreements. If the town is really interested in preserving its resources, why does it fear the federal government becoming a third party to preservation agreements, leaving title with the town and providing federal funds to relieve some of the tax burden which results from a town conservation budget nearing \$300,000 a year? And even if this town administration is conservation-minded, what protection do we have from a future town government that wants to permit additional commercial or private housing development on the wetlands?

Another attempt to bring this legislation to the House floor will be made early in this session of Congress, and I hope that the town will recognize the need for this bill and will comply with the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the people of the South Shore by supporting the legislation.

[From the Nassau (N.Y.) Herald, Jan. 18, 1968]

DEAR MRS. SPANIERMAN: OUR TOWN of Hempstead has been instrumental in blocking passage of the Federal Wetlands Bill, which has national importance—besides affecting us here locally.

Although our town now has its own conservation program in conjunction with the state (finally after years of 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 board vote and state at any time. 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 courses, etc. This is why federal involvement is so important—to make future encroachment of the wetlands more difficult. The federal involvement in the bill is not ownership or control, but merely a voluntary agreement for studies, management advice, financial assistance, etc. Our town helped torpedo the bill at the last moment (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: Presiding 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.
Defenders of Wildlife.
National Audubon Society.
North American Wildlife Foundation.
National Wildlife Foundation.
Sierra Club.
The Wilderness Society.
The Izaak Walton League.
Wildlife Management Institute.
Hempstead Town Lands Resources Council.
Conservation Planners, Inc.
League of Women Voters.
Garden Clubs of America.
Federated Garden Clubs of New York State.
Nassau County Planning Commission.
Long Island School Boards and PTAs.
Long Island Fisherman Association.
Long Island League of Salt Water Sportsmen.

Mr. Chairman, I have received many letters from constituents expressing support for this legislation. I am pleased to call these to the attention of my colleagues—and include them in the RECORD at this point:

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE,
Mineola, N.Y., January 19, 1968.

HON. HERBERT TENZER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HERBERT: I hope that we will see in this session of the Congress long overdue action in support of your dedicated efforts to save Nassau's priceless wetlands.

The time for action is now. Fourteen thousand acres have already been lost to the dredger and developer. "Studies" of this critical situation, which has been studied thoroughly for many years, would only serve as a stalling tactic to enrich the few and deprive the many of a vital part of our natural heritage.

Leading conservationists rightly question the value of the wetlands agreement between New York State and the Town of Hempstead since it can be abrogated.

Your efforts to provide permanent protection for the wetlands would have succeeded in the last session of Congress but for the last-minute turnabout by Representative

Wydler at the urging of the Presiding Supervisor of the Town of Hempstead.

They apparently do not understand that vast economic and sports interests involving fish and wildlife are dependent upon our wetlands' central role in migration.

The Town of Hempstead's participation in permanent protection of the wetlands is not mandatory under the terms of your bill. Yet one would hope that its officials would feel some responsibility to areas on Long Island and throughout America where your legislation would help prevent what has happened in Hempstead.

It is scandalous that a small group of men wielding political power in one small area of the East coast should jeopardize America's wetlands.

Fortunately for Nassau County residents, the County has acquired 175 acres of wetlands for the Cow Meadow Natural History Preserve from which our people can learn the use and values of the wetlands.

Without passage of your bill, however, Cow Meadow could become a lone memorial to one of our greatest natural resources.

I commend your challenging the Congress with this major opportunity to serve the future of our nation, and I urge all the people of Nassau to support your far-seeing efforts to save the wetlands in Nassau and throughout America.

Sincerely yours,
EUGENE H. NICKERSON.

LAWRENCE ASSOCIATION,
Lawrence, Long Island, N.Y.,
January 17, 1968.

RESOLUTION

To: 1. Hon. Ralph G. Caso. 2. Conservation Commissioner J. Stewart Kilburne.
Copies to: Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Hon. Herbert Tenzer, L.I. Press, Newsday, S.S. Record.

Re: Federal Wetlands Bill.

This is to inform you that at a regular meeting of the Board of Gov. of the Lawrence Association, it was resolved to advise you:

1. That we are completely familiar with the events surrounding the failure of the Federal Wetlands Bill to be voted on during the last congressional session ending December 1967.

2. That the Lawrence Association reaffirms its support for this legislation and urges you to change your position and do what you can immediately to help pass this bill without further delay, obstruction, or weakening changes.

This is a bill of national importance, and being completely voluntary it is inconceivable that local politics should act as a hindrance any longer.

M. A. BENDES,
President.

FEDERATION OF NEW YORK STATE
BIRD CLUBS, INC.,
Freeport, N.Y., December 2, 1967.

HON. HERBERT TENZER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HERB: For whatever help it can be, the Federation of New York State Bird Clubs, Inc., continues to stand firmly behind HR 25.

I would like to report in my newsletter to the clubs in the state the votes of the New York State congressmen. If possible, I would appreciate a copy of the day's Congressional Record (since it will probably also carry the debate).

Also, I would appreciate a copy of the bill. Thank you and Good Luck!

Best regards,
MAXWELL C. WHEAT, Jr.,
Chairman, Conservation Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], the chairman of the

full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], chairman of the subcommittee which handled this legislation; the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY]; the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER]; the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GROVER], and others for bringing to the floor of the House this important legislation.

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. Chairman, I would like to say a word of praise to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER], 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. WYDLER], who has been of valuable assistance in the development of the provisions thereof; also, a good word in behalf of our good friend, the distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORRIS], who has worked so long and hard upon this legislation; as well as my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH]; and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GROVER], who have helped iron out the many difficulties with which we were faced in drawing 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. KEITH].

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, and 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 those studies, they could or could not 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.

On the other hand, changes in the ecology of other areas would require updating of any studies that have been made. The record as it stands now seems to be somewhat in conflict on this subject, and I hope that the chairman of the subcommittee will clear this up.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, in response to the inquiry of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, may I say that I believe that there are, as the gentleman 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 those 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 local governments 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. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time first to compliment 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 gentleman has prepared and is 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 agreements 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 the approval of—or, rather, dealing with the agreements by the Department of the Interior with all units of government for management of the estuarine areas and wet lands which will be permitted in the bill previous to the time that the studies authorized by the bill are completed.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I understand further that the bill in its final form provides assurances 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. I have one further question, if I may.

Under the definition of estuarine areas and estuaries, is it conceivable that the flow of a salt spring into a river, which is an occurrence which we find every once in a while in the State which I represent, could create a situation in which you define that river as an estuarine area and place it under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior?

Mr. DINGELL. I will tell the gentleman—emphatically “No.”

The requirement here is, in the case of estuarine area, with the exception of the Great Lakes, that they be generally tidal in nature.

Mr. EDMONDSON. So you are not aiming at rivers 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 and terminates in an estuary. At this point, the river waters, the ocean tides, the coastal currents, and the contours of our shores interact resulting in the depositing 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 pollutants.

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.

For those of us 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 do not get out to the great Atlantic 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 is going to 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 worked 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 after many agreements 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.

This 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 study both 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 of 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 was intended by the committee in its original 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 administration, management, and development of either State or locally 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, be bypassed, 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 estuarine areas, and, on the other hand, reverse ourselves by saying, "Go ahead, Mr. Secretary, and enter into agreements to manage these lands," which, in essence, is really the same thing as acquisition, and it would permit him to do this without 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 to be 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 see no need or 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 at this point.

May I ask the gentleman again, for my recollection and for the record—am I correct that section 2 of H.R. 25, as passed unanimously by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and which bill is now before us, 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 publicly owned estuarine areas located 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 in the bill before us.

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 Federal Government 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 Merchant Marine and Fisheries, that 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 or could happen 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 my Subcommittee on Rivers 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 improvements by 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 wet lands, to preserve 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 during dry seasons, 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.

On the 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, without any regard or any consideration to established 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 causes me great concern. 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 needless type 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 need only apply and satisfy all requirements 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 water pollution in these areas. These laws have been administered 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 study the problems of pollution and 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

Interior. In essence, it adds another layer of administration an individual must pass through before securing final permission to commence a commercial dredging operation. In general, the goal sought is a good one. There are many problems in coordinating the interests of the State, and of the various Federal agencies, and the approach of the memorandum is not an unreasonable one.

I am somewhat concerned, however, that this memorandum may establish a precedent that agencies may join together to agree to procedures outside the scope of enabling legislation and which might conflict with State laws.

To my way of thinking, another crucial problem is that pyramiding administration in this manner might result in unreasonable delay or expense to the individual who must wade through it.

The memorandum, in most cases, indicates that the Army will continue to have the final word in whether to approve a dredging operation which has been approved by the State. The individual need make only one "Federal stop" and the Army is merely charged with the additional function of soliciting opinions from Interior as to the impact of the specific proposal on fish, wildlife, and water pollution. In most cases, the additional legwork would be performed by the Federal agencies. This is as it should be.

Still a recent case has come to my attention where the demands placed on the individual applicant seem somewhat questionable.

In a case handled through the district engineer of Houston, the applicant, as he had done for years, made application to the Army for certain dredging operations. The Army, after consulting with Interior, found that no navigation problems existed, but felt that pollution might be a problem.

Accordingly, as a condition to approval of the permit, the Army required, among other things:

6. A survey shall be conducted in the Galveston Estuary by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Corps of Engineers, or other appropriate agencies to map each major oyster reef and determine its area, condition, and value. The cost of this work, not to exceed \$100,000, shall be funded by the applicants.

7. A twelve-month study shall be conducted by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to assess further the problems of siltation from shell dredging for the purposes of improving operational procedures and developing general guidelines to reduce or eliminate damage to oyster reefs. The cost of this work, not to exceed \$70,000, shall be funded by the applicants.

8. The applicants shall cooperate and assist in the study to assess siltation and in other ways as may be necessary.

If this is the type of procedure consistently expected to be followed under the memorandum of understanding, then I say we should demand a thorough congressional investigation of what exactly is authorized in the memorandum, and whether it is within the purview of existing legislation.

I would like to pursue some of the questions asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] with reference to the memorandum of understanding

which apparently was entered into between the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior. My question specifically is this: In cases of a dredging operation in an estuary, who would make the decision as to whether that would be controlled or managed by a certain department?

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 navigation. 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 of understanding? I want to know what that does with respect to the rights of the States and the rights of the individuals who are doing the dredging.

Mr. DINGELL. I would have to tell my good friend that the full memorandum 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 measure, we did so not 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, so to speak. Still who would make 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 a 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, even though it were State waters?

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 it is considered as 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 parties involved, but I do not want 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 1899. That question was not considered by the committee on which I served.

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 committees of Congress which 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 section in 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 stresses upon natural resources 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. TENZER] deserves special credit for his efforts in connection with the Long Island wetlands area.

A 1964 survey on the Long Island wetlands revealed that 33 percent of the total wetlands area had been lost in the previous 10 years to spoliation from pollution, 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 TENZER for his leadership in the fight to halt the steady destruction of the Long Island wetlands.

I regret that the legislation as originally introduced has been weakened.

Section 12 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 dredging permit. Instead reliance is to be placed on an administrative arrangement, a memorandum of understanding, lacking firm congressional mandate, for consultation between the Departments of the Army and Interior prior to the authorization of any dredging. Hopefully, the original intent will be effectively carried out in practice, but there is no question that legislative authority would have been preferable.

A second provision which can only weaken the intent of the legislation is

section 2(a)3, providing that, in carrying out the inventory of the Nation's estuarine areas, the Secretary of the Interior shall consider—as well as their ecological, esthetic, and navigational values—their value for commercial and industrial development. It is careless commercial and industrial exploitation that has necessitated protective legislation. Requiring the Secretary of the Interior to keep in mind further commercial exploitation in his study hardly furthers the purposes of this legislation.

H.R. 25, as reported from committee, restricts the authority of the Secretary 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 wet lands 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 regions cannot be regained once these areas have been eroded and contaminated.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity of recording my support for H.R. 25, a bill 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 Great Lakes. Considering the substantial additional population and industrialization of shore areas predicted for the next twenty years, any delay in enacting this legislation will endanger countless brackish 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 encroaching on 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 needlessly filling them over a period of years. 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 State of Florida alone, the value of this fish life to the vacation industry is enormous.

It seems to me that the protection of a reasonable number and distribution of estuaries along our entire coastline is 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 and am 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 at any point.

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 natural, commercial, and other resources, 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 the need to develop these estuaries to further the growth and development of the Nation. In connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the estuaries of the Nation and in consequence of the benefits resulting to the public, it is declared to be the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the responsibilities of the States in protecting, conserving, and restoring the estuaries in the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation and in cooperation with the States, the Secretary of the Army, and other Federal agencies, shall conduct directly or by contract a study and inventory of the Nation's estuaries, including without limitation coastal marshlands, bays, sounds, seaward areas, lagoons, and land and waters of the Great Lakes. For the purpose of this study, the Secretary shall consider, among other matters, (1) their wildlife and recreational potential, their ecology, their value to the marine, anadromous, and shell fisheries and their esthetic value, (2) their importance to navigation, their value for flood, hurricane and erosion control, their mineral value, and the value of submerged lands underlying the waters of the estuaries, and (3) the value of such areas for more intensive development for economic use as part of urban developments and for commercial and industrial developments. This study and inventory shall be carried out in conjunction with the comprehensive estuarine pollution study authorized by section 5(g) of the Federal Water

Pollution Control Act, as amended, and other applicable studies.

(b) The study shall focus attention on whether any land or water area within an estuary and the Great Lakes should be acquired or administered by the Secretary or by a State or local subdivision thereof, or whether such land or water area may be protected adequately through local, State, or Federal laws or other methods without Federal land acquisition or administration.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior shall, not later than January 30, 1970, submit to the Congress through the President a report of the study conducted pursuant to this section, together with any legislative recommendations, including recommendations on the feasibility and desirability of establishing a nationwide system of estuarine areas, the terms, conditions, and authorities to govern such system, and the designation and acquisition of any specific estuarine areas of national significance which he believes should be acquired by the United States. No lands within such area may be acquired until authorized by subsequent Act of Congress. Recommendations made by the Secretary for the acquisition of any estuarine area shall be developed in consultation with the States, municipalities, and other interested Federal agencies. Each such recommendation shall be accompanied by (1) expressions of any views which the interested States, municipalities, and other Federal agencies and river basin commissions may submit within sixty days after having been notified of the proposed recommendations, (2) a statement setting forth the probable effect of the recommended action on any comprehensive river basin plan that may have been adopted by Congress or that is serving as a guide for coordinating Federal programs in the basin wherein such area is located, (3) in the absence of such a plan, a statement indicating the probable effect of the recommended action on alternative beneficial users of the resources of the proposed estuarine area, and (4) a discussion of the major economic, social, and ecological trends occurring in such area.

(d) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$750,000 for fiscal year 1969 and \$250,000 for fiscal year 1970 to carry out the provisions of this section. Such sums shall be available until expended.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, based on studies conducted by the Secretary in cooperation with the New York State Department of Conservation and reported in 1961 and 1965, may enter into an agreement, containing such terms and conditions as are mutually acceptable, with the State of New York or any political subdivision or agency thereof for the permanent management, administration, and development of the estuarine lands and waters which are generally depicted on a boundary map dated September 15, 1965, of the proposed Long Island wetlands area on file in the offices of the Department of the Interior and which are owned or will be acquired by the State of New York or by any political subdivision or agency thereof. Such agreement shall, among other things, provide that the State of New York or the political subdivisions or agencies thereof and the Secretary of the Interior shall share in an equitable manner in the cost of managing, administering, and developing such estuarine areas, and such development may include the construction, operation, installation, and maintenance of buildings, devices, structures, recreational facilities, access roads, and other improvements, and such agreement shall be subject to the availability of appropriations. State hunting and fishing laws and regulations shall be applicable to such areas to the extent they are now or hereafter applicable.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior, in conducting the study authorized by section 2 of this Act, shall, in consultation with the interested States, also study, with funds authorized by that section, the desirability and

feasibility of authorizing the Secretary to enter into agreements such as the one authorized by subsection (a) of this section for the administration, management, and development of publicly owned estuarine areas located in other States as another method of conserving the Nation's estuarine areas. The Secretary shall make recommendations thereon in the report authorized by section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 4. In planning for the use or development of water and land resources, all Federal agencies shall give consideration to estuaries and their natural resources, and their importance for commercial and industrial developments, and all project plans and reports affecting such estuaries and resources submitted to the Congress shall contain a discussion by the Secretary of the Interior of such estuaries and such resources and the effects of the project on them and his recommendations thereon. The Secretary of the Interior shall make his recommendations within ninety days after receipt of such plans and reports.

SEC. 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 (50 Stat. 917), as amended (16 U.S.C. 669 et seq.), the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act (64 Stat. 430), as amended (16 U.S.C. 777 et seq.), the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 197), and the Anadromous and Great Lakes Fisheries Conservation Act of October 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 1125), the needs and opportunities for protecting 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 an estuarine area by a State, the Secretary shall establish such terms and conditions as he deems desirable to insure the permanent protection of such areas, including a provision that the lands or interests therein shall not be disposed of by sale, lease, donations, or exchange without the prior approval of the Secretary.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect the authority of any Federal agency to carry out any Federal project heretofore or hereafter 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 (if the agreement with such subdivision or agency is first approved by the Governor of the State involved or by a State agency designated for that purpose) for the permanent management, development, and administration of any area, land, or interests therein within an estuary and adjacent lands which are owned or thereafter acquired by a State or by any political subdivision thereof: *Provided*, That, with the approval of the Governor of the State involved or of 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 general study applicable to that area is completed 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 shall share in an equitable manner in the cost of managing, administering, and developing such areas, and such development may include the construction, operation, installation, and maintenance of buildings, devices, structures, recreational facilities, access roads, and other improvements, and such agreement shall be subject to the availability of appropriations. State hunting and fishing laws and regulations shall be applicable to such areas to the extent they are now or hereafter applicable."

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—if the agreement with such subdivision or agency is first approved by the Governor of the State involved or by a State agency designated for that purpose—for the permanent management, development, and administration of any area, land, or interests therein within an estuary and adjacent lands which are owned or thereafter acquired by a State or by any political subdivision thereof.

Provided, that with the approval of the Governor of a State the Secretary may also enter into an agreement for the area, where the general overall study has been completed, which is authorized by other sections of the bill.

Such agreement may provide also that the Secretary shall share in an equitable manner in the cost of managing, administering, and developing such areas, and that the development may include the construction, operation, installation, and maintenance of buildings, devices, structures, recreational facilities, access roads, and other improvements.

But the agreement is subject to action by the Congress in terms of appropriating such funds as are necessary to carry out the purposes of the agreement.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GROVER. I make this observation to the subcommittee chairman. I note that we say the improvements may include the construction, operation, installation, and maintenance of buildings, devices, structures, recreational facilities, access roads and so forth.

I believe the thrust of the New York State Wetlands Acts on this subject is to encourage the preservation of these ecological systems in their native habitat.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is entirely correct.

The proposed amendment is merely general language usually found in provisions of this kind, which authorizes him to do only that amount of construction absolutely necessary for the successful administration and the preparation of the area. It is not our intention to

authorize the Secretary to go into big land development projects or big alterations of these wet lands. It is the intention of the committee that the wetlands remain as wild and in as near a natural state as possible.

Mr. GROVER. I am glad the chairman has made that statement. I know the wetlands with which I am familiar could best be managed left alone. Of course, we must have administration and we must spend money to keep them forever wild. They lend themselves best to the perpetuation of the ecological cycle that way, and the wild life flyways. I refer in great part to the upper east coast and mid-Atlantic areas.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is correct. This is the matter discussed between the gentleman and me, and also the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER]; that it was the intention by this amendment to permit a broader agreement than just, let us say, in one political subdivision; to permit a unitary management of a number of subdivisions.

Mr. GROVER. I can appreciate that. There could be a variety of developments in various parts of the country. I wanted to make the point that the initial philosophy and the thrust was to keep the wetlands and estuary areas forever wild.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we are indulging here in a unique legislative procedure.

Bills concerning this subject have been pending for a long time. They have had thorough discussion in the committee.

The bill presented to us today was recommended unanimously by the committee.

If this amendment was such a good amendment, I cannot understand why it was not included in the bill before it reached the floor.

I think through adopting this amendment we would open a great number of serious problems. There is no estimate of cost and there cannot possibly be an estimate of cost included with this amendment. In this bill we do authorize money for a study, because the Interior Department does not have the money now to make this study unless we give them an additional amount. The budget of the Interior Department is tight already. To authorize in any fashion additional spending by the Interior Department without further appropriation by this House or the Congress could definitely impede projects and administration which are already authorized by the Congress.

I do not think we should give precedence over congressional authorizations to very vague unauthorized expenditures which are proposed in this amendment. I know that there will be administrative problems arising among various Federal agencies and departments and between the Federal Government and the States and local political subdivisions. We are not talking here about small unauthorized expenditures, but we are talking about "a permanent"—and note that word permanent—"management, development, and administration of any area,

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. Chairman, as I indicated earlier in the general debate, I had serious doubts about some aspects of the amendment, although not of the intentions of the gentleman from Michigan, whatsoever or his unquestioned knowledge in this very important field. I still have these doubts. I am just reluctant about going along. Perhaps I shall go along, but I want to make it clear that I do question the advisability or the good judgment of striking from the bill which has had committee review and authorization, of striking language that would do away with congressional review of any proposed contractual agreements between the Secretary of the Interior and the States and local political agencies. In most other operations dealing with these same bodies of water we do need congressional authorization and review. I am reassured by section 4 of the bill, and I would like to ask the gentleman if my understanding is correct that in section 4 of the bill other Federal agencies such as the Corps of Engineers, the Departments 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. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. In the first place, I would like to remind my good friend from Minnesota 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 language of the amendment, they must consult and coordinate endeavors, first of all, with State and local units of government. Second, 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 reassurance, 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 am I correct that under your amendment any estuary area in which a study has been completed would be immediately eligible for this process of contractual agreement between the local governmental subdivision, with the approval of the Governor, and the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the President? Is that right?

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct, but

only in those wet lands where two things have happened; namely, one, where the study has been completed. There is only one such area in this country and that is the Long Island wet lands which have been referred to previously. However, in the case of the Long Island wet lands, it is the expectation of the subcommittee and the committee that that study will have to be updated, again consulting with the State and local subdivisions. In addition to this, I must say to my good friend from Minnesota that it is the expectation of myself at least that there is only one area in the country where this kind of an agreement will be able to be entered into before the completion of the study, which will be in 2 years. This is in the so-called Long Island wetlands area. There we have a total cost estimated figure for 5 years, of \$510,500 or a cost average of about \$100,000 a year to manage the area.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, with these assurances there will be, obviously, very few of these areas that will come up for any agreement within the 2-year period of time involved before the full study and comprehensive report and all recommendations are submitted by the Secretary of the Department of the Interior to the Congress of the United States?

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman from Minnesota is correct.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, with these assurances and with all of my reservations, it is my opinion that the question with which we are confronted today is the question of improving our safeguards of the jurisdiction of the authorization committees of the Congress and our interest in some of these areas.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I too have doubts about this particular amendment that is being offered, because it is rather broad. In fact, I think we are getting into the field of creating joint park and recreational areas without the specific approval of the Congress, and this should only be after the debate upon the general study authorized by the particular section of the bill involved.

It is my further opinion that we ought to wait until the study is completed.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan has done a good job. This study is aimed at the solution of the problem. It is needed, and I wish to commend the gentleman from Michigan for bringing it up to date and to encourage more local participation in recreational areas in the field of our fish and wildlife.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] has been a fighter in that 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 should maintain control of these specific developments under the terms and the provisions of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, all we need is an agree-

ment on the part of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, the President of the United States, and the local and State governments as to the specific meaning of national parks and State national estuaries. As I read and construe this legislation, there is no limit thereon. It just says, in effect, "subject to the availability of appropriations" that the Department of the Interior could just go in and operate under its regular procedures of operations, without any designation of whether or not they are creating such an area.

Second, 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 this 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 bill here now under consideration does not mention the law to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. CASEY. I understand that.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, it is the assumption, at least by myself—and I am not authorized to speak for any other than the 16th District of Michigan, that the particular amendment is legal and valid and fair in all respects. Therefore, I have no reason to believe otherwise. However, there are certain aspects of the problem that I have never studied, and I have reference specifically to the statute involved to which reference is made where there is no longer a requirement by reason of the understanding achieved by the Department of the Interior and the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CASEY. Again, that is not answering my question. It is not the intent to confer by this language to the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of the Army any powers that they have not heretofore been authorized by law?

Mr. DINGELL. There is no language in the bill which would authorize the two Departments to enter into memorandums of understanding with regard to that. The gentleman is correct in that particular.

Mr. CASEY. And it is not the express intent of the Congress to confer any additional powers on either the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of the Army other than those powers that they have had heretofore?

Mr. DINGELL. Except insofar as they are conferred by the language of the bill. But I will point out to the gentleman, as he has indicated, that there is no conferral by this legislation on the two Departments to enter into agreements.

Mr. CASEY. As the gentleman knows, I did not care for the bill as it was originally introduced, and I believe the gentleman should be commended for taking the steps that he has, and in moving

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 that is contained 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 do this 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 that now 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 provide for the management of those wetlands? This would not permit lands owned by the States to be purchased with Federal moneys 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 the committee 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 land and water 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 upon the language in 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 in the light of earlier language 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. There are States and local units of government. Remember, this authorizes an agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and either local units of government or the States and conceivably in those instances 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 words "shall share in an equitable manner in 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 State 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 choose to enter into an agreement because it might be desirable, on an economic basis. But you ought to remember that that would only be with regard to lands owned by the States.

Mr. KEITH. Yes.

Mr. DINGELL. In 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 Bureau of the Budget has to agree. The Department of the Interior and the local subdivision of the State must enter into a fair and open and 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 do this. They would try to get the Federal Government to 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 they have to wait until 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 5, 1968.

HON. STANLEY A. CAIN,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR STAN: I am hopeful that my bill, H.R. 25, to preserve and protect the wetlands across the United States of America 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

estuarine areas and allow partial studies of certain selected areas.

It appears that one of the areas selected for early and partial study will be the area of Long Island. Previously, certain surveys have been made of wetlands on Long Island located in the Towns of Hempstead and Oyster Bay. It appears to me and to all the Congressmen involved in the area that any partial study of the Long Island area should be made of all the wetlands in the Long Island area. That is to say, all the wetlands located off the shoreline of the counties of Nassau and Suffolk on both the south and north shores. They are ecologically one unit and such a study will be much more valuable in drawing recommendations and conclusions in preservation of the wetlands for future generations.

I would be most pleased to hear from you regarding this recommendation and, of course, would be most pleased if you were to concur in it.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1968.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: In response to your telephone request of January 31, I am pleased to furnish you with a copy of the report on Preservation of Hempstead and South Oyster Bay Wetlands of September 1961 and its supplement of June 1965. You will note that the original report was prepared jointly by the New York State Department of Conservation, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. The supplement was prepared by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in consultation with biologists of the New York State Department of Conservation.

The Hempstead-South Oyster Bay study was an early ground-breaking venture in the conservation field and we visualize a demand for similar endeavors. We shall be pleased to conduct similar studies in other areas of Long Island as appropriate and if agreeable to State and local governments. Such studies, of course, would depend on appropriations for this purpose.

It has been my observation that conservation of our country's estuarine resources cannot be satisfactorily accomplished by Federal, State or local governments working unilaterally. It has always been our policy to cooperate closely with the State and local agencies in this regard, and you may be assured this policy will be continued in our consideration of estuarine problems of Long Island and other parts of the Nation.

Please be assured that our Department would not execute any agreements for administration and development of an estuarine area owned by non-Federal public agencies under the terms of H.R. 25 unless it is concurred in by the State. Actually, we believe an agreement with local political subdivisions should only be exercised where the State is a party to it.

Your continued interest in estuarine preservation and other matters of concern to conservationists is most appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY A. CAIN,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute amendment, as amended.

The committee substitute amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Brooks, 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. 25) 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 1058, 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 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 an inventory and study 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 all Members may have 5 legislative days in which 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 if there is 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 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, provided a rule is granted 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. 14934, 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. 989, jury selection and Service Act of 1968, subject to a rule being granted.

George Washington's Farewell Address will be read on Thursday, February 22.

ADJOURNMENT OVER FROM TODAY TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12; THEN TO FEBRUARY 15; AND THEN TO FEBRUARY 19

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.

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

and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on crime in America focused attention on a number of new proposals, and others left pending at the end of the first session of the Congress, which must be enacted before the 90th Congress adjourns, if we are to do our part to reverse the rising tide of crime across the Nation. Certain measures taken in the first session must be followed up, as the President has reminded the Congress. Last year, both bodies passed legislation to make it a crime to obstruct criminal investigations by forcible interference with a witness, or potential witness, before criminal proceedings have been initiated. That law, Public Law 90-123, will be of material assistance to law-enforcement officers in breaking the barrier of silence that often hampers an organized crime investigation.

Companion legislation which would enable the Government to obtain witnesses for criminal prosecutions by extending witness immunity provisions to four statutes frequently utilized in prosecuting members of the underworld was passed by the Senate and is now pending in the House. I am speaking of legislation which would permit the compulsion of testimony through grants of immunity in cases involving travel or transportation in aid of racketeering enterprises, obstruction of justice, bankruptcy frauds, and bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest. The importance of these statutes to organized crime prosecutions was emphasized in the recent report of FBI Director John Edgar Hoover for the fiscal year 1967. Mr. Hoover reports that under Federal law barring interstate transportation in aid of racketeering, the FBI obtained 97 convictions. These are part of a total of 197 convictions resulting from FBI investigations of violations pertaining to all racketeering activities.

Also, during fiscal year 1967, FBI investigations of bribery and conflict of interest violations resulted in 17 convictions, growing out of investigations into the conduct of government employees in the administration of their public responsibilities.

FBI investigations under the National Bankruptcy Act resulted in 48 convictions. Investigations in bankruptcy cases in recent years have turned up numerous planned bankruptcies engineered by the criminal underworld in violation of the statute. Although these statistics indicate a concerted assault on organized crime activities, clearly prosecutions would be facilitated and convictions of major crime leaders could be obtained by the enactment of immunity legislations which would compel the underlings of the criminal syndicates to testify against the top leaders of the syndicates. I urge the House to enact such legislation without further delay.

PERSONAL RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has for some time now been engaged in an apparent campaign to carry traditional American guarantees of personal rights and freedoms to their most extreme, illogical, and ridiculous conclusions. The Court forgets that it must also protect the Nation as well as the individual, for without the national structure the rights of the individual would soon perish.

It is basic to national sovereignty, I think, for the Nation to be able to protect itself from actual and potential harm. Yet the Court hands down a decision in the *Robel* case which would prevent the United States from prohibiting the employment of subversives in defense plants.

This, in my view, is sheer folly, and I am consequently lending my support to efforts in the House to pass a bill amending the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, which would serve to reverse the effects of the Court's *Robel* decision.

The people of America have long remonstrated with the Court against these hasty and dangerous decisions, but to no avail. It is therefore left to the Congress to take action to redeem the integrity of the U.S. Government and to prevent the obvious damage these decisions threaten to loose upon us.

I am cosponsoring legislation which will authorize the Government to bar from employment in defense facilities individuals believed disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion. The bill provides for designation of defense plants, investigations into the backgrounds of employees to determine the possibility of subversiveness, and the injunctive process to prevent employers from hiring subversives.

This is apparently an attempt to reverse the Court's ruling in the *Robel* case, and it is sad that this bill is necessary. But when it becomes evident that the Supreme Court has no taste for the defense of the Nation, we should not allow the same to be charged against the Congress.

SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. FASCELL. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Alliance for Progress will celebrate its seventh anniversary in 1968. It continues to be one of the most successful of our foreign aid programs. The Latin American nations have responded readily to the idea of self-help which is the cornerstone of our aid program, and their determination to help themselves is evident in their actions and their progress.

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, the Peace Corps, and food for peace—Public Law 480. This assistance supplements, but does not substitute for, the efforts of the people of Latin America to become self-reliant. The will, the 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 Information Committee, 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 our colleagues:

U.S. ASSISTANCE TO THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

AID loan and grant disbursements to Alliance countries for the year ending June 30, 1967, amounted to \$563 million, a new high in the annual volume of such assistance.

During calendar year 1967 the authorization rate of development and program loans totaled about \$460 million, against \$500 million in 1966 and \$300 million in 1965.

Summary figures, subject to adjustment, for all U.S. economic aid to Latin America over the past six fiscal years—1962 through 1967—amount to \$7,021 million. This includes AID loans and grants, Food for Freedom, the Social Progress Trust Fund, and the Export-Import Bank programs in Latin America. Likewise it takes in contributions to the Inter-American Development Bank, the Peace Corps, and the Inter-American Highway.

LATIN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE GAINS IN 1967

1967 closed with an encouraging announcement from the U.S. Department of Agriculture which maintains the Latin American Agricultural Production Index.*

The 1967 Index, said the USDA, was UP—substantially UP over 1966 when drought added to the woes of large farmland areas in Latin America. The estimated 1967 gains are over and above Latin America's 2.9 percent annual population growth rate.

LATIN AMERICAN COOPERATIVES FLOURISH

US-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, bringing the total to 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 \$16 million in small loans, to reach a new total of \$51 million in interest-bearing loans for farm supplies, education, health and consumer requirements.

More than 30 rural electric cooperatives have been organized in twelve Latin American countries. AID's loan assistance of about \$15 million, plus \$9.4 million in local contributions have financed rural electric cooperative operations in Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Costa Rica, Nicaragua and Peru. More than 25 pilot cooperatives now serving

* For comparison purposes, agricultural production in the years 1957-1959 is equivalent to 100 in the Index ratings.

more than 40,000 families are in various stages of completion or operation.

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 authorizations for long and medium-term loans, medium-term guaranties and insurance, and short-term insurance for exports to Alliance countries totaled \$849.1 million for the year ending June 30. This 70 percent increase over the previous year was an all-time record besides. Every dollar of this credit assistance was earmarked for goods and services needed to further 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 goals 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 strength democratic institutions.

During 1967 five investment conferences sponsored by Partners committees have resulted in joint business ventures. In November a Partners' investment conference in Washington brought together about 50 Brazilian businessmen and 75 prospective U.S. investors.

In 1967 the stateside Partners committees founded the National Association of the Partners of the Alliance with Edward S. Marcus, of Dallas, as president. This association is a clearinghouse for voluntary activities in Latin America; and it provides facilities through which investment opportunities are channeled to prospective investors.

PEACE CORPS EXPANDS IN LATIN AMERICA

The Peace Corps expanded its programs in Latin America during 1967. More than 4,300 Volunteers served in 19 nations, representing about one-third of the world-wide total. This was an increase of 800 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. About \$275 million of this sum helped to finance 5,000 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 Miami, Florida. Another modern airport under construction at Concepcion, Chile, will be operational in 1968.

Additional facilities are being added to the high-altitude jet airport at El Alto, on the outskirts of La Paz, Bolivia, developed with loan assistance from AID.

Water and sewerage

Improvements and extensions to Panama City's 30-million gallon-per-day water dis-

tribution and sewerage systems were completed in 1967. Further extensions will get underway early in 1968.

Extensions and improvements to Lima, Peru's water supply and sewerage systems were almost completed.

School building

Among the AID-assisted school building projects in 1967:

In Panama 30 new primary schools were completed and an additional 53 primary schools are under construction.

A 40-school construction program in Chile was completed in 1967.

El Salvador's primary school construction program, involving 1,600 classrooms for 64,000 children, was also completed.

In Mexico, the University of Guadalajara 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 substantive measures:

It amended the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, adding "home ownership and decent housing" to the three previous AID priorities—health, education and agriculture—and expressly included slum clearance, urban development and cooperatives among the purposes of capital assistance.

Next it added \$50 million to the investment guaranties authorized for Latin American housing, bringing the total Congressional authorization to \$500 million. A total of 47 Alliance projects comprising 42,750 dwelling units valued at \$224.4 million have been authorized to date under this program. Contracts have been signed for 26 of these projects with 24,050 dwelling units, for a total cost of \$144.6 million.

Counting local currency housing and urban development loans, Inter-American Development Bank loans of \$275 million (of which \$260 million were funded by the U.S.) and the investment guarantee authorization level of \$500 million, the U.S. has allocated or committed more than one billion dollars to Latin American housing during the last six years.

GUARANTIES SPUR PRIVATE INVESTMENTS

Through the first nine months of 1967 more than \$233 million worth of private U.S. investments in Latin American countries was covered under AID's Specific Risk Insurance Program, compared to \$123.3 million insured during the entire calendar year of 1966 for Latin America.

During the nine-month period forty U.S. companies received AID guaranties covering 39 projects in 14 Latin American countries. The total value of these guaranties was \$515 million, compared to \$320 million for all of 1966. Thirteen of the 40 projects involved investments in food or agriculture valued at \$64 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 included such diverse enterprises as banking, 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 concluded agreements with 28 companies 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, popula-

tion planning and voluntary relief services in the Office of the War on Hunger. At the same time, AID's Office of Private Resources was charged with the responsibility of enlisting private industry's active participation.

During 1967 more than six million Latin American school children received nutritious meals through U.S. Food for Freedom feeding programs. Another 1.1 million pre-school children and mothers also benefited.

During 1967 four U.S. industrial firms under AID service contracts undertook high-protein food studies in Latin America 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 conducted in Latin America by the Office of Informational 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.

AID also announced that assistance would be given to local 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.

Financing under AID program assistance loans is now available for contraceptives and other necessary devices.

In 1967 commodities valued at more than \$110 million were channeled through Food for Freedom programs in Latin America. About 45 percent of this amount supported programs co-sponsored by U.S. voluntary agencies, involving some 12 million recipients.

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 featured the following distinguished guests: Senators THRUSTON B. MORTON and EDMUND S. MUSKIE, and Representatives MELVIN R. 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 Eastern Educational Network was aired at 9:40 P.M. E.S.T. on December 15, 1967. The program was an analysis of the 1st session of the 90th Congress.

PARTICIPANTS

From The Congress: Senator Thruston B. Morton, Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Representative Melvin R. Laird, Representative Hale Boggs.

Outside Experts: Dr. Alfred de Grazia, New York University; Dr. Robert L. Peabody, Johns Hopkins University.

NET Correspondents: Paul Niven, and Dick McCutchen.

Congressional Quarterly Reporters: N. Prentice Bowsher, Joseph Foote, William B. Dickinson, Jr., Neal R. Peirce.

ANNOUNCER. At 6:36 this evening the House of Representatives adjourned. The Senate followed suit fourteen minutes later. The 1st Session of the 90th Congress had come to an end. For the next 80 minutes, a report on that Congress, as seen by some of its leading members and outside experts.

In color, the National Educational Television Network presents "Congress '68." In the studios of WETA, in Washington, Dick McCutchen.

Mr. McCUTCHEN. Good evening. Tonight we'll take a look at the record of the 90th Congress and analyze that record in the light of the needs of the nation.

To take part in this program we have invited observers and critics of the Congress as well as four of its distinguished members. In Room S-207 of the Capitol, from the Senate, Thruston B. Morton, of Kentucky, former Chairman of the Republican National Committee and the Republican Campaign Committee; and Edmund S. Muskie, of Maine, current Chairman of the Senate Democratic Campaign Committee.

From the House of Representatives, Hale Boggs, of Louisiana, Democratic Whip of the House, and Melvin R. Laird, of Wisconsin, Chairman of the House Republican Conference.

From the studios of WNDT in New York, Professor Alfred de Grazia, Director of the Center for Applied Research of New York University and Editor of Congress, the First Branch of Government.

Speaking from Washington will be Professor Robert L. Peabody, Associate Professor of Political Science, Johns Hopkins University, and Associate Director of the American Political Science Association Study of Congress.

Here in the studio to provide an account of this congressional session are four staff members of the independent Washington research organization Congressional Quarterly: reporting on Vietnam and foreign policy, Prentice Bowsher; on the cities, Joseph Foote; on taxes, William B. Dickinson, Jr.; on congressional ethics and reform, Neal R. Peirce.

Now an up to the minute report on what happened in Congress today, on the mechanics of that annual last minute rush. For that report we switch to NET Washington Correspondent Paul Niven at the Capitol.

Mr. NIVEN. Congress more or less shattered precedence today by adjourning about when it expected to, with none of the last minute hassles which often add unexpected hours or even days to a session. It gave final passage to and sent to the White House four major bills: Social Security changes; \$9.1 billion for school aid, an authorization; \$2.3 billion for foreign aid, a record low; and just under \$1.8 billion for the war on poverty,

enough for most existing poverty programs but none for new ones.

The legislators also agreed to come back on January 15, giving themselves a rare full month in which to vacation or to mend fences back home.

The House of Representatives let out a whoop of joy when Majority Leader Carl Albert made the final motion. In the Senate, Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, a Vietnam dove, put in a plug for peace in 1968; and Minority Leader Everett Dirksen put in a plug for his television program tonight, urging his colleagues to rush home and see it.

Oregon Democrat Wayne Morse tut-tutted the Senate for quitting on Friday afternoon so as to get home for the week-end and served notice that he would object next year. But then even Morse had come to the Christmas spirit and said everybody should go away with a prayer on his lips.

Well, all of this at 6:36 in the House and 6:50 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 in the sessions we're going to try to describe the process by which a bill becomes law. Some members of the Congress have said that it takes them as long 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 Senator. First, after sounding out other legislators to test their mood and line up support, the Senator draws up a bill and takes it to the Senate where the legislative metamorphosis 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 against it the bill dies there, but should the majority approve it is declared passed and sent to the House where essentially the same process is repeated. If the House changes the bill before passing it, it then goes to a joint conference committee made up of key committee members from both houses where 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 he signs it into law; if not, Congress can override his veto and pass it, if 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 survived that process in 1967. As of mid-afternoon today, the President has signed 202 bills, most of them, as for any Congress, were of limited significance, some of them 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 measures we will consider among four broad categories: Vietnam, the cities, taxes, and congressional ethics and reform.

In foreign policy the Constitution places primary responsibility in the Executive Branch. The extent of a Congress' role has been the subject of debate throughout 1967, especially among dissident Senators, including Chairman J. William Fulbright of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

But there is no doubt that the Congress does have a role in foreign policy. For one

thing, it has the power of the purse. A President could not fight a war without soldiers and weapons, and without congressional authorization and appropriation he could neither pay the men nor buy the arms. The lawmakers have other more subtle ways of influencing foreign policy, too.

This year on the Hill, as at the White House, Vietnam has over-shadowed the whole field of foreign policy, and beyond that has greatly influenced federal policy in the domestic field.

For a review of legislative action on Vietnam and foreign policy, here is Prentice Bowsher.

Mr. 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 dealt with Vietnam a lot 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—\$32 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 something like \$70 billion; of that, \$20 billion was for Vietnam.

Debate in Congress on Vietnam surrounded these bills, it surrounded other bills. It surrounded new casualty totals, new troop commitments to Vietnam, new bombing targets in Vietnam, and almost any time a Senator or Congressman had a new idea that he wanted to express.

Let's take a look at this legislation. First, the symbols here. We've put an "X" for bills that have cleared the congressional process you saw described. We put a "plus", as you see here, if the administration favored the bill. We put a "minus", as you see here, 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, \$12 billion for this one. Veterans aid, they simply extended it to GI's fighting in Vietnam. Poats' appointment, this was a chance for Congress to vote on the American aid program in Vietnam. Poats was a foreign aid official, he was up for a new appointment. Congress—the Senate, rather, came within one vote of defeating the nomination. It ultimately was confirmed.

National commitments, this was Fulbright's resolution, just recently reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, it's important. It raised broad constitutional questions; didn't get full consideration by the Senate this session; might next session.

U.N. action—everybody liked it. This was Mike Mansfield's resolution. But there is little doubt that the U.N. Security Council really could take much substantive action on the Vietnam war.

The next three, really minor measures; as you can see, they didn't get far.

Foreign aid, Congress cleared it this afternoon. There was an unspecified amount of money in that bill for Vietnam. Draft law revisions, the question here was educational deferment. Negroes, supposedly, according to critics, could not get them; more affluent youngsters, mainly whites, could get them. This was a problem here and, as you can see, Congress did pass it and the administration favored it.

Mr. McCUTCHEN. Prentice, getting back to that first item, this is the third year in a row that the administration sought additional funds for Vietnam. What is the outlook for another request for even more money next year?

Mr. BOWSHER. I'd have to say the outlook is pretty good, Dick. President Johnson, in his tax surcharge message back in August, said

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 House Appropriations Committee has said that it is correct that additional funds will be needed, and that is the man who should know.

Thank you.

Mr. McCUTCHEEN. If the subject of Vietnam overshadowed all other foreign policy problems this year, the subject of the cities towered over the domestic field. Even before the summer the Nation was increasingly preoccupied with the problem of the big increasingly ghetto-ized 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, any of the problems emerged.

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 social ills, at the physical blight of urban areas. Now the President asked for \$662 million for that; he got \$312 million.

The rent supplements was another program of this nature. 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.

In the poverty program he did far better than anyone expected, really. He won passage of his final bill today with \$1.7 billion. The rat control was one of the surprises of the year. The House, on July 20, laughed the bill off the floor, literally; but came back two months later, quietly, to reinstate the \$40 million program.

Crime was a big issue, one I am sure will be substantially bigger next year. I don't know what the President will propose. Perhaps we could talk about that in a moment. The President this year did propose a \$50 million program to help communities update their law enforcement; the bill went down to defeat, that is, by the Senate.

Let's take a look at the scoreboard for just a moment. Model cities and rent supplements both went through but with the President getting about half a load.

The poverty program did well, \$1.7 billion. Rat control has yet to be funded, perhaps next year.

Food stamps, extension of an existing program.

Air pollution, a rather weakened bill went through this year.

Anti-crime didn't amount to anything this year.

Anti-riot was passed by the House. This was the bill that was aimed at people who crossed state lines and tried to incite to riot. It died in the Senate.

Civil rights simply didn't get off the ground this year.

Teacher Corps, one of the President's pets; it was finally funded this year and it will be interesting to see what the results of that program are.

Elementary education, a big bill, cleared late this afternoon, one of the last bills to go out this session.

Truth-in-lending, one of the consumer bills, was not passed this year. Meat inspection was; flammable fabrics was. Consumer bills will probably be big next year.

Finally, last but not least, the Public Broadcasting Act, which we considered a genuine landmark piece of legislation, particularly important to bring non-commercial television to many of the major cities of the country.

Mr. McCUTCHEEN. You said that crime was a big issue this year and is going to be substantially bigger next year. What is the outlook for action there?

Mr. FOOTE. Well, I think that both parties will be pushing this. It is an election year and perhaps not the best year to pass crime legislation in, in an emotional atmosphere, but I think the President is going to go after this in a big way. He is going to try to take that issue away from the Republicans, so both parties will be pushing crime legislation next year. I am quite sure, Dick.

Mr. McCUTCHEEN. Thank you.

An expensive array of Great Society programs, plus an expensive war, plus a balance of payments problem gave President Johnson a year-long fiscal headache in 1967. The Congress was not very sympathetic.

William B. Dickinson, Jr.

Mr. DICKINSON. Dick, the Constitution says that Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes. In the year when its power to shape foreign policy was at low ebb, the Congress seemed to jealously guard its constitutional rights in the fiscal field.

Twice this year a Democratic-controlled Congress turned down a Democratic President in his request for a 10 per cent surtax on personal and corporate income. The reject 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.

If lack of action on taxes brings 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 ask for a tax increase early 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 sent his special message on taxes to Capitol Hill. Any sense of urgency in the message seemed to be lost on the Congress.

The tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee held a month of hearings and then put the whole business aside. Prospects for action revived in November when Britain devalued the pound sterling. Cabinet officials 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 World War II but far below 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 apparently prompted by the run on the dollar through the gold purchases on the London and Paris gold bullion exchanges.

In other words, the tax debate must be regarded for 1967 as President Johnson's greatest legislative failure of the year. Congress simply didn't fear inflation or big budget deficits as much as it feared the wrath of tax-weary voters back home.

Let's take a quick look at some of the other legislation in the tax field.

This morning the Senate managed 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, with the March check on March 3rd. The cost—\$3.5 billion. The bill contains controversial new restrictions on welfare payments to families with dependent children, and these will provide fuel for further debate in 1968.

The other 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. McCUTCHEEN. Bill, thank you very much.

One subject that looms larger in every session loomed larger than ever this year, 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.

Neal Peirce.

Mr. PEIRCE. The nationally publicized cases of Thomas Dodd and Adam Clayton Powell this past year forced Congress to delve into a subject that it likes to keep behind 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 misused House funds, House committee funds, falsified travel accounts and had apparently cashed his estranged wife's Congressional 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 for using some \$16,000 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 and also shared legal fees with one of the lawyers for the Teamsters Union. Long was exonerated of wrong doing by the Senate Ethics Committee in October, but Life Magazine then charged a whitewash and Senator Stennis agreed to reopen the case.

Finally, one might note that early this year Bobby Baker, who had a few years ago been 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. McCUTCHEEN. 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 or members of Congress to give them some idea of 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 set up by unanimous vote last spring, but it has very severely restricted powers. It's packed with old timers with pretty much a don't rock the boat philosophy and we don't expect too much out of that group.

In the Senate, Senator Stennis' Ethics Committee promises to have a code of ethics up quite early next year and there is a good possibility according to Senator Stennis that there may be a code of financial disclosure for members of Congress in that measure when it comes to the floor and this could be

an important breakthrough because many experts believe that unless there is some kind of across-the-board disclosure 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, there was a vote in the Senate in which disclosure only came four votes short of passage indicating that the idea which used to be rejected out of hand may have a chance in the future. Also in September, the Senate did pass a comprehensive campaign spending reform law, the most far-reaching measure of its kind ever to reach or ever to be approved by one of the chambers of Congress. This bill would tighten up the archaic and loophole ridden provisions of the Corrupt Practices Act to require complete spending reports of all the candidates for President and for Congress. But a similar bill, one even stronger, has been stalled in the House Administration, full House Administration Committee since last summer and we don't see too much hope for its passage, at least no very good hopes right now.

Finally, we should note that the Senate last year passed early in 1967 the Legislative Reorganization Act, the first in 20 years, to tighten up committee procedures and also to tighten up the woefully inadequate lobby registration laws, but that bill got snarled up in the House Rules Committee where it still is.

Mr. McCUTCHEN. 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, Congressmen Boggs and Laird, I would like to ask each of you in turn to give your personal verdicts on the work of the Congress in 1967 in relation, I suppose, to the needs of the Country in 1967.

Senator Muskie, 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 we should have done that we didn't do, but I think that the achievements are real and meaningful.

Let's 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 points in this session looked to be on its deathbed and finally sent him a 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 there has been an effort on the part of this Congress to come to grips with the problems but its ability to do so I think has been compromised, some very real political realities.

There is the political reality that in 1966 in the House over 40 additional Republicans were elected. This was a reduction in the strength of the President's party and it made itself felt. And interestingly enough, the impact of this increased Republican representation in the House seems to have been on the conservative side.

On the Senate side there were additions on the Republican side of young senators who seemed to give the Republican side of the aisle a more moderate look than it had had before, and both of these injections of new blood from the Republican side I think are

reflected in the voting records in this Congress. The result is that there were two strong pressures in this Congress as I see it, one from the conservative side, the pressure to reduce spending, reduce new programs, including those that the other side regarded as essential from the point of view of the cities and so many domestic problems and then on the more liberal side, the pressure for more effective action in dealing with the problems of the cities and in dealing with racial unrest and so on. And as a result of these two pressures, we got something down the middle between the two.

Mr. NIVEN. Your colleague, Senator Kennedy of New York, said tonight that the Congress, the Executive nor the Legislative Branch had done what needed to be done this year. That is what he said in effect. I gather you don't agree with that.

Senator MUSKIE. I expect you get that point of view from the conservative side represented by people like Congressman Laird, too, that we didn't do what we should have done, as well as from the liberal side represented by Senator Kennedy. I think from each of these points of view the Congress didn't do what it should have done, so the result is we did something down the middle that did a little for the city but not what should have been done, that did a little to reduce spending from Congressman Laird's point of view, but not what should have been done, that did a little in the tax field but not what should have been done, and I think this is the product of the strong pressures, each of them I think a little stronger than normal.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator Morton?

Senator MORTON. First, let me say that I am years older than any of my colleagues who are appearing on this program but am junior to my friend, Congressman Boggs, in service in the Congress. This to me has been the most frustrating year from a personal standpoint that I have ever had in the Congress 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. Whom do you blame?

Senator COOPER. I don't know whom to blame, but the breakdown is there. It is specific and it is there. And under our Constitution the Senate has a greater role in the conduct of foreign affairs than does 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 law and order.

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 the long-range solutions to this problem. But we have got to have sort of a fire brigade.

Now, I ask that we take—put in transferability—take 10 percent of that which we have already allocated to the cities so it doesn't have to go through Congress, give the President transferability so that he can set up a fire 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 complicated.

But I say frankly this has been a frustrat-

ing session. When I came—when we came here in January and I heard my majority leader, who is one of the greatest guys I have ever known, Mike Mansfield, get up and say, "Now we are going to review these welfare programs objectively, these things that we hurried through the 89th Congress," I had great hope. I thought we were going to do that. And then we end up with a committee, Subcommittee of the Labor Committee, headed by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, and we whitewashed all of them.

I, for instance, was very much against the Head Start program in its inception. I have changed my mind. I think it is a good program. In most places it is a good program. And I think we ought to examine and analyze all these programs. I think we are encouraging the breakup of the family. We are encouraging people not to go to work. I think we have got to objectively—I don't care whether they are Republicans or Democrats, objectively go to work on these things and I hoped we were going to do it.

So for me this has been a frustrating year. Mr. NIVEN. Congressman Boggs, have you found this session as frustrating as Senator Morton has?

Representative BOGGS. No. As a matter of fact, my mood is quite different from that of Senator Morton's. I feel very gratified this evening. We have just adjourned Congress. What we have done from my point of view is a miracle, remarkable. We lost 47 Democrats in the House, all of whom were supporting programs such as the ones that Senator Morton said we should do, and we had to operate without those 47, and sometimes it was very difficult.

I listened to these high level men giving these analyses. They didn't even mention the fact that we had to pass the debt ceiling three times and on each occasion we didn't get a single Republican vote. So that we had to get votes for the very basic thing of maintaining 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. And none of these things come easy. Congress by its very nature is controversial and you only move after you have great controversy. But, if anyone had said just six weeks ago that tonight we would have a viable poverty program, preserved and administered as a separate agency of the government, wherein the poverty people, the poor people are actually participating, they would have said, well, that was impossible. As a matter of fact, one of my dear friends on the Republican side, Congressman Goodell, started the debate on the subject by saying the bill was one dedicated to bosses and boll weevils. By bosses he meant the people who are elected to run our towns and cities, the municipal officials of our country, and by boll weevils it ultimately got down to defining boll weevils as southern members of Congress which some of us didn't exactly appreciate. But in any event, despite all the controversy, and I am not intimating for one moment that we didn't have bipartisan support on many of these programs, but despite all of that, despite the atmosphere that is created by Vietnam, despite the partisan atmosphere that always develops prior to a presidential election, I think anyone who looks at this session objectively will come to the conclusion that it has been a constructive session of Congress.

Mr. NIVEN. Congressman Boggs, you clearly feel that it was much more constructive than Senator Muskie or Senator Morton do.

Representative BOGGS. 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 these votes together.

Mr. NIVEN. You see now—excuse me.

Representative Boggs. I think what we have done is quite remarkable really, and I can understand the frustration Senator Morton expressed because there are frustrations all over the country. But I don't see why the frustrations should be attributed to Congress. The frustrations come from Vietnam. They come from the great migrations into our cities, from elsewhere, of poor people. They come from a change in the population pattern in our country and all these problems that 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 fighting a war, I think it has responded very adequately.

Mr. NIVEN. Congressman Laird, do you share Congressman Boggs' verdict?

Representative LAIRD. 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 deficit Congress because it has made possible the highest deficit that this country has ever experienced at any time since World War II. And this deficit is going to have its effect upon the cost of living, the tax of inflation 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. Twelve new grant in aid programs were asked for by the President.

Grant-in-aid programs using the old model of the 1932's. Instead of moving into a new model of the 1970's and beyond, and the Republicans with our 47 new members still in the Minority made an all-out effort to institute tax credits for human investment, for training, tax credits for state and local taxes paid, revenue sharing so that when the war is over in Vietnam, we would have a new approach to these problems of our cities and our states. We in the Republican party believe that we have problem solvers in our cities and in our states and we believe that the creativity of each individual can be brought to its fullest effect by returning the resources to the local communities instead of setting up this project by project grant application basis that was suggested again in this session by President Johnson.

No, I think this Congress will be deficit in many ways. The fact that it didn't institute any new approaches to the problems of our cities, to the problems that our states face, and also because we are going to have this tremendous deficit of from 23 to 25 billion dollars this year and a possible deficit of some 40 billion dollars in fiscal year 1969, the next fiscal year.

Mr. NIVEN. Thank you, Gentlemen. It is clear that we have four rather distinct viewpoints on the work of the first session of the 90th Congress.

Our discussion will be joined at this point by two outside political scientists who will question the four of you from afar. First, speaking from a studio in Washington, Professor Robert Peabody of Johns Hopkins University.

Mr. PEABODY. Well, Paul, I guess the first question I would have would be something like this. Congress has just adjourned. We have seen a wrap-up by four experts from Congressional Quarterly; four of the most able and distinguished members of Congress have given us four quite distinct views of what the record of the 90th Congress, 1st Session, was all about.

I had an unusual opportunity to watch

the 1st Session of the 89th Congress, 1965, at firsthand. Democrats called that one a great Congress. It certainly passed a large number of very important pieces of legislation. Now the 90th Congress, 1967, has been completed. I guess the question that I am left with is something like this: How do you evaluate the output of a Congress? Is it in terms of the numbers of bills passed? Clearly not. Is it the kind of bill that is passed, what it does for certain kinds of people? Well, that is probably more important. I happen to have heard the Senate minority leader Dirksen and the House minority leader Gerald Ford of Michigan a little earlier this evening, and they were talking about how constructive the 90th Congress, 1st Session, was, only they seemed to disagree with President Johnson in his speech down in Miami last Monday where he said Congress was no good because of the status quo Republican attitude. Dirksen and Ford, on the other hand, seem to be arguing that this Congress was a good, constructive Congress precisely because they had 47 more 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 know is how do you evaluate the output of a Congress? How do you determine whether it is truly representative of the needs of the American public? And so far I guess I am still up in the air.

Mr. NIVEN. Thanks, Professor Peabody. We will get to some of those questions in a few minutes. First, however, an analysis from 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 method of evaluating the work of Congress, not only for this past year but in terms of the past and of the future, because I think when you evaluate Congress, you have to have some kind of historical standard.

This Congress, it seems to me, has been fairly typical. Perhaps the disposition of many of the congressmen because of the Vietnamese war and the situation in the cities has been a little meaner, but the output has not been more or less radical or conservative, I would say, than a typical Congress.

I don't want to comment on the performance of the two parties. I would leave that pretty much up to the experts who are bored already and who have preceded me.

I think that one might find good and bad bills have been passed and I might also mention that a lot of bad legislation has been screened out. Some of it has—some good legislation has gone out as well. The tax proposal probably must be passed. Regrettably, as Congressman Laird has said, there are many reasons for regretting that the country should have come to this point. On the other hand, there is a lot of work that the Congress has done that is not reflected in its bills that we have been scoring here. There has been this every day scrutiny of agencies going on, a half a thousand very active people, experts in their own rights, going about examining the work of the bureaucracy. There has been a lot of financial watchdogging. There have been inspection trips of all kinds. Congressmen have been found all over the world. These so-called junkets are actually for the most part very useful practices and should be encouraged because we want to know and 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 watching.

Mr. NIVEN. In this program please stay in place.

Mr. DE GRAZIA. Then the Congress has had a number of most interesting hearings and 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 bit like the husband who is not able to bring his wife a fur coat for Christmas time, at least it is also like 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 at all times. Questions will be directed to you as individuals but any of the four may comment on the answers of another. May we have a question first, from Professor Peabody?

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 ask 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 do to inform the American public as to the reasons why we are in Vietnam and to clarify or make more sense out of what we are trying to accomplish there?

Senator MUSKIE. I suspect, speaking for myself, that every member of the Senate feels that he has in his own way done what he can to enlighten his constituents as to the issues involved in Vietnam, but the total effect of 100 Senators with 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 I suppose in votes on defense appropriations bills, but we can not speak as one voice on Vietnam, and we are usually separated into two groups, the hawks and the doves, and 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 contribution from the Senate to an understanding by the American people of why we are in Vietnam. My answer is I suspect that each of us has done his best to answer that question, but I am not sure that all of our constituents are satisfied they have had a sufficient answer.

Mr. NIVEN. I know these labels sometimes are resented 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 more of the same isn't going to accomplish our mission there. I think that we failed to recognize that we are engaged in two wars. There is the question of aggression. There is our moral obligation. I am not talking about the morality of it. I have never questioned that. I am talking about the reality of it. I think that when we get into South Vietnam with the civil disturbance there we are just opening up Pandora's box. If we are going to try to stop every civil disturbance all over the world, whether we say it is inspired by communists or not, I just think we are going far beyond our means even though we are the most wealthy and the most powerful country in the world. I think we get into a hopeless dilemma and I am afraid we are getting on that wicket in Vietnam and I must say that the constant talk of victory, victory, victory that we hear from the administra-

tion and from the military commanders in Vietnam, well, from my own state the 101 Airborne just went over there and they are the greatest outfit in the world, I think, the greatest fighting men in the world, and every Republican, every Republican in the House and Senate has supported the troops in Vietnam and we will continue 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 these gallant men, but I must say 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. Can I break in here, Paul?

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. We are not. I grant you that. We have differences as to Vietnam in our party as indeed do the Democrats. My point was that when it comes to appropriations for those boys who are fighting so well in Vietnam, I have yet to see a Republican who didn't vote for them.

Mr. NIVEN. Professor de Grazia, do you question—

Professor PEABODY. It's a problem, though, that I—

Professor DE GRAZIA. No question about—

Mr. NIVEN. Excuse me just a moment—

Representative LAIRD. The Vietnam situation, I think this is one of the areas where the whole question of Congressional oversight can be brought into focus. I don't believe that we in the Congress have done the job of oversight 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 third and fourth quarter of fiscal 1968 to finance the second quarter of this fiscal year. We are operating on a deficiency basis in the Department of Defense to finance 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. Those of us on the Defense Appropriations Committee know the war is costing closer to \$30 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 supplemental because the Executive Branch had already obligated the funds.

Mr. DE GRAZIA. 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 the Congress might define.

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 GRAZIA. 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 throwing out the idea that Senator Fulbright and we have several over 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 introduced a resolution along that line. 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 each of us has an obligation 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 the targets we ought to be hitting.

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 towards a settlement of the war, but at some point we have learned the lesson in 180 years that after you ask all the questions, after you debate the alternatives and the options, you exercise a little self-restraint and a little steadfastness to support your policy.

Mr. DE GRAZIA. 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 is hardly proper. 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 apparently you refuse to cross—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. I think Vietnam is a good thing to talk about in connection with this Congress because it is the overriding thing.

Mr. PEABODY. But we could stay here with Vietnam for another half-hour.

Representative LAIRD. But it does affect so many things. 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. I think it has to do with opposition in the world as well as our spending policies. Somebody should mention that. But go ahead, Professor. He was about to ask a new question.

Mr. NIVEN. I think we ought to move on to domestic problems and especially the problems of the cities.

Representative BOGGS. What is the question? Go ahead, Professor.

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. Thank you.

Mr. PEABODY. How come it is when the Administration, the President, the House leadership right down the line, wants a tax bill it can't get out of the Ways and Means 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 than I can. 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 shall do so because I think that what is happening now is that the burden is being felt unequally. 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—

Mr. PEABODY. I wonder—

Representative BOGGS. Excuse me. Let me go ahead.

In addition to that, certain sectors of the economy are bearing a tremendous burden. The interest rates have gotten very high, and this means the housing industry, the building and loan associations, the small savings associations and so forth, building suppliers, and so on, are bearing a much greater burden than other sectors of the economy.

So that I think that come January, when we look again, and I think that Congressman Laird is undoubtedly correct, that the war in Vietnam is costing closer to \$30 billion 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 reject. I have never made any bones 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 have enjoyed that fine luxury of just voting against taxes but every now and then you have to vote for them. We had to vote for them in Korea, we had to vote for them in World War II, and we are going to have to vote for them now.

Representative LAIRD. Already, I would just like to say I told the President he would get eight of the 15 Democrats to vote for that tax bill.

Representative BOGGS. I remember that statement. I applauded you for it.

Representative LAIRD. 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 report out the President's bill, isn't that correct?

Representative BOGGS. Well—

Senator MORTON. As a member of the Finance Committee, I can only say when the President comes out and tells us in February it is an \$8 billion deficit and in October it is \$35 billion, it makes it very difficult to approach this thing objectively.

Now, I agree with my friend, Congressman Boggs. I think that, especially in the light of what has happened to the pound, the secondary reserve currency as we call it, that we are going to have to do something to put confidence back in the dollar and I am afraid that we are not doing it, and I hope we will take action in January, but it is very difficult in view of the apparent switches that are going on by the leader of your party.

Representative BOGGS. Let me recall a little

history here, Senator. I was on the committee and you were a member of the House back in the beginning of the war in Korea. Senator MORTON. Yes.

Representative BOGGS. 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. We had taken a look at the World War II tax schedule and the House had actually passed a tax reduction bill, both in individual income taxes, 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 it, Korea came, June 1950.

Senator MORTON. And that changed the whole picture.

Representative BOGGS. 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.

Mr. NIVEN. Gentlemen, I would like to pose a question which is really more about the mores that prevail in this building than it is about taxes. Why is it that when the President of the U.S. with 30-odd million votes behind him, wants a tax increase he has to approach more or less as a petitioner a Congressman from Arkansas who is elected by 200,000 people perhaps? What is the source of Congressman Mills' great power? Is it the seniority system? Is it that—

Representative LAIRD. No one has power in the Congress unless he has votes on the committee backing him up and Congressman Mills had a vast majority 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 MORTON. 15 Democrats.

Representative LAIRD. 15 Democrats and 10 Republicans. Now, Congressman Mills has his power because he is supported by members of the committee.

Mr. NIVEN. Congressman Boggs?

Representative BOGGS. Well, you know, I am always reluctant to try to delve into the mind of another man, and—

Mr. NIVEN. Does Congressman Mills represent the mood of the House on taxes?

Representative BOGGS. Congressman Mills is one of the ablest members of the Congress. I would say to you that in my judgment that if Congressman Mills in January takes another look and reports—if the committee reports a bill, that the House would pass it. These things don't happen overnight. Do you know it took us two years to pass a tax reduction bill? People were complaining about that. They said my goodness alive. What is wrong with you fellows? And it took us 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. Your journalists in both electronics and the press generally, you like to keep these controversies going. You like to say, well, Mr. Mills is fighting the President. 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.

Representative LAIRD. Well, Hale, 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 with that than anybody else, being the Democratic Whip.

Professor PEABODY. I would say you are both pretty good vote counters.

Mr. NIVEN. Professor de Grazia, did you have a question?

Professor DE GRAZIA. I was listening to some lessons in political science. But I did have a question of Congressman Boggs. If he is so concerned about inflationary tendencies I wonder why he was so enthusiastic about raising the debt twice in the last year.

Representative BOGGS. 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 is ridiculous. We voted as Democrats eight times, a clear majority of the Democratic Party to raise the debt ceiling under President Eisenhower because we thought it was responsible government. 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 and not paying off the obligations of the government of the U.S. is just something that I can't buy and I don't believe you do either.

Mr. NIVEN. Gentlemen, let's turn now to the urban problems on which a great deal of this money has been spent in 1967. Professor Peabody, have you a question?

Professor PEABODY. Yes, I do.

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 thought it had a lot of problems to 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 so-called. What is being done 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 LAIRD. 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 the housing administration and, but we did favor it and I voted for putting in the Public Health Service because we already had an existing program.

Professor PEABODY. As I recall, you were in a distinct minority in that position.

Representative LAIRD. Well, I might have been in the minority but we put together a coalition that became the majority on that issue and it is now in the Public Health Service. The only thing about it is that the President handed out all those pens last week when the bill was signed to everyone but he failed to ask for a single dollar to fund the program. And I think that should be pointed out, that it is nice to make these fancy speeches about the programs and what has been accomplished, but it also takes an appropriation. It takes a request through the Bureau of the Budget and there has been none forthcoming on that issue.

Professor PEABODY. I think I would like to say—

Representative BOGGS. Just for the record, you know, I greatly admire Congressman Laird. I consider him one of the really attractive members of the House, certainly one of the ablest. But he will admit that on the first go-around that his party was not quite

so enthusiastic as particular for that bill. That is an understatement really.

Representative LAIRD. But they were against setting up a new categorical aid program and it is—

Representative BOGGS. Sorry, Mel, I won't—

Representative LAIRD. When we already had an existing program in the Public Health Service in HEW. We wanted to use—

Representative BOGGS. You know, it reminds me of some fellow who said you Republicans are never for anything the first time.

Representative LAIRD. Well, we are not for the categorical aid approach on any of these programs today.

Mr. DE GRAZIA. Senator Morton—I would like to ask a question of Senator Morton. He did mention that there was no agonizing reappraisal of the poverty program.

Senator MORTON. No.

Mr. DE GRAZIA. And I wonder whether the Congress actually has the machinery for making such an appraisal.

Senator MORTON. Yes, I think Congress definitely has.

Mr. DE GRAZIA. I would like to hear your opinion.

Senator MORTON. I think the speech made by my leader, Senator Mansfield, the leader of the Senate, indicated that last winter when we came back to the 1st Session, beginning of this long session, and frankly I had high hopes—I personally think that our whole welfare programs, all of them, need re-examination. I don't say that we can do the job any cheaper. It may cost us more. But I say we have to instill in people a desire, a will, to create, a will to produce, to instill in them desire to be productive members of society. Many of us had very serious misgivings about the social security bill, the welfare features of it, which we passed only today in the Senate, but we of course had—there was little choice. I mean 24 million people were going to benefit and 800,000 were going to be perhaps hurt, and, as a pragmatic politician I knew what we were up against and this was brought out clearly in the debate, and I hope that we will be able to do something about it.

But frankly I think that we are looking at this thing, we are going at this thing in the wrong way, and I hope that the next Congress, whether they are—next session of this Congress or the next Congress, whether there are more Democrats or Republicans 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 as members of Congress.

Senator MUSKIE. I would like to make a comment.

Representative BOGGS. I would like to make one, too, when you get through.

Senator MUSKIE. I have been listening with a great deal of interest to Congressman Laird from time to time and Senator Morton just now making an argument that is all too familiar around here, that the purpose we seek to serve, the particular piece of legislation is worthwhile but this isn't the right way to do it and until we find the right way to do it we are not going to get support.

Mr. DE GRAZIA. Yet they don't come up with the means for finding the right way, is that right, Senator?

Senator MUSKIE. Well, they offer suggestion from time to time, but then, as Congressman Laird distinctly said tonight, not being in the majority, he disclaims responsibility for getting the votes necessary to get action. Now, I am all for responsible action and I am all for getting the best idea that we can, but when you deal with problems as urgent as the problems of our cities you 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 Boggs. 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 the programs at hand. And they are addressed at the very critical urban problems with which we must deal, so why not let us try them?

Representative Boggs. Let's go on a little further there, Senator. The Education bill which we passed today, which we finalized today, is secondary and elementary education 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 talk about urban programs. When you take education, health, poverty and social security, you have an enormous contribution, and housing.

Senator MUSKIE. And pollution.

Representative Boggs. And pollution—to the problems of the cities—I want to go on one thing, the Social Security thing.

Representative LAIRD. Then I would like to break in.

Representative Boggs. 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 750,000 people now on welfare will be trained for gainful employment within the next two years.

Senator MORTON. Mothers of one or two-year-old children.

Professor PEABODY. Can I break in here a minute?

Representative LAIRD. 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 wait a minute.

Representative Boggs. Pretty hard when professors and politicians are on the same program.

Professor PEABODY. Equal time.

The question I have is this. It seems to me Republicans have come up and now let's say it is hard to say who has come up with the idea, but the notice simply is one of tax sharing.

Now, I think it is fair to say that Walter Heller has a plan, Joe Pechman at Brookings has a plan, but if my memory serves me correctly, Mr. Laird is the first Congressman to introduce a bill calling for some form of block grants, and I wondered if you might want to explain that approach as an alternative to some of the programs that the Democrats have been proposing.

Mr. LAIRD. I appreciate that question very much because that really is the alternative. That is a better way to do things than the way of the categorical aid approach.

Senator Muskie mentioned several of the programs that were first enacted in the 89th Congress, four of them, to be exact. These programs aren't of a massive nature.

Take, for instance, the water pollution, sewer construction aid program, another categorical aid program that was set up. You know, we have \$160 million authorized and appropriated in that program. Over in HUD right now there is \$5,100,000,000 worth of applications. They are holding up sewer construction all over the United States—

Senator MUSKIE. May I say that we au-

thorized \$6 million and the House would not increase the Senate appropriation.

Mr. LAIRD. The President's budget—

Senator MUSKIE. By \$23 million. I know, but we gave you a chance to go above it.

Mr. LAIRD. It is \$160 million and the President asked for that. There is \$5 billion—

Senator MUSKIE. \$203 million.

Mr. LAIRD. We gave every penny that the President asked for.

Senator MUSKIE. Which was \$203 million.

Mr. LAIRD. Every penny—

Senator MUSKIE. We gave you a chance to go up another twenty-three and you didn't. So why should you complain about the authorization?

Mr. LAIRD. I am just telling you—the President—take 223—

Senator MUSKIE. But you have indicated this was a Congressional idea.

Mr. LAIRD. Right.

Mr. NIVEN. Gentlemen, this argument could go on all night.

Mr. LAIRD. \$5 billion worth of applications—

Mr. PEABODY. A good example of what happens in Congress all the time.

Mr. LAIRD. The trouble here is—

Mr. PEABODY. This is fascinating—

Mr. LAIRD. That is why we need another approach of a massive nature.

Mr. NIVEN. I would like to listen to—

Mr. LAIRD. The problems of our city.

Mr. NIVEN. We are in our last five minutes and I would like to move along to a last subject which 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. 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 reported an agreement 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 simplify and shorten the roll call."

This is John Matthews, 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 don't—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 coming into 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 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, but putting in a vote machine 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 one good or another political reason to avoid being counted on an issue?

Mr. Boggs. No.

Senator MORTON. No, 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, really. Certainly not much of an ethical question.

Senator MORTON. I think a full disclosure of our income.

Mr. NIVEN. 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?

Senator MORTON. No. I came out for that several years ago.

Mr. NIVEN. Why hasn't it happened?

Mr. LAIRD. I think it is about to happen. The Ethics Committee of the House has a recommendation that is about ready to come out. We set this committee up this year and I think they are very close to some kind—

Mr. Boggs. 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 537 people up here and you get a sour apple in the barrel—

Mr. Boggs. Right.

Senator MORTON. And it rubs off on every one of us.

Mr. Boggs. Right.

Senator MORTON. And I think the gentleman who asked the question is right. I think we are in ill repute about it and I think the Congress ought to do something about it.

Mr. LAIRD. And perhaps the Congress should move more rapidly on it. But I think we are about ready in the House. I think the Election Reform bill may get out of the House early in the next session.

Mr. Boggs. I think Mel Laird made a very significant statement. A lot of people—one of the professors mentioned the tedious committee work that goes on. Most of the work necessary to draft a code of ethics and do it properly has already been done and we should be ready to act early in the second session of this Congress.

Mr. NIVEN. Gentlemen, thank you very much. I think whatever one may think of the results of the first session of the 90th Congress, anyone who has been here at all knows that all of you have worked very hard. It remains only to issue bon voyage as you go home, Merry Christmas and Happy New Year. Thank you so much for joining us.

Now back to Dick McCutchen.

Mr. McCUTCHEN. For the last 80 minutes you have seen a report on the first session of the 90th Congress as seen by some of its leading members and outside experts. That session came to an end shortly before 7 o'clock this evening. The Congress will reconvene in one month on January 15.

Our thanks to, in Washington, Professor Robert Peabody of Johns-Hopkins University. In New York, Professor Alfred de Grazia of New York University.

On Capitol Hill, Senators Thruston B. Morton of Kentucky and Edmund Muskie

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 Ethics.

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 matter.

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 these ships flew the 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 time 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 need badly enough to pay the freight and to charter free-world vessels must be of significant importance to them. In addition, I am advised that free-world vessels have, in fact, delivered strategic goods to North Vietnam. 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.

Because I believe 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 this morning 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 include 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, White House, 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 67 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 the enemy to continue its aggressive action against the defenders of freedom in South Vietnam. The fact that this trade is 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 9 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 Communism.

Most respectfully yours,
CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
Member of Congress.

FREE WORLD SHIPS IN NORTH VIETNAM, 1968

	Month	No.	Deadweight tonnage
British	January	9	65,650
Cyprus	do	1	3,100
Total		10	68,750

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 Institute, as related in the following news article from the Chicago American of June 1, 1967:

MEMORABILIA AT SMITHSONIAN: SPANISH AMERICAN VET 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 2033 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. Peterson, chairman of the institution's 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 shore batteries 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 revise and 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 ship and travel on American ships 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 large numbers of merchant ships 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 abroad for U.S., and U.S.-affiliated, interests 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 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.

Informed persons 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 whatsoever, and nothing else 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.

The concurrent resolution 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 not 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 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, when 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.

The 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 cast his vote for this vitally important resolution. 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 help solve its balance-of-payments problems. The American merchant marine already contributes nearly \$1 billion a year toward a more favorable payments position. Yet, the foreigners carry all but a fraction of our 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 is peanuts. Think of how the 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 its 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 SS *United States*, the safest, 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 largest container 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 related 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 restoring better balance to the federal budget, 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 expressed 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 observed.

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 keystone to any effective balance-of-payments program and it is missing from our present Government program.

The two experts also disapproved restrictions on foreign investment and travel which they view as a step toward full-fledged control.

As 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 unevenly on 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 statement 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.

I hope and urge that 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 the 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 plane and ship travel 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 tax on purchases.

He proposes to reduce the duty-free limit on foreign purchases from \$100 to \$10 and to cut 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 first \$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 \$15 a day.

Moreover, the expenditures tax, so-called, is enormously complicated by exemptions, ifs and ands and buts. For instance, businessmen, students, teachers or professors on sabbaticals would be exempt if they stay abroad more than 120 days and are engaged full-time in business, 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 yield of the taxes. And if it isn't enforceable, it hardly can be expected to reduce the balance-of-payments deficit by any worthwhile amount. No such problem ever was licked 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 in the cities and states of our country: action at the local level, action at the state level and action by the Congress of the United States.

We in the Congress must heed this call and the cry of our citizens to action in the national interest by enacting an effective anticrime 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 sponsored such as a Safe Streets 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 safe streets and crime control bill 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 sales 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 or to acquire a permit 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 how many more cracks of rifles, shotguns and even automatic weapons 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 does 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 into 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 appease southerners 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 charge is made 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 gentlewoman from Oregon who, after long study of the proposal to place elected public officials on these boards, decided as we did that this was a good move. If she had not felt this way, I am absolutely certain that she would have refused to have supported 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 that pertain to 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 time we recognize that the ills 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 eliminate the causes of these troubles.

**CONGRESSMAN LLOYD MEEDS'
OUTSTANDING NEWSLETTER 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 this 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 boasts 30 calibre machine gun, tear gas launchers, chemical fire extinguishers and a siren so loud its wail can stun rioters.

Force is one answer to controlling riots. Unfortunately, for some people it is the complete answer. I can't agree.

I would like to discuss, frankly, some of my thoughts about this tough and controversial problem of riots and their causes. I hope you will think about it, too, and let me know your views in "Exchange."

Cities all across the land are "gearing up". Special riot training is being given to the police. New mob control techniques are being developed. New devices are being marketed to help police quiet crowds, quell violence and prevent fire and death.

Police forces 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 more recreational areas 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" demagogues and "white power" rabble-rousers can only inflame passions at the expense of cool-headed and creative action. Genuine social injustices will not be corrected by the raging of a mindless mob. Where violence occurs, it must 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 and stability. The techniques discussed so far deal only with ways to control riots.

We also need effective ways to prevent riots. The best way to do that is to first know what causes people to storm through streets—burning, looting and killing.

A man with a good job, a promising future and a livable home does not riot. He shares the "American Dream." He knows, just as you and I do, that with hard work, drive, and a little luck he can attain any kind 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 that basic 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 cold fact is that the Negro in America is not really in America." These people who are virtually imprisoned in the slums share neither our prosperity nor our self-confidence.

Elliot Liebow says in his book, *Tally's Corner*, that:

The bus boy or dishwasher who works hard becomes, simply, a hard working bus 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 that), fatherless homes and the rotting 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? His is hardly the kind of situation that would motivate you or me.

One vital difference, then, is that we have hope of success, and he does not.

Another difference is that we are accepted by our fellow men for what we are, as individuals. Other people don't prejudice us by the color of our skin before we have a chance to demonstrate our abilities.

That isn't true for our fellow American citizens who are Negro.

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 first base.

We must understand these basic difference if we are ever to find an effective way to get the jobless poor off the seats of their pants and into productive roles in society.

What, then, should we do?

Broadly speaking, we should assure truly equal 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. This example reflects a national pattern which results in low-quality education in ghetto schools.

John Conyers, a Negro Congressman from Detroit, told me, "You attend a graduation ceremony and you know damn well that some of those kids couldn't read the face of their diploma if their lives depended on it."

Inequality of opportunity hits the Negro child early and dogs him for a lifetime. His very home is a reminder of this inequality. Over 30% of the Negro families in this country live in substandard housing . . . sweaty, rat-infested, dilapidated tenements. Landlords frequently refuse to meet even minimal building and sanitation standards and evict any tenant who dares to complain.

Whose responsibility is it to see that these conditions are improved?

I believe that the burden rests on the poor

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 again . . . to seize the new opportunities . . . to help themselves. For our part, we must assure genuine equality of opportunity, particularly in jobs, housing and education. Now, how do we go about it?

JOB

The number one priority is jobs. A Community of breadwinners earning decent wages is not a community likely to explode. For the poor, a good job can be the cornerstone of a new life in which there is a real chance for them to get ahead.

For those people with some marketable skills, jobs must be found.

For those without skills, some present vocational training programs will need to grow and some new approaches developed and implemented.

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 too. It needs to be enlarged.

On-the-job-training.—This is one of the most successful of all the manpower programs I have studied as a member of the House Education and Labor Committee. With participation by private business and industry, people are trained for a job while actually working at it. This training generally leads to positions that offer salary increases and promotions.

Vast expansion of this program is necessary, and private enterprise must be encouraged to participate in a massive way. Tax credits and other incentives may be necessary to stimulate greater business involvement.

Eliminate racial barriers.—If a man can't work because of his race, regardless of how well qualified he may be, all the rest I have discussed is pointless. Employers and unions are increasingly dropping racial barriers, but there are still problems with some whose words are not matched by deeds.

HOUSING

The core cities and ghettos of this nation are clogged with smoke, soot, garbage and raw sewage. They are perfect breeding grounds for rats, riots and crime. Cold in winter, hot in summer and unbearable year 'round, the crowded tenements are shameful reminders of the "other America".

Massive rebuilding programs must be undertaken to replace, repair or rehabilitate great rotting sections of our cities.

Model cities.—Offers federal financial assistance to city governments for planning and implementing local programs to improve housing, parks, shopping centers, community facilities, schools, transportation—all aspects of community life in the central city. It needs more adequate funding.

Rent supplements.—Make it possible for private enterprise to provide housing for low-income families whose earnings are enough to make them ineligible for public housing. This gets around an old problem whereby people are penalized for working because their income may be high enough to force their eviction from public housing but too low for them to rent adequate private housing. This new approach offers a stepping stone from dependence to independence and should be amplified.

A home ownership program.—That would make eventual home ownership available to the poor is needed. Just pride of ownership alone could do much to prevent slums from recurring.

Urban renewal.—In cities must be rechanneled to help solve tenement area problems. Too often it has been used to replace low-

rent slums with high-rent apartments, leaving low-income families no choice but to move on to other slums.

Involving the poor in renovation projects.—Should be carried out, because such an approach meets a cross-section of ghetto problems. It could provide productive employment while renovating slums. With ghetto residents actually participating in the planning and building; community pride, dignity and a sense of accomplishment could be developed. This in turn would help insure continued community interest in maintaining clean, livable, pleasant neighborhoods.

EDUCATION

Every high school graduate with an academic background that qualifies him for college or for a good job, is one less person who will need the Job Corps, Manpower Training or some other remedial program. He is one person less who will occupy the welfare rolls. It's really a matter of educating these children properly the first time, so we don't have to go back and patch them up later.

Because ignorance is so much a part of the problem of the very poor, quality education is a vital part of the solution.

Quality schools.—First we have to assure that schools in the poor sections of cities have truly adequate buildings, good faculties, enough materials—in short, they must be as good as what we expect for our own children.

Compensatory education.—Special programs such as Head Start, remedial work, guidance and counseling must be especially tailored to the specific needs of the children they serve. Much greater emphasis needs to be placed on this.

Teacher Corps.—A promising program that puts dedicated teaching teams into ghetto schools to supplement both faculty and program, has been badly mauled by Congress. But it needs to be augmented and fully funded.

Vocational education.—Today millions of young people drop out of school because they are not primarily interested in academic studies. Vocational education should be more readily available as a supplement for those who wish to develop their potential in this direction.

I will soon introduce in Congress legislation that completely revamps and strengthens the federal contribution to our state and local vocational education programs. I foresee an intensive approach to develop the whole man and to tailor training and skills to local job market needs.

These remedies and others that may be required will not be cheap or easy. They will require a minimum of 4 billion dollars the first year, and more in subsequent years until the blight of our cities and the despair of ghetto life are eliminated.

Can we afford it?

First of all, it is wrong to assume that if we don't spend the money to correct the situation, it will cost us nothing. Riots, welfare, crime and urban rot all cost billions too.

Secondly, did you know that as a nation we spend nearly \$4 billion each year on cosmetics? We spend \$17½ billion each year on tobacco and liquor. Certainly, then, we can afford to invest a fraction of that amount to make America a better place to live for all our citizens.

One other point, and probably the most important: We often hear people say, "The Negro must prove himself. He must be willing to assume his place in our society with all its responsibilities. The Negro must pull himself up by his bootstraps."

I don't disagree with that, but have to point out that he can't pull himself up by his own bootstraps if our society insists that he remain barefoot. He can't prove himself if he doesn't have the means. He can't gain self respect if, as a society, we remind him in a thousand humiliating ways each day that we don't think he is quite as good as the rest of us.

This adds up to a chilling and shameful fact: We talk a good game about "brotherhood of man" and each individual's "equality before the law and in the sight of God." But too often, it is just talk.

Assuring equality of opportunity in jobs, in housing and in education is just the first step of a longer journey. Our goal is the decent treatment of every American citizen as a person, as an individual possessing strengths and talents that can enrich our society. That goal cannot be achieved until—when you and I say "equal", we really mean it.

What do you think?

THE FAILING JUDICIAL IMAGE AND CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEDZI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it was more than 2 years ago that I first called to the attention of the House the shocking story of a bitter feud among three Federal judges in Oklahoma City, Okla.

Shortly thereafter, I introduced a resolution in the House calling for a special investigation of the situation. No action was taken on the resolution for the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. EMANUEL CELLER, appointed a special subcommittee for the ostensible purpose of making such an investigation.

For the benefit of new Members and to refresh the memories of older Members, I pointed out that there was then and had been for nearly 4 years—ignored and gathering dust in the files of the U.S. Supreme Court—an official transcript of the allegations in this sordid case.

The transcript is the verbatim statement of Federal Judge Stephen S. Chandler in which he accused Federal Judges Alfred P. Murrah and Luther Bohanon of persecution and worse.

Chandler's testimony was given before the Judicial Council of the 10th Circuit Court, sitting in Wichita, Kans., on April 25, 1962, after Chandler had been disqualified by the Judicial Council from presiding in a bankruptcy proceeding.

Chandler asserts in his testimony that Federal Judge Murrah, now the chief judge of the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals, sometimes cursed him and once tried to get him to alter his estimate of property values; that his telephone was tapped and he was afraid of being poisoned.

He accused Federal Judge Bohanon of spying on him, circulating rumors about him, and soliciting a bribe. Chandler said that in 1942, Bohanon, then an attorney, offered to get him—Chandler—appointed as a Federal judge for \$25,000. It was on January 30, 1962, said Judge Chandler, that Bohanon's attitude toward him changed from warm friendship to bitter hatred.

In the case in which he fixed the value of certain property, Judge Chandler testified that Judge Murrah called him into his chambers and said:

Now you have got to change that . . . You are going to delay our building here.

Chandler said he replied that his appraisal was correct, and he refused to change it whereupon, said Chandler:

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 in a jury case. He refused, and Murrah 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, that disqualified Chandler from 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 establishments of the special three-man investigating subcommittee, headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JACK 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 an action filed with the U.S. Supreme Court, Chandler v. Judicial Council of the 10th Circuit of the United States, miscellaneous No. 34, and certain charges made during a hearing before the 10th Circuit Judicial Council.

The two main problems before the subcommittee can be stated generally as follows:

First. Whether the 10th Circuit Judicial Council has been granted legal authority to strip a Federal district court judge of his judicial powers, or whether that power was usurped by the said judicial council; and

Second. Whether any of the said judges have so conducted himself that he has committed an impeachable offense.

The seriousness of these issues requires that they be treated with the strictest solemnity.

No one can criticize the objective of the subcommittee, but Mr. BROOKS went on to say that "The core of the issue is still pending before the U.S. Supreme Court in the Chandler against Judicial Council case."

He said:

The subcommittee hesitates to publicly act on this issue until the Supreme Court has reached a decision in said case.

Apparently to buttress the case for procrastination by deferring to the Su-

preme Court, Mr. BROOKS quotes the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. CELLER, as follows:

Until the Supreme Court acts (on Chandler v. Judicial Council) I do not think it would be meet or proper for the Committee on the Judiciary to intervene.

Mr. Speaker, on January 13, 1967, after reading Mr. BROOKS' remarks of January 10, 1967, and for the first time fully realizing the stranglehold the U.S. Supreme Court had on the Judiciary Committee and its subcommittee structure, I wrote the following letter:

The CHIEF JUSTICE,
The Supreme Court,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHIEF JUSTICE: The Honorable Emanuel Celler, Chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, informs me that there is pending before the United States Supreme Court the case of Chandler versus Judicial Council.

Please provide me with answers to the following questions:

1. When was the case of Chandler versus Judicial Council filed with the Supreme Court?

2. When is it anticipated the Supreme Court will make a determination in this case?

An early reply to this inquiry will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

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:

Hon. 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 materially. It is, therefore, not possible 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 makes no difference whether it is a Judge Chandler, a Judge Smith, or a Judge Jones—there is here involved the integrity of the entire Federal court system and those who occupy its benches.

The Supreme Court ought to have expedited its decision instead of procrastinating and perhaps if the Chief Justice would stop gallivanting around the world, in season and out, and at taxpayer expense, he would find time to conduct the business of the Court.

Bear in mind, too, that in this case there are grave allegations of misconduct and corruption involving a multiplicity of Federal judges—allegations that certainly shake the trust and re-

spect of citizens in the courts and justice in this land.

Is there a studied, deliberate, and diabolical hope that this case will wear itself out and quietly pass into the limbo of things forgotten?

Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said on the floor of this House on February 21, 1966—I have never met any of the principals involved in this situation. I have no personal knowledge of the character or qualifications of these jurists.

I do know that when a Federal district judge sits before a tribunal of four Federal circuit judges and makes the charges which I have quoted, as well as others—and for almost 6 years little or nothing is done to prove or disprove those 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 sad state of our judiciary in general, 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 trust and, No. 2, the principle of the separation of the powers.

As the gentleman from Iowa will recall, on February 1, I inserted an article on page 1862 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the 1-minute rule, entitled "Judge-Politicians Meet in Private 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 "Reprimand Judge Oliver" on page 2021 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 5. Yesterday I inserted an article which was entitled "Political Thicket" on page 2463. I cite these and filed them for the RECORD 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 Constitution, all of which can be cited, about the separation of the powers or the equal and coequal branches of Government. There is no question about the authority of the State legislature to redraw the congressional district lines, and there is no question about rule XI of our own House of Representatives which says:

All proposed legislation, messages, petitions memorials, and other matters relating to the subject listed under the standing committees named below shall be referred to such committees respectively—(12) the Committee on the Judiciary, subheading 1, 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 judiciary acts so capriciously and arbitrarily on the one hand, yet avers it will respect the congressional legislation precluding elections at large in the 91st and 92d Congress.

In a letter 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, one or the other, and indeed 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 patronage, for gerrymandering, and for redistricting all districts that were within 5 percent of the mean national norm in the first place; that is, the 1967 legislative action. It had been put in State legislation and signed into law by the Governor, and the people were satisfied and the candidates were filing, when this upset came along in order to accommodate, maybe, two or three different districts or persons.

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 6288 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 go into the surveillance of these 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:—meaning the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary—we Democrats do not like putting Democratic eggs under a Republican hen for the Republican hen 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 note in article 5 under the heading of "Essential Conduct":

A judge should be temperate, attentive, patient, impersonal, and since he is to administer the law and apply it to the facts, 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, arguments or communications designed 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 while 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 a judge who becomes the active promoter of the interests of one political party against another. He should avoid making political speeches, making or soliciting payment of assessments or contributions to party funds, the public endorsement of candidates for political office and participation in party conventions.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] if in view of all of these admonitions and in view of all the matters which have transpired, and further including article 34 of the Canons of Judicial Ethics which reads—"A Summary of Judicial Obligation":

In every particular his conduct should be above reproach. He should be conscientious, studious, thorough, courteous, patient, just, impartial, fearless of public clamor, regardless of public praise, and indifferent to private political or partisan influences; he should administer justice according to law and deal with his appointments as a public trust; he should not allow other affairs or his private interests to interfere with the prompt and proper performance of his judicial duties, nor should he administer the office 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 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 juridical 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 constabulary.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Iowa for bringing up this timely and erstwhile matter. Some day we should go into methods of appointment and tenure of our judiciary. Its outdoing itself in proving it needs a general overhaul.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I believe his statement about failing juridical 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 reunderline the fact that we are defaming 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.

GEN. JOHN LEONARD HINES A LIVING ARMY LEGEND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEDZI). 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 and 99 years old, 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 his former aide and frequent visitor Gen. Charles L. Bolte, retired, told him recently that the Army was now entitled to the same ration allowances as the Navy, Hines said, "Ah, they've finally made it."

Vietnam occupies a special spot in General Hines' heart because his old outfits, 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 war in Cuba and the Philippines and later to the bloody battles for trenches in France. Just before America entered World War I, he took part as adjutant general and chief of staff of the punitive expedition into Mexico with Gen. John J. Pershing.

When the United States entered the war, he went to France, May 28, 1917, as a lieutenant colonel and the assistant adjutant general of the American Expeditionary Force. Like Eisenhower, a quarter of a century later, promotions followed in rapid order. Hines became colonel, brigadier general, and then major general during the war. He won the Distinguished Service Cross for his part in the Battle of Soissons in the summer of 1918 as well as the Distinguished Service Medal and several foreign decorations. The citation to his DSC reads 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 the front lines of the 16th Infantry, located its left flank, and walking in front of the lines, encouraged the troops by his example of fearlessness and disregard of danger. He then succeeded in finding the right forward elements of the 26th Infantry, and directed the linking up of the two regiments, thereby enabling the operations to be pushed forward successfully.

Pershing said he was "No. 1 on the list of general officers known to me."

After the war, he held various command assignments until 1922 when he was deputy chief of staff to Pershing. In 1924, he was selected to be the Army's Chief of Staff by President Calvin Coolidge. Hines took the job, but he did not like it. He did not care for the paper work, desk duty, making speeches and writing memos, all an indispensable part of Washington duty. Two years later he left to command IX Corps and in 1930 he succeeded Gen. Douglas MacArthur in command of the Philippine Department. In 1932 he retired from active service at the age of 64. Hines then traveled extensively and later settled in Washington, D.C. Like many old soldiers, he missed the Army and when World War II came along, he applied for active duty. He was turned down. The Army had nothing against him—it was just that he was 73 years of age at the time.

Early in his military career, General Hines gained the reputation for sagacity, tact, and dependability which made him ever an outstanding leader. Of fine soldierly appearance and bearing, standing well over 6 feet, his presence alone inspired men to follow him, on and off the battlefield. Never unduly demonstrative and wholly devoid of flamboyance or loquacity, his calm forthrightness and effective consideration for those about him evidenced one of his favorite maxims

that loyalty works both ways—up and down. The Army and the Nation are the better for his having served them.

I submit a factsheet on this grand old soldier, prepared by the Department of the Army:

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 Offensives in 1918 until the Armistice in November. 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 regimental commander—of the 16th Infantry in the 1st Division, rose, continuously, to the further battle command of brigade, division, and corps. After the War, General Pershing 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 all respects. No 1 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, having served as his Deputy Chief of Staff for the preceding two years. Separated by eight years in age and five years as cadets, one a cavalry officer and the other an infantryman, these two, in the last ten years of service together, formed an enduring relationship of mutual respect, understanding, and cooperation.

Being retired statutorily, for age, in 1932, after 44 years of active duty, including service in the War with Spain, the Cuban Pacification, the Philippine Insurrection, the Punitive Expedition into Mexico, and World War I, and placed on the retired list of the Army in 1940 as full general by special Act of Congress, General Hines continued to enjoy the long years of retirement with his family, friends, and associates in and out of the military forces.

John Leonard Hines was born in White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, on May 21, 1868. His father, Edward Hines, son of a farmer in Ballyvaghan, County Clare, Ireland, and his mother, Mary Frances Leonard, from County Galway, emigrated—he to Richmond, Va., and she to Baltimore, Md., about 1852—on the same ship but as yet unknown to each other. It was on a post-Civil War visit to Baltimore that Edward met Mary Frances and married her. Of their seven children, three lived to maturity—John, his sister Mary Ellen, and his younger brother, William.

Schooling in the West Virginia mountain country in the post-mid nineteenth century was not an easy matter, and most of John Hines early education was gained in the typical one-room school. Fortunately, the schoolmaster saw promise in him and coached him privately, until, in 1875, he was sent for a brief period to a small private school near Concord, W. Va. Returning to White Sulphur Springs, and eager to find a road to progress, he learned from the newspaper about a competitive examination for entrance into the United States Military Academy. Coached again by another interested teacher, he won the appointment to West Point and was ordered to report in 1887.

At the Military Academy Cadet Hines had a hard time making passing grades. He had to devote all of his time to his studies, and attended few if any "hops" or other social entertainments. He stayed at West Point, almost uninterruptedly, through all his cadet years partly to continue his intensive studies and partly because there were few family funds to allow the luxury of return trips to West Virginia. During the entire four years,

seldom did anyone come to the academy to see him. Companionship came from his classmates, and from the contemporarily small classes characterizing the period came the knowledge of each other which marked the subsequent years of Army service. In his first year he gained the nickname of "Birdie", because one of his classmates, seeing him crossing the Plain with his distinctive springy walk remarked that he looked like a bird hopping along. During his cadet years his disciplinary record was high, showing then true qualities of a soldier, so well proven in the years to come, by the acid test of war. He took great interest in athletics and was one of the mainstays of one of Army's first great football teams.

Graduating in the Class of 1891, he was commissioned 2d Lieutenant and assigned to the 2d Infantry at Fort Omaha, Nebraska. He served there and at Fort Harrison, Montana, until the Spring of 1898, when the regiment proceeded via Tampa to land at Cienfuegos and take part in the Santiago Campaign. He served with his regiment throughout the campaign, at the battle of San Juan Hill, and was later cited in War Department orders for gallantry in action there.

During a brief return to the United States, Lieutenant Hines, on December 19, 1898, in Columbus, Ohio, married Harriet Schofield (Rita) Wherry, one of the daughters of Colonel (later Brig. Gen.) William M. Wherry, a Civil War Veteran and holder of the Medal of Honor, who had been his commanding officer. Two children were born of this marriage, Alice Grammar in 1900, and John Leonard, Jr., in 1905.

Returning to serve another year in Cuba, Lieutenant Hines resumed the early gaining of the practical experience in finance, supply, and administration begun in his post-graduation years, which—as did in fact his experiences under fire and in command—did much in the years to come to round out his high qualities for command and staff. In the after years of reminiscence General Hines was wont to recall that as a junior officer in the isolated doldrums of peacetime post life he found that there were always tasks, aside from troop duty and drill, which, though often assigned, could still otherwise be undertaken by the willing young officer and much of future use be thereby learned, tasks which most officers, after a time preferred to avoid.

Again after only a few brief months in the United States, during which he was promoted and assigned to the 23d Infantry, Captain Hines proceeded, with a detachment of recruits, to station with his regiment on the island of Marinduque in the Philippines. On scouting duty at Boac, in skirmishes with the insurrectos at Nalabut and Yba, he was commended by the island commander. After transfer to Jolo and return home for duty as regimental and post quartermaster at Plattsburg Barracks, he again proceeded to the Philippines for similar duties at Malabang, Mindanao. Here again he took the field, this time against hostile Moros.

The subsequent years, until 1916, found Captain Hines on various state-side assignments, principally quartermaster, as also at Nagasaki, Japan, and again in the Philippines—this time with the 19th Infantry. After his fifth return to the United States and promotion to major and battalion command in the 6th Infantry, he soon began a series of assignments in the then important position of adjutant and adjutant general, finally as such with General Pershing's Punitive Expedition against Pancho Villa.

It was from this initial closer relationship that came the inclusion of Lieutenant Colonel Hines in the first group of officers selected by General Pershing to begin the staff of what became GHQ—the headquarters of the American Expeditionary Forces. A five months period of this service, during which he was promoted again, was ended in Oc-

tober, 1917, by his assignment to command the 16th Infantry in the 1st Division, then in training in northeastern France. It was here, during the severe conditions of winter, including tours of trench duty, that Colonel Hines, faced with the common problems of developing competent officers, devised a system of training staff supervision which later proved its worth in battle. Although under fire at times during the so-called quiet training period, the troops began their offensive battle experience with the move to the Montdidier area, north of Paris, to aid in stemming the rising tide of the German offensive.

There ensued, for the 1st Division, the fierce actions in the Cantigny-Montdidier area, a prelude to its drive against the hinge of the German salient south of Soissons. Promoted during the first week of May, and assigned to command the 1st Brigade, General Hines' dynamic and effective leadership in battle was such as to elicit later from his division commander, Major General Summerall, the comment: "He is the highest type of man and soldier, and I believe that in war or in peace there is no task too great for him to perform with credit to himself and to the country. He commanded the 1st Infantry Brigade during the battle of Soissons and the occupation of the Saizeras sector. He was distinguished by his masterful leadership, his unswerving loyalty, his indomitable courage, his wonderful endurance, and his skill as a tactician. The success of the 1st Division in the desperate fighting at Soissons is due in great measure to the qualities General Hines displayed in the operations."

After the successful Aisne-Marne counter-offensive, General Hines was promoted to major general and assigned to command the 4th Division, which had also participated in that battle, and was re-assembling in northeastern France in preparation for the American Army attack on the St. Mihiel salient. In a matter of just a few days, General Hines drew together the elements of his division, moved it into line on the northwest hinge of the offensive, and shortly after the success of the comparatively brief battle, moved it westward across the Meuse and into line for the great Meuse-Argonne Offensive. Again the evidence of his outstanding battle leadership, in the rapid initial advance of the division, came to the fore and resulted in less than three weeks in his elevation to the command of the Third Corps. In the continuing action he directed the corps in a successful crossing of the strongly held Meuse river line, one of the most difficult operations in war and in this case one made doubly difficult by lack of space for maneuver.

General Hines continued in command of the Third Corps after the Armistice, during the march into Germany, and the occupation of the Rhine bridgehead. Upon the dissolution of the AEF General Hines returned briefly to GHQ until his return to the United States in early September, 1919. There followed for him a series of divisional commands with the dwindling forces of the early post-war years, culminating in the command of the Eighth Corps Area. Then, in 1922, General Pershing called him to Washington as his deputy, and as his successor as Chief of Staff two years later. His selection to these highest Army assignments and approval therefor by his civilian superiors was influenced in large measure by his characteristic ability of going always straight to the heart of any problem and producing a swift, clear-cut, and workable solution. Here, again, his earlier practical administrative experience in the junior and field grades served him well, in finance, supply, and personnel, especially in view of the then growing curtailments in troop strengths and military budgets, and the necessity of closing or disposing of posts and other installations no longer needed or supportable.

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 outdoor soldier who liked best to be on horseback with troops training in the field—but who could gallop on the dance floor at a post hop as well as on a horse—he was less happy at a desk in an assignment with inescapable political overtones at the seat of government. So, when his years on the War Department came to a close, he went to command the corps area farthest from Washington, in San Francisco, and then, for his final year of active service, to a scene of his earlier years, the Philippines. Much of his initial years in retirement was spent in his boyhood home of White Sulphur Springs.

CONCERNING AN EXCHANGE OF CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, AND SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS OF FAYETTE COUNTY, GA.

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 took place, the substance of 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 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 the two letters written on successive days by Mrs. Martin and by Mr. Henderson. This letter from Mr. Bowers to Mrs. Martin asked for a clarification of an apparent conflict in the substance of two letters.

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 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 in my 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 office called 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:

JANUARY 31, 1968.

Mrs. RUBY G. MARTIN,
Director, Operations Division, Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

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, February 6, 1968. If the Board approves the plan we will forward same to you by February 15, 1968.

We hereby request delay in any further action by your office until February 15, at which time you would have the opportunity to review the plan submitted for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A. EUGENE BOWERS,
Superintendent, Fayette County Schools.

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.

On January 31, 1968, Mr. Bowers sent me a copy of this letter—same date—to Mrs. Martin attached to an original letter—January 31, 1968—addressed to me, as follows:

FAYETTE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Fayetteville, Ga., January 31, 1968.

Hon. JOHN J. FLYNT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLYNT: Enclosed you will find a copy of a letter of this date to Mrs. Ruby Martin. You will also find a copy of a letter from Lloyd Henderson dated December 8, 1967 and 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 officials of H.E.W. have sent conflicting statements to us. The plan which Ruby Martin recommended would not be feasible inasmuch as facilities would not permit implementation of her plan. 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."

We appreciate very much your getting a delay in action by the Office for Civil Rights to bring about an immediate hearing until February 15. This will give us time to get approval for evening classes in Business Education for the remainder of this school term and also time to get approval for additional NDEA projects in the amount of \$12,000 and for additional allocations in Title I funds for this term of approximately \$5,000.

Sincerely,

A. EUGENE BOWERS,
Superintendent, Fayette County Schools.

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 in action by the Office for Civil Rights to bring about an immediate hearing until February 15. This will give us time to get approval for evening classes in Business Education for the remainder of this school term and also time to get approval for additional NDEA Projects in the amount of \$12,000 and for additional allocation in Title I funds for this term of approximately \$5,000.

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 demonstrate his efforts at and accomplishment of integration of classes prior to February 15, 1968. This is evidence of good faith.

He also planned to use the additional NDEA projects to encourage transfers of students and faculty to participate in these new classes to be funded by NDEA funds. I have no information of the purpose for which the additional \$5,000 in title I would be used.

The application on file for the funds for evening classes in business education states the urgency of beginning classes by February 5, 1968, in order to give a full semester credit for these courses to students in both high schools in Fayette County.

Mr. Bowers sent me a copy of his letter to Mrs. Martin and I assume he sent her a copy of his letter to me since both were written and mailed at the same time.

I received both letters on February 1, 1968, and I assume Mrs. Martin received both letters on the same date.

Mr. F. Peter Libassi and I discussed this in my office on yesterday, February 7, 1968, for approximately 2 hours.

Upon my arrival in my office on yester-

day, 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 heretofore granted based upon "concrete" evidence which they had received that the Fayette County Board of 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 15 February 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 application 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 for all new activities are likewise to be deferred.

Detailed letter to follow.

(Signed) F. PETER LIBASSI.

Immediately following the conversation with Mrs. Martin, we called Superintendent Bowers and told him the contents of the telephone conversation with Mrs. Martin. He replied, "Yes, I have already received that telegram." Among other things, the fact that Mr. Bowers had already received that telegram indicated without question that the telegram from Mr. Libassi had been dispatched to Mr. Bowers prior to the time that Mrs. Martin called my office to advise of the action of revocation which the Office had taken.

Mr. Bowers tells me that the facts are, that on Tuesday night, February 6, 1968, the Fayette County Board of Education met and approved the recommendation of Mr. Bowers, the superintendent of schools, for the further integration of students and faculty in three of the Fayette County schools and included a plan for the orderly integration of the remaining schools in Fayette County.

I immediately requested a personal conference with Mr. F. Peter Libassi, Director of the Office of Compliance, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and he agreed to come to my office at approximately 2:45 p.m. the same date. Mr. Libassi did in fact come to my office at approximately 2:45 p.m. this same date, and stated, that while he ratified the decision, the decision had not in reality been made by him. He stated that Mrs. Martin made the determination and asked him to ratify it, which he did. He was asked by me what evidence he had to support his conclusion that the Fayette County Board of Education and the Fayette County school superintendent had not acted in good faith. He refused to state what this evidence was. He not only refused to state what the evidence was, he refused to state the source either by individual or by cate-

gory of such information upon which he had relied.

He told me that he had been told by another person, who had been told by still another unidentified person, that the Fayette County Board of Education had acted in bad faith. This is hearsay and rumor in either the third or fourth degree. It is not factual and it is not evidence.

Upon this third- or fourth-hand report of rumor and hearsay evidence, he deliberately revoked an extension which he had previously granted in writing. Relying upon this written extension of time, the school superintendent and the Board of Education of Fayette County formulated a plan which by any reasonable and objective evaluation complied with all rules, regulations, guidelines, and laws under which the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is administered.

This unprovoked and unjustified action which was taken by Mr. Libassi impugns the character and integrity of Superintendent Bowers, each member of the board of education and, through them, the character and integrity of that county.

His action has nothing to do with the adequacy of the action taken by the board of education on February 6, 1968. It demonstrates his own bad faith and his own incredibility. He revoked his own previous action without either evidence or facts and solely on a conclusion.

The action taken by Mr. Libassi is unworthy of a Federal employee or official.

I call upon him to reinstate his and Mrs. Martin's letter of February 2, 1968, and to extend his apology to Mr. Bowers and the Fayette County Board of Education. In the absence of such reinstatement and apology, I call upon the President of the United States to order the immediate dismissal of Mr. F. Peter Libassi and Mrs. Ruby G. Martin.

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 in the February 4 edition of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, titled "A Busy Day With Cardinal Krol," which I include, under leave granted:

A BUSY DAY WITH CARDINAL KROL

(By Thomas J. Monahan)

By choice he is a man of God. By circumstance, he is a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church.

Wrapped up in the six-foot frame of John Cardinal Krol, Cleveland's contribution to 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 want to be popular, but I can't shirk my responsibility," the 57-year-old cardinal told me recently during a day I spent with him on 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 his archdiocese will make him popular. Nothing a leader does meets with unanimous consent and Cardinal Krol is an astute observer of 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 is 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 Human Relations Award for "his leadership in the Ecumenical movement both nationally and internationally; his efforts in carrying out the directives of Vatican Council II; his work in bettering race relations in America; his labors on behalf of nationality groups, his missionary endeavors among American Indians 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 the day he was born, Oct. 26, 1910. The final product was the making of a cardinal.

He is the fourth of eight children of the late John and Anna Pietruszka Krol who came here from Poland in 1901. His father was a machinist.

He attended St. Hyacinth Parish School on the city's southeast side and graduated from Cathedral Latin School in 1927. In Latin's 1927 yearbook there is this tribute:

"The pleasure one feels in the consciousness of having performed his duty is the reward one receives for all his pain. John must certainly feel this most delectable sensation. He does his duty, never swerves from it; his conscience tells him he is right and he leaves the consequences to God."

While in school, John Krol followed his father's advice: "Watch anyone at work and you can learn to do the job yourself."

When he was 15, a classmate got a paper-hanging job and asked Krol if he could do the job with him. He did and there were no complaints.

His working versatility ranged from hair-cutting through plumbing, masonry work, carpentry and gardening. After high school he worked as a meat cutter for a chain store.

At 18 he was named manager of one of the stores. When the chain decided to bond its managers, young Krol, who was below the bonding age, resigned not only from the store but from a way of life. He chose instead to make an alliance with God.

The future cardinal's mother, whenever her household chores permitted, used to attend mass during the week and this deep religious commitment was passed on to her son.

When she died in 1946, John Krol was al-

ready on the rise—a monsignor and vice chancellor of the Cleveland Catholic Diocese.

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" in his episcopal seal: *Deus Rex Meus* (God is my king).

Following his ordination in 1937, John Krol studied canon law—church law—in Rome and Catholic University, Washington, D.C., where he received his doctorate.

It was partly through canon law that he came to the attention of an apostolic delegate to the United States, Archbishop Amleto Cicognani, now the Vatican's secretary of state and himself a cardinal.

While driving the late Archbishop Edward F. Hoban and then-Archbishop Cicognani to Cleveland from Cincinnati some 20 years ago, the then Monsignor Krol was asked by Archbishop Hoban to solve a problem in canon law. His evaluation brought him more problems for solutions and cemented a friendship that had begun on a teacher-to-pupil plain some 10 years earlier when John Krol was a canon law student in Rome.

In 1951 John Krol was named chancellor of the diocese here by Archbishop Hoban. Two years later he became auxiliary bishop to Archbishop Hoban. Seven years ago he was named archbishop of Philadelphia.

His administrative abilities are unquestioned in ecclesiastical circles.

Since arriving on the banks of the Schuylkill River on March 22, 1961, to become the 10th archbishop of the Philadelphia Catholic Archdiocese, he has been a busy man indeed. Sometimes his working day is 20 hours—and younger priests marvel.

James McCaffrey, who has been chauffeur-ing cardinals in Philadelphia for 26 years, said in what this visitor assumed to be a distinct Philadelphia dialect: "There is no comparison between the previous two cardinals and his eminence. He doesn't let any grass grow under his feet."

Around Philadelphia they call him "Your eminence" but he still answers to monsignor or bishop whenever a friend forgets.

Cardinal Krol puts in a seven-day week. He occasionally finds time for a round of golf—he shoots in the low 80s or high 70s—and out-of-town speaking engagements often mean a break in his schedule.

His day usually begins about 6:30 a.m. An hour later he offers mass in his private chapel for his house staff. After breakfast he opens his mail and takes care of appointments before leaving for his chancery office.

He sometimes drives to the chancery, a 120-year-old home at 228 N. 18th Street, next door to SS. Peter and Paul Cathedral in downtown Philadelphia. Once in a while he chauffeurs one of his aides to the office.

He uses his own key to open the front door. Most of the offices of the archdiocese are scattered throughout the downtown area because of the lack of a central office building.

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. But they are a necessary part of life."

Cardinal Krol thrives on those meetings. It gives him a chance to meet more people and to explain his church to them.

Shortly before suppertime, Cardinal Krol will drive the nine miles to his home at 5700 City Avenue in northwest Philadelphia. Any time left before dinner is eaten up by opening more mail. Occasionally he has a guest.

Two of his aides, Msgr. James F. Connolly, his secretary, and Msgr. Philip J. Dowling, executive secretary of the cardinal's Commission on Human Relations, usually dine with him.

After dinner the cardinal visits his chapel for a few moments of silent prayer and then

on his way to his room, he stops off in a nearby parlor and plays on the piano. He is an accomplished pianist.

The cardinal occupies only two of the nearly 40 rooms in the home. His second floor suite consists of a combination office-sitting room and bedroom. The remainder of the house is used by his aides and a house staff. There are several guest suites and three small chapels for visitors.

In his room after supper he will work on matters he couldn't clear up during the day. Chauffeur McCaffrey said he often sees the cardinal's lights on well after 1 a.m.

What sort of a man is he?

Two years after coming to Philadelphia two firemen died while fighting a fire in one of the parochial schools. Then-Archbishop Krol immediately went to the homes of the widows and gave them each checks for \$5,000.

Another time a priest remarked at a dinner meeting that he was going to buy a car.

"A two-door, your eminence."

"How about your mother? She's still crippled with arthritis, isn't she?"

"But that's all I can afford."

"Nonsense," said the cardinal, "You can afford more when it comes to your mother."

The priest bought the four-door.

Last Dec. 27 Cardinal Krol met with 260 of his 819 pastors to discuss financing the diocese and to plan several major construction projects including a new chancery building and a new seminary.

He held a dinner for the priests and then presented two plans for financing to them.

Afterward one of the pastors said, "I've never heard of such a thing—a cardinal asking me how I want to finance a diocesan program."

That choice won't be made by the pastors, a spokesman for the cardinal said later. Letters have been sent to the cardinal from the pastors telling him they will accept any plan he wants to put into effect. And they suggested that Cardinal Krol went overboard in giving them an opportunity to express their opinions.

"He did it the hard way," one pastor said. "He didn't have to get up in front of us and ask us. He could have sent a letter out and told us and we would have accepted his decision."

His rapport with his pastors is growing steadily. He has traveled over most of the five-county archdiocese and met most of them.

Cardinal Krol operates a school system that has been expanded by some \$27 million in new building in the past five years. It yearly educates some 60,000 students, tuition free. Pastors pay \$150 for each student.

The cardinal is proud of the system and is refusing to yield to some pressure to limit it.

The far-reaching consequences of Vatican Council II are still being felt in all areas of church life. Shaping those programs that have changed Catholic life in the past five years was one of the tasks of Cardinal Krol.

Other American bishops point to him as the single force behind the smooth running of the worldwide meetings of bishops. He used his administrative talents to their fullest while in Rome during the four council sessions and in the preparatory sessions.

He was the only American prelate to serve in the preparatory stages of the Council after Pope John XXIII called it.

When it opened, he was one of its five undersecretaries. When it closed Pope Paul VI named him to the committee to implement the decrees throughout the world.

Last June 26, Pope Paul named him a cardinal.

With the rank came the obligation of electing a successor to Pope Paul and helping administer the worldwide church. But worldwide obligations are familiar to him because

of the Council contacts, especially among the other religions.

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, "we had a charitable understanding. We always find ourselves taking pretty nearly the same viewpoint on civic and community affairs. And we don't give the ecumenical movement a wan smile and pretend there are no differences. We know there are differences, but we know that we are instruments in the hands of God and we approach those differences with honesty and sincerity."

Bishop Corson said in Rome last summer of Cardinal Krol: "He and I think like each other, and that's not always true of people 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 a 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 students quietly formed a 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 getting involved in human relations work. On their days off they help supervise the Community Service Corps volunteers and visit homes of the inner city residents.

In opening his schools to youngsters of all faiths, the cardinal made only one major stipulation: the youngsters must obey the rules of the schools. He told his priests, nuns and lay teachers not to talk about baptism until the parents ask for it.

Working quietly, his Human Relations Commission helped pass a fair housing ordinance for Philadelphia and a state law.

There are only two topics that Cardinal Krol will not discuss either privately or publicly and they are birth control and celibacy.

His aides say he is obeying Pope Paul who asked his bishops to remain silent on both issues, especially the birth control question, until a decision is made by him.

He feels that the church is moving ahead, despite what some critics say. He urges the liturgical reforms allowed by Rome.

As a canon law expert he hopes the church law will be overhauled and disclosed that he spoke at the recent Synod of Bishops in Rome and asked that such a move be made. He proposed that the new church law be restyled to fit into three categories: constitutional, pertaining to church dogma and thus never needing updating; common law, a section that would need little revision, and particular law, that could be updated at will.

His impressions of Pope Paul were gained first-hand. "I think he is a tremendous strategist. He makes certain, firm, definite progress. And the progress he makes is the progress that holds."

Asked if there will ever be a need for another Vatican Council, the cardinal said: "I would venture to say, with absolutely no claim to prophecy, that while the ecumenical council was a tremendous blessing, the Synod of Bishops will bring into the Vatican the blessings of the Council almost on a regular basis, so that the Vatican will be alert and aware of the needs and problems of the church throughout the entire world. And consequently can adjust its directives and legislation to meet these needs."

He doubts whether people can rightfully

call the Vietnam war immoral, because they lack all the facts. "I wouldn't even claim to know all the facts that are involved although I have been to briefings with Secretary of State Rusk and have direct information from Vietnam through a priest who ran the Catholic Relief Services there for 17 years.

"You demonstrate for a purpose to achieve a purpose. But demonstrations should bring you to the negotiations table."

He has grave reservations about nuns and priests demonstrating for the sake of civil rights. He believes priests should preach the Gospel of Christ to reemphasize the twin commandments of love. "That is as it should be."

Regarding the roles of the secular and Catholic press: "Both have similar roles, to tell the truth, the whole truth. You have a tendency today with some journalists of selective reporting. They will report only what appeals to them.

"And there is 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 New York [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, similar to that introduced in the other 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, establish 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 special 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 diversion of funds disclosed in congressional investigations;

Sixth, establish a U.S. Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission to administer the requirements of this bill, subject to judicial review; and

Seventh, consolidate in the Commission most existing Federal regulatory

standards relating to pension and welfare plans, thereby relieving employers, unions, 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 their productive years in the hope they will receive enough compensation in their later years to insure 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 that 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 possibility of developing an institution arrangement 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."

That 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 employers, unions, 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. GERALD R. FORD. 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 excellent 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 taken by 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 valued at almost \$4 billion is lost through crime every year. Millions of dollars are taken from the productive economy by organized racketeers—money that 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 neglected.

For decades the conditions that nourish crime have been gathering force.

Republicans 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 problem. The fact and fear of crime stalks our Nation. Since 1960 the reported rate of crime has increased over 88 percent. This alarming increase cannot be attributed to population growth, which has increased only 10 percent since 1960.

Republicans believe that the administration must account to the Nation for these figures. All levels of government—local, State, and National—share responsibility for the safety of our Nation.

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 effort. The greatest failure of the Johnson administration is its failure to provide Americans with this much needed leadership. No program can fill a leadership gap.

Republicans welcome the President's pledge to fight crime. 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 effectively respond to 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.

Crime must be brought under control and 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—the 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 not only is concerned about but also that he finally means to do 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. It is apparent that 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. I suggest that 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 of crime measures which is so urgently needed in the Congress this year. This is all to the good. Whatever the motives behind the President's new posture, the end result will benefit all Americans. By embracing some Republican ideas he has at the very least laid a predicate for a meaningful dialog on an issue that troubles every thoughtful American regardless of party.

Those who heard the President's message and who had an opportunity to read it since recognize, I think, its distinct Republican flavor. It contained much of Republican origination and Republican orientation. Of the 22 proposals specifically explained by the President, four

have such a Republican orientation. The immunity legislation which the President called upon the Congress to enact is 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 would make a proper shop for the conduct of basic research in new techniques in law enforcement and in prisoner rehabilitation. 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 FBI at Quantico.

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 all will recall the legislation, after it passed the House, went to the other body where it died that year. I think the date upon which the bill was debated is significant. That date was July 19, 1967. And, in order to demonstrate that the President's recommendation 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, at pages 19362–19363, a portion of the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. He stated in part as follows:

The distinguished Attorney General on "Meet The Press" last Sunday said he was opposed to this bill . . . And in the conversation that I had with the Attorney General in my office yesterday he repeated to me that he was opposed to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, "yesterday" would have been July 18. July 18 was 4 days after the first outbreak of the Newark riots and, now, some several months later, for the first time the President is recommending the adoption of antiriot legislation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman 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 at the time of the original hearings which were held on the anti-riot proposal of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], I wonder if I am not correct in my recollection of the hearings that 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 thing is that 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.

Last year 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. NEDZI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The excerpts referred to follow:

I. ORGANIZED CRIME

1. *Electronic surveillance*—a bill which outlaws all wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping except by law enforcement officials under Court approval and continuing 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 combatting organized crime. The McCulloch-Ford bill (H.R. 13275, October 3, 1967), co-sponsored by the Task Force, follows the blue-print for such legislation fashioned by the Supreme Court in the *Berger* case.

2. *Witness immunity*—a bill to expand the power of the Government to compel the testimony of hostile witnesses by granting them immunity from prosecution when they plead the Fifth Amendment during the investigation and during the trial of certain organized crime cases. Title II of the Criminal Procedures Revision Act (H.R. 11267, June 29, 1967), co-sponsored by the Task Force contains this provision.

3. *Loan-sharking*—a bill (H.R. 14373, December 11, 1967) which would make it a federal crime to lend money at rates of interest prohibited by State law whenever such a loan interferes with or affects interstate commerce or whenever any part of the loan transaction or efforts at collection cross state lines. In addition to the Chairman and members of the Task Force, this bill is

sponsored by the Minority leader, the ranking Minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the ranking Minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

4. *Obstruction of investigation*—a bill which would make it a federal crime to interfere with or obstruct investigations by federal agents by the intimidation of potential witnesses. Legislation of this nature was passed by the Congress and enacted into law during the First Session. It was first proposed by Rep. William Cramer (R.-Fla.), a Task Force member, in 1960, and is contained in Title I of the Criminal Procedures Revision Act.

5. *False statements*—a bill which makes the rules of evidence in perjury prosecutions less rigid and more realistic. This is contained in Title II of the Criminal Procedures Revision Act and was recommended by the Katzenbach Crime Commission.

6. *Profits from Criminal activities*—a bill which makes it a federal crime to invest money which has been earned from illegal racket activities in legitimate businesses. This is the Criminal Activities Profits Act (H.R. 11268, June 29, 1967) co-sponsored by the Task Force.

7. *Funds unreported for tax purposes*—a bill which makes it a federal crime to invest money which has not been reported for income tax purposes in legitimate business. This is H.R. 11266, co-sponsored by the Task Force, and principally aimed at organized crime.

8. *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.

II. INVESTIGATIONS AND PRETRIAL PROCEDURES

1. *Motions 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. H.R. 8654, proposed by Rep. Thomas Railsback (R.-Ill.), a member of the Task Force, is such a bill and such a provision is contained in Title I of the Task Force sponsored Criminal Procedures Revision Act. The bill has passed the House.

2. *Searches incident to arrests*—a bill to codify, and make less confusing, the existing law of search and seizure where lawful arrests are involved. Title I of the Criminal Procedures Revision Act contains a provision to this effect.

3. *Searches pursuant to warrants*—a bill to permit the issuance of search warrants for property which constitutes evidence of the offense in connection with which the warrant is issued. This is in conformity with a recent Supreme Court decision (*Warden v. Hayden*). It is the subject of H.R. 8653, proposed by Rep. Railsback, and contained in Title I of the Criminal Procedures Revision Act.

4. *Execution of search warrants*—a bill to permit the issuance of search warrants authorizing the officer executing it to enter the place to be searched without announcing his identity and purpose where the Judge or Commissioner has determined that physical evidence sought is likely to be destroyed or when danger to the officer exists. This is one of the provisions of the Criminal Procedures Revision Act, patterned after H.R. 8652, sponsored by Rep. Railsback.

III. THE POLICE

1. *Survivorship and disability benefits*—a proposal to provide Federal survivorship and disability benefits for local police and non-federal law enforcement officers who are killed or injured while assisting federal officers in the apprehension of, for example, bank robbers, kidnappers and AWOL military personnel. The Survivorship Program originally proposed was broadened to include a

disability program in a bill introduced by Chairman Poff and endorsed by the Task Force. This legislation passed the House this year.

IV. THE COURTS

1. *Bail reform*—a proposal to re-examine and amend the Bail Reform Act of 1966 to allow the Courts more discretion in granting or denying release on personal recognizance to defendants who are found to be a danger to the community or in revoking the release of those who have committed other crimes after release.

2. *Federal Magistrates*—a bill to abolish the present U.S. Commissioner system and to replace it with a lower-tier of judicial officers, U.S. Magistrates, who are empowered to handle minor trials and otherwise perform routine Court functions that presently occupy the time of Federal judges that ought to be devoted to more serious matters. S. 945, proposed by Senator Tydings (D.-Md.) and Scott (R.-Pa.) is such a bill.

V. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

1. *The District Anti-Crime bill*—an omnibus anti-crime bill dealing with special law enforcement proposals for the District of Columbia. H.R. 10783 passed the House on June 26, 1967, by a vote of 355 to 14.

2. *Appropriations and personnel*—proposals to increase the authorized strength of the District of Columbia Police Department, to increase the staff of the District Bail 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 omissions in the President's message, I believe, should 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 known as the safe streets bill; finally under amendment in committee it became known as the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Act. The President did recommend again the passage of the safe streets bill, but seemed anxious to insist that the bill which is passed by the Congress be the bill which he proposed to the Congress.

The Republican amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL], we believe, made a significant improvement in the legislation, and we trust that the president will see fit to lend his endorsement and pronounce his endorsement in the other body.

At that point I believe parenthetically it should be said that we Republicans agree with the President when he makes the point that essentially law enforcement is a responsibility of State and local governments. And we do agree, because we share the concern of all thoughtful people that too much concentration of too much power at the Federal level of government tends toward the develop-

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 the 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 wish 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 House of Representatives in August of last year. I am sure the gentleman joins with me in deploring 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 local and State 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—

Our best estimate is that the federal investment under this act—

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 \$300 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 retreating from \$300 million to \$100 million in his recommended support of the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act for its second year; namely, fiscal year 1969.

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 committee 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 eloquently 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 able supporters of the efforts and leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL], specifically to Republican Congressman BIESTER of Pennsylvania, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAILSBACK], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY], who were the prime architects in supporting the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] in developing and gaining wide support from Republicans and Democrats 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.

This is the impact of the bill. There is no special activity or special magic that the Federal Government brings to this situation.

Mr. POFF. I am glad the gentleman has brought out that point. All those who are knowledgeable in the field agree, 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 to 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, be anything that he said in his message,

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 by 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. I think that this was an activity for the great benefit of the United States, that the gentleman in the well perfected this amendment to make loan sharking a Federal crime, and secured its attachment to the truth-in-lending bill.

I am interested to note that the President in his message said:

Organized crime is big business in America.

I think this is something that Republicans in this House and the Republican task force on crime have been saying loudly and clearly for some time. He went on to say that—

Its sinister effect pervades too many corners of America today—through gambling, loan sharking, corruption, extortion, and large movement of narcotics.

I am hopeful also, with the gentleman in the well, that the President's omission to say anything about specific legislation in regard to loan sharking indicates that he will support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman for his kind comments.

May I reciprocate by saying how fortunate the task force is to have a member with the distinguished background that he has enjoyed at the bar and on the bench.

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

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

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I saw some consternation on the faces of those who remain as I walked in with these eggs. I want to assure you I am not planning to pelt anyone with them. I would like, rather, to pass out some bouquets to the chairman of our crime task force, who has been tirelessly and thoughtfully exploring the scope of this issue, which is so important to the American people.

This task force has been working hard for a long time, and I am proud to have been a member of it. I think it will continue to work hard for some time to come. While this is not a partisan issue, it is an issue of the people—really the people's greatest issue. It certainly is the

kind of issue that should have the attention of us all, regardless of party, regardless of our particular concerns in this field.

I think we all welcomed the President's message this week. We welcomed the assessment of this very shrewd politician that this is a major issue. We welcomed an indication that he was putting the prestige of his office behind a leadership posture which would be more constructive in the reduction of this issue and the reduction of the terrible concerns of the American people for the safety of the streets.

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 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, progress that is desperately needed.

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 commerce of the most nefarious sort.

We look forward to some new approaches, to some new vigor in the fight against organized crime, if the President's message means what we all hope it does, because in the final analysis, this battle cannot be fought with words. It has to be fought with leadership of the highest order, it has to be fought with determination, and it has to be fought by all sides of our political system, by all parts of our Government.

I know the Republican task force on crime will indicate its efforts and its best thought to continuing the battle we have now been fighting for a year, in cooperation with the President if possible, but, regardless of partisanship and regardless of the possibilities of cooperation, at least to the fullest extent of our capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, again I commend the speaker in the well for the remarkable contributions he has made, for his diligence, for his thoughtfulness, and for the leadership he has given to our task force.

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

I know all on the task force agree with me when I say that the gentleman brings a great reservoir of talent to our efforts.

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

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on what the gentleman from New York has just said, and agree with him that crime and riots are

not a partisan issue, but the responsibility of all the Members of Congress—my responsibility—and the responsibility of the people of this great country.

Also, I join with my colleagues in commending the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Virginia, on his vast knowledge of legislation pertaining to crimes and riots. I certainly agree with the gentleman we need stronger legislation in this field.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend—and I use the word "friend" carefully. I count him truly as a friend, and I only hope I can deserve the tribute he just paid me.

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

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

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that the gentleman from Mississippi would be welcome on the Republican task force on crime. He has only to make one modest change.

Mr. Speaker, we all appreciate the character of the gentleman's contributions to the fight against crime.

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

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

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, today a clergyman from St. Paul, Minn., visited me in my office. He is one of a number of Minnesota clergymen who has made a commitment to do more in the contest against the growing incidents of juvenile delinquency both in his city and in the State of Minnesota.

He commended me on my appearance a week ago Friday night at Macalester College in St. Paul as the final banquet speaker at a meeting of clergy and laymen concerned about juvenile delinquency.

I gave him a copy of the President's crime message of yesterday. He sat in my office while I was on a long distance telephone call, and read from the message, and later quoted to me the following words of the President of the United States:

I propose the passage of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act.

This clergyman said to me: "Congressman, do you think it will pass?" I said: "It already has passed the House of Representatives, in September of last year. To be sure the House in its wisdom rewrote the bill recommended by the administration. It tailored the bill to the Republican philosophy of the proper role for the Federal Government in the fight against juvenile delinquency, and it passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming majority." The clergyman look at me and said: "I find no reference to that fact in the President's message. Could you tell me why?" I said: "Sir, you have not addressed your question to the right party. I cannot look into the mind of another man."

I said: "I will make available to you the full text of the bill as passed by the House in September of last year, the bill which will make a meaningful contribution to the fight against juvenile delinquency, which will do so in a proper and most humanitarian way. I will also send you a copy of the debate in the House

of Representatives, so that you may understand the reasons for the rejection by the House of Representatives of the administration recommendations and the adoption of those put forward under the leadership of individual Republican Congressmen serving in the House."

He said: "I hope you will. Is it not too bad that you do not have a voice equal to that of the occupant of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, so that the entire country would understand that excellent progress legislatively in the Congress has already been made on this problem of juvenile delinquency prevention?"

Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, attention can eventually be drawn to the impasse which exists in the U.S. Senate, and whatever reasons there may be for the delay, that those reasons will disappear, and inaction will end and action will take place in our other Chamber across the other side of this building.

All Americans deeply concerned about the growing rise of crime and juvenile delinquency should indeed be demanding that our sister Chamber take the same sort of constructive action which was taken here in the House of Representatives last August and last September.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman.

Before I conclude I should like to say that the thing in the President's message which disappointed me most was his insistence once again upon the wiretap bill which he first proposed. As the Members of this body will recall, the President would permit wiretaps for the gathering of evidence only in national security cases, and he would decide or allow the appropriate authorities of the Executive establishment to decide when the national security was involved and what constituted national security cases.

The legislation which the task force has endorsed, which has been introduced in this body and in the other body, would permit wiretapping only in those cases where the law-enforcement officer was able to convince an appropriate judge that the evidence could not be acquired by other techniques, to convince the judge that a crime had been committed or was being committed, to convince the judge that a court order was necessary to acquire evidence of a crime specifically named in the legislation.

Legislation of this kind has received almost universal endorsement. The concept enjoys the approval of the three previous Attorneys General, of the Judicial Conference of the United States, of the majority of the President's own Crime Commission, and of every national law enforcement association in the United States which has pronounced upon the subject.

The Attorney General of the United States today stands almost alone in his opposition to that legislation.

The urgency of that legislation is greater today than it was before Monday of last week. On that day the Supreme Court rendered two decisions which jointly had the effect of nullifying the utility of the gambling tax statutes under which so many of the organized criminals of this country have been brought to the bar of justice. Now that law enforcement officers are stripped of that means of assembling evidence it is all the more important that this carefully de-

vised legislation be considered promptly and favorably by both Houses of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged to hope that the President will have the opportunity during this session of Congress to receive on his desk a bill which will incorporate as one of its essential features the legislation introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gerald R. Ford], and a number of other Members on this side of the aisle. If such legislation is a part of the bill before the President, I believe he will see fit to sign it. I cannot believe that the President could bring himself in the present state of things to veto such legislation. With that thought in mind, I trust that our committees in both the House and the other body will move promptly.

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 thank the gentleman for yielding. I must agree with the gentleman that I could not see the President bring himself to veto that kind of legislation when he reaffirmed again the statement he made last year, in his message about crime this year, in which he said:

Public order is the first business of Government.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman and my colleagues for their patience.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, we welcome President's Johnson's support in what we hope will be an all-out effort to combat and control crime. The need for such an effort has been carefully documented. Each day brings new statistics that show a skyrocketing rise in crime. Each day brings fresh evidence that something must be done to reverse the alarming trend toward lawlessness.

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, a Republican-sponsored bill that 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 can 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 easy enactment.

The statements referred to follow:

HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON THE ANTI-RIOT LEGISLATION, H.R. 421, JULY 12, 1967

The House Republican Policy Committee urges the prompt enactment of H.R. 421. This Republican sponsored legislation (the Cramer bill) would impose criminal penalties upon persons traveling in or using the facilities of interstate commerce with the intent to incite a riot.

Last year in response to a growing public demand for assistance in maintaining law and order in the streets and urban centers of our land, Republican anti-riot 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 Floor as an independent measure.

The proposed legislation represents the legitimate exercise of Federal criminal power under authority based on the commerce clause of the Constitution. Historically, certain types of conduct have been prohibited by Federal Statute when the facilities of interstate commerce are used. For example, there is the Mann Act, the prohibition against the interstate transportation of strike breakers, the Federal Kidnapping statute and the Anti-Racketeering Act.

H.R. 421 is not intended to and does not limit the right of dissent and peaceful demonstration. Legitimate activities by those who travel in interstate commerce to participate in public gatherings or other lawful demonstrations are not affected. However, those persons who use facilities in interstate commerce, or who travel from one State to another or from a foreign country to a State, in order 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 the most effective means of riot control rests with the State and local police. However, by assuring Federal jurisdiction over "out-of-State" inciters, State and local authorities will be substantially assisted in keeping the peace and protecting the public safety.

H.R. 421 would 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 summertime 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 damage unless this additional protection is afforded them.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON THE LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967, H.R. 5037, AUGUST 2, 1967

The events of recent weeks have starkly dramatized the crisis in law enforcement in this country. The very ability of government to maintain law and order and to provide personal safety has been challenged. Local law enforcement, criminal justice, techniques of correction and rehabilitation must be updated and improved.

H.R. 5037, the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act of 1967, properly amended, could be an important step in the establishment of a federal program to provide assistance to local law en-

forcement agencies. Unfortunately, the Administration bill that was originally submitted contained the standard Great Society formula. It stifled local initiative and direction and placed maximum federal control in the hands of the Attorney General. In an effort to improve the bill, the Republican Members of the Judiciary Committee obtained a number of amendments. For example:

(a) An appropriate judicial review is provided in cases where the Attorney General cuts off funds.

(b) Congressional oversight on the operation of the data bank has been established.

(c) The open-end authorization was eliminated, thereby insuring essential legislative review of this Act.

(d) The direct Federal payment of regular police salaries has been banned.

The present emergency demands that meaningful and appropriate Federal assistance be given to state and local law enforcement agencies. However, this crisis must not be used as a vehicle to place Federal control over state and local police administration and to lay the foundation for a centralized Federal police force. Therefore, additional and essential safeguards on the broad powers of the Federal Administrator should be adopted.

Law enforcement and criminal justice administration are primarily local responsibilities. Crime is essentially a local problem that must be dealt with by state and local governments. Even the Attorney General has stated, "We would hope to have all the States really working for a fully comprehensive plan for the State." Any provision or measure that would upset or reverse this historic concept must be avoided. The recent riots have reemphasized the basic fact that the State and its designated agencies must have the primary responsibility for coordinating the law enforcement effort within a state. Certainly, experience under the "poverty" program has demonstrated that failure to coordinate Federal activities with state activities creates serious financial and administrative problems.

In a letter dated June 8, 1967, the National Governors' Conference noted that "the state holds the primary responsibility for establishing the coordinating machinery needed for intergovernmental assistance programs." It was then suggested that H.R. 5037 be amended so that where a state has a plan for an appropriately balanced distribution of aid to local law enforcement activities, the Attorney General shall make all grants to the state agency designated by the Governor to administer such plan. On July 18, 1967, Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller also urged the adoption of an amendment that would "assure that the State can effectively coordinate application for assistance." Governor Rockefeller pointed out, "If comprehensive crime control envisioned by H.R. 5037 is to be effective, it is essential that the legislation recognize the primary role of the State, especially in developing a statewide comprehensive plan."

We support an amendment of this type. We believe it will provide essential state coordination and eliminate the Federal Government's power to dominate and control local law enforcement. We reject the Democratic Majority's contention that "... the Attorney General should have the maximum discretion in promulgating regulations and in administering the authorized programs to determine the population size that would be most appropriate for participation in the light of all considerations relevant to the particular programs."

We believe that an appropriate allocation formula should be adopted. In the present bill, the only limitation on the Attorney General's discretion to distribute funds, is the prohibition "that not more than 15 percent of the funds appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year to carry out the purposes

of this Act shall be used within any one State."

Certainly, there must be a statutory assurance that there will be a meaningful amount of funds available for every State.

We believe that serious consideration should be given to the establishment of a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice which in turn would be authorized to establish regional training institutes. In order to have a real impact on our law enforcement problems, the education and training of law enforcement and criminal justice personnel and research must be emphasized. Improved training of local and state law enforcement personnel in riot prevention, riot suppression and riot control is needed. New techniques for combating organized crime must be developed. These objectives can be accomplished through an Institute similar to the National Institute of Health or the National Academy of Science. Moreover, the improved methods for crime detection, prevention, prosecution, and rehabilitation can be developed and taught in this manner without the danger of dominance by the Federal Government.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, as I stood before this House, I praised certain portions of the President's message on crime. Indeed, I do find much to commend in the President's recommendations, particularly those regarding a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. If created, it could conduct research into the application of advanced scientific and technological devices for improving law enforcement, as well as for improving police training and education at Federal, State, and local levels. However, at the risk of sounding self-laudatory, I wish to remind the President—and the public—that such proposals were first put forward by Members of this House and were embodied in the substitute amendment which I offered to title III of the omnibus anticrime bill.

In fact, when one examines the President's 22 proposals to "insure public safety," one finds that they consist almost entirely of recommendations previously made by Republican Members, or are a rehash of the administration's past proposals. Careful scrutiny of the President's February 7 message reveals his concurrence with Republican thinking on the crime problem. For example:

The President urges the prompt passage of the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act—formerly heralded by the misnomer "Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967." I agree that final action should be taken on this bill—a measure which was considerably improved by a series of Republican-offered amendments passed by this House last August.

The President asks for a "major assistance program" for the purposes of educating and training the Nation's law enforcement personnel, as well as the initiation of a comprehensive research program to be conducted through a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice—virtually the sum and substance of my amendment to title III of the anticrime bill.

The President seeks a \$100 million authorization for the crime bill—an amendment offered by my Republican colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MacGREGOR] would have provided an increased authorization.

The President desires controls on the hallucinatory drug, LSD—a measure first suggested by my Republican colleague from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

The President also asks for riot control legislation—legislation which my Republican colleague from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] 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 purpose.

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 "beguiled" 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 eager 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 county 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 been setting throughout his administration. Every statistic is an indictment of his public stewardship—every line a confession of his failures to preserve to the people even the basic freedom—freedom from the fear of criminal tyranny in the streets of our cities and the homes of our land.

Crime is an issue in 1968, because the President did not make it an issue of his concern in 1967, or 1966, or 1965, or 1964—when all America was crying out for some protection for the honorable and decent citizens against the violent and corrupt criminals who seemed to enjoy unbelievable favor in the administration of justice during these years.

The folly of this foolishness has come

home. The day of reckoning is here. That is why crime is an issue, and the President cannot escape it, or wish it away.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks today following the colloquy following my special order.

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

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION REFUSES TO TELL AMERICAN PEOPLE TRUTH ABOUT "PUEBLO," BECAUSE—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, does the administration not trust the American people enough to tell them what really happened in the *Pueblo* incident? Why does the administration not release the information the Communists almost certainly have: the full texts of the messages between the *Pueblo* and higher U.S. authority? A very small part of *Pueblo*'s transmissions, just a few words, have been made public, but there has been no information of any kind as to what the *Pueblo* was told to do, or not to do.

There were 2½ hours between the time the *Pueblo* was first stopped until it went off the air; 1½ hours from the time North Korean ships moved in until it quit transmitting; 45 minutes from the time of North Korean boarding until it went silent; 20 minutes from time of North Korean orders to go to Wonsan until the last message was sent.

What did the *Pueblo* tell Washington, and what went back in return?

The administration's statements and actions to date have gone from hard-line to soft-line to contradiction to the truly incredible recommendation that we admit we were wrong whether we were or not. The net result is confusion:

Hard line: a carrier task force to the Sea of Japan; fighter squadrons to South Korea; reserve callup.

Soft line: a Presidential reminder at a news conference that it took 7 months to get the crew of an RB-47 reconnaissance plane back from the Soviet Union.

Contradiction: Ambassador Goldberg told the U.N., without qualification, that the *Pueblo* was never in North Korean waters. The Secretary of Defense says we cannot be absolutely sure of this.

Plead guilty, regardless: the Senate Democratic majority leader suggested we admit the ship was in North Korean waters, whether it was or not, if this would get it back.

Espionage may be an unpleasant fact of the cold war, but it is a very real and necessary operation and I am certain the American people know and understand this. We have other so-called spy ships and the Soviet Union has around 40.

The Soviet ships lurk outside U.S. Polaris submarine bases at Guam, at Rota, Spain, at Holy Loch, in Scotland, and, where I have seen them myself, at Charleston, S.C. They wait off the Flor-

ida coast and monitor space flights from Cape Kennedy; they circle Kwajalein Atoll, in the South Pacific, where we test antiballistic missiles. They shadow our fleet in the Mediterranean and in the Atlantic, and one now follows our naval forces in the Sea of Japan, off North Korea.

We consider 3 miles the limit for our territorial waters. According to the State Department, Soviet ships have come inside our limit on three occasions. Each time we have followed normal international practice in informing them they are trespassing, escorting them outside the limit, and protesting to Moscow.

Some countries, such as North Korea, consider 12 miles the limit. I have introduced legislation that would have 12 miles apply off our own shores to ships of all countries that claim 12 miles off their coasts.

The Soviet Union and North Korea are certainly working together now to make the whole incident as humiliating and difficult for the United States as they possibly can. We may be certain, too, that whatever intelligence data was taken from the *Pueblo* by North Korea was in Moscow in a very short time. In spite of this, we still are so naive as to seek Soviet help to get the ship and the men back. This is like asking the Mafia to handle an anticrime crusade.

Release of the messages would not tell the Communists anything they do not know. They monitor our broadcasts, too.

But release might tell the American people more about our lack of military preparedness and foresight than the administration cares for them to learn.

It might show we learned nothing from the attack on the U.S.S. *Liberty*, another electronic intelligence ship, in the Middle East last year.

The messages might show there were not enough planes available in South Korea to help handle such incidents.

The messages might show there were not enough ships available to provide some sort of naval backup and protection.

Secretary of Defense McNamara said that to have protected the ship would have been a provocative act. This is nonsense. We are quick to worry about provoking someone else, but if someone provokes us we try to excuse it, explain it away, cover it up, and temporize, giving the appearance of weakness and indecision.

"Speech is silver," says the old proverb, "but silence is golden." In this case, silence is also deceptive, evasive, and another attempt by the administration to bury a series of errors that added up to a gross tactical blunder.

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 request 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 and savings and loan associations, and those institutions were increasingly being subjected to robberies and burglaries.

It is an obligation of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee to evaluate the efficiency and 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"—House report 1147, 88th 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, hereafter called supervisory agencies, each establish by rules or regulations specific guidelines for the prevention of external and internal crimes against banking institutions under their supervision, consistent with the requirements of the several kinds and sizes of such institutions, and the public interest.

2. That in establishing such guidelines the supervisory agencies give consideration to incorporating therein, as requirements, adequate audit, compulsory vacations, direct verification, decoy money, and other widely accepted measures referred to in this report.

3. That the examiners employed by the supervisory agencies be given such training in the methods of prevention of external and internal crimes as will enable them to ascertain and advise on any security deficiencies in the institutions they examine; and that to assist in the examination for security against external crimes the examination report forms call for detailed information in that regard, similar to the American Bankers Association's bank inspection form referred to in this report.

4. That the supervisory agencies consider making it a requirement on the institutions they supervise that fingerprints of prospective officers, directors and employees of such institutions be submitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for criminal record checks.

5. That the supervisory agencies establish an interagency committee for the purposes of making a coordinated effort to lessen bank crimes through the collection and analysis of bank crime statistics and the study and development of means of combating such crimes; and to assist banking institutions toward greater security against such crimes by undertaking such research projects as may be deemed advisable, including the requirements, from the security standpoint, of a model institution, and the testing and evaluating of security means and devices.

6. That the adequacy of the institution's crime prevention facilities and procedures be

considered whenever a supervisory agency must act upon its application for charter, deposit insurance, branch offices, or any other application requiring agency approval.

7. That the supervisory agencies impress on the directors of the institutions they supervise the collective and individual responsibilities of directors for the adequate security of their institutions against losses from crimes.

8. That consideration be given to legislation which would permit the supervisory agencies to approve or disapprove major changes in management arising from changes in control or ownership of institutions they supervise, and to exclude underworld elements from becoming directors, officers, or employees of banking institutions.

Over the intervening years, as chairman of the subcommittee, I have sought to have the above recommendations carried out by the bank supervisory agencies. In many respects the results have been excellent.

For example, the supervisory agencies have inaugurated procedures requiring their examiners to check on the kinds of security features banking institutions have provided to guard against robberies and burglaries. The agencies attempt to persuade banks and savings and loan associations to submit the fingerprints of prospective officers, directors, and employees to the FBI to be checked for any criminal records. Also, legislation has been adopted which requires that the supervisory agencies be notified of any changes in control and ownership of the 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 a story 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 alltime 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. Additional large losses were suffered due to burglaries or larcenies. 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 that armed bank robberies represent. Bank officers and employees, customers, and police of-

ficers have been victims of the violence that is inherent in every bank robbery.

The FBI reports that banks are attractive targets for criminals not only because they are repositories for large sums of money, but also because security and protective methods are grossly inadequate in many banks. Some financial institutions are lagging behind retail stores and other business establishments in the protection they afford against robberies, burglaries, and larcenies. By and large, banking institutions have not taken full advantage of the safeguards which modern technology has placed at their disposal—such as hidden cameras, closed circuit television, microphones, and silent alarms. Some even refuse to use marked or "decoy" money, which would aid in the apprehension and conviction of bank robbers.

Federal supervisory agencies, in general, have issued no regulations requiring even basic security measures for the prevention of external crimes against financial institutions, and there have been indications that some doubt they have authority to do so.

The time has come when the Federal Government must assume responsibilities in this direction, and the President has clearly so indicated in his crime message. I therefore favor legislation which would authorize and require agencies vested with control of federally insured banks and savings and loan associations to develop and prescribe standards for the installation of such safety devices as are necessary to discourage robberies, burglaries and larcenies, and to assist in the apprehension of the criminals who commit these crimes.

I urge my colleagues to support these recommendations of the President.

THE NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT CONFERENCE

Mr. RYAN. 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. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1967, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare convened the New York-New Jersey Air Pollution Abatement Conference under the Clean Air Act of 1963. The first phase of the Conference considered primarily sulfur dioxide pollution and made specific recommendations for abatement, which were issued by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner.

The second session of the Conference started on January 30, 1968, to examine how the recommendations had been carried out, to consider particulate pollution and to make further recommendations.

I testified on January 30, 1968, about the continuing menace of air pollution in the New York metropolitan area and particularly about the failures of the New York City administration in air pollution control and abatement. As I did in January, 1967, I made specific proposals for action to be taken by the Conference in order to achieve clean air.

Although size and air pollution do not necessarily coincide, New York City has the most polluted air of any major city 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 when they come.

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 low-sulfur fuels. It scoffed at a new city law prohibiting open burning. It is scoffing at its own laws governing municipal and apartment house incinerators. It has encouraged landlords to scoff at the laws.

The New York City administration 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 before the Conference 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 1951 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 confirmed 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 by mid-1969, 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 law."

RECOMMENDATIONS

I asked the Conference to make part of the public record a list of the major particulate 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 53.6 tons per day. The figure used in my testimony, which was obtained

from the New York City Department of Air Pollution Control, was 13,000 tons per year. So the situation is considerably 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 effect.

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 action 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 ALUMNI HALL, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 30, 1968

This Second Session of the Interstate Air Pollution Abatement Conference is investigating particulate pollution which endangers the health and welfare of persons 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 problem of air pollution is well known to all. We know its costs and its damage to health and property. We have the power, the funds and the technologies to stop pollution.

"The need today," I pointed out then, "is not primarily for more discussions, new technologies or even new laws. The need today is for 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 controls to benefit the citizens it represents but for looser controls to accommodate influential interests and the real estate operators.

Today I am testifying more in sorrow than in anger.

I am testifying to New York City's ineptitude, broken promises, and shocking failures.

Over the last year, the City Administration has given a demonstration of the worst administration of air pollution control efforts of any major city in America.

Although theoretically all in the same Administration, the City's Mayor, Air Pollution Control Commissioner, and Sanitation Commissioner apparently never coordinate policy.

The Administration has promised speed and engendered delay. It has told different stories to different audiences. It has calmly broken its own promises.

For a year the City Administration has called for more Federal aid for air pollution control, while not even using the funds the Federal government had already provided.

For more than eight months, the Administration has played a comedy over enforcing the law governing apartment building incinerators.

Despite proclamations, it has not upgraded its own Housing Authority incinerators.

Despite plans and promises, it has taken no rapid action to upgrade municipal incinerators. They are all operating in violation of the law.

Although faced with almost certain air pollution disasters that may kill hundreds or thousands, the City Administration has failed to establish an adequate essential emergency plan to prevent such disasters.

The Administration is the City's worst polluter. It is also the City's worst lawbreaker and its worst scofflaw. It is scoffing at its own laws governing incinerators. It is encouraging and in fact advising landlords to scoff at the laws. It is undermining State Law, specifically Rule 200.

I am testifying in the hope that this Conference will make recommendations, requiring the New York City Administration to obey its own laws, to enforce its own rules, to use Federal funds it already has and to act to end air pollution not in ten years, but now.

I am also asking this Conference to require compliance with the recommendations it made last January.

THE DIRTIEST AIR

New York City has the most polluted air in the nation. We pump more poison and pollution 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 55th in population but 15th in terms of pollution. Jersey City is almost as bad, 45th in population but 17th in terms of pollution.

Primarily, New York City has the dirtiest air in America because the City Administrations, past and present, have not taken the actions or enforced the laws that would ensure clean air.

THREAT TO HEALTH

As almost every expert now agrees, air pollution damages our health. It helps kill many of us slowly and some of us rapidly. Dr. John T. Middleton, Director of the Public Health Service's National Center for Air Pollution Control, has stated publicly that in New York City and other large urban areas, "the public health and welfare are threatened by air pollution."

Dr. Norton Nelson, Director of the Institute of Industrial Medicine of the New York

University Medical Center, has pointed out, "Air pollution in its effects on health . . . acts primarily through the exacerbation of existing diseases."

With rapidly increasing air pollution, respiratory diseases have been growing at an appalling rate. Studies have shown that air pollution contributes to bronchitis and emphysema, in which lung tissue is progressively destroyed. These diseases have been causing twice as many deaths every five years. To put it another way, in New York City since 1960 the death rates of emphysema have increased 100 per cent.

Air pollution also may contribute to lung cancer, which now takes 50,000 lives a year. One study by a doctor at Albert Einstein Medical College has found that the death rate from lung cancer among men living on the north shore of Staten Island, where air pollution has been rampant, is more than 30 per cent greater than for men living on the south shore, where the air is relatively clean.

Air pollution sometimes kills quickly. We are all familiar with the historic air pollution disasters—the Meuse River Valley of Belgium in 1930; London's killer smog of 1952, which killed thousands, the Donora, Pennsylvania disaster of 1948; and disasters in New York City in 1953, 1963, and 1966, which killed hundreds.

As I have warned many times in the past, in New York City we face atmospheric inversions that will concentrate the slowly murderous effects of air pollution into a few hours or days, and murder hundreds or even thousands.

DAMAGE TO PROPERTY

As well as injuring our health, air pollution costs us billions of dollars every year in property damage. One estimate puts the cost at \$65 per person or from \$11 to \$12 billion dollars a year. Yet for around \$3 billion dollars a year we could erase the outrage, according to *Fortune* Magazine.

In the 17-county New York and New Jersey area, we are paying \$3 billion dollars a year for pollution damage.

New York City itself estimates each person in Manhattan spends about \$350 extra per year because of air pollution. According to the City, polluted air is costing the family in Manhattan \$850 a year, a family in the Bronx, Brooklyn and Queens \$720 and the family in Staten Island \$560 a year.

In air pollution we are now paying many times more for the dirty air we don't want than we would have to pay for the clean air we do want.

The New York City Administration has formally and publicly made the following declaration to all of us. I quote to you from a pamphlet, "What Does Air Pollution Cost You," above the names of the Mayor and the Commissioner of Air Pollution Control:

"It's your job, as a consumer and a taxpayer, to build a market for air pollution control—to demand clean air. And to tell all those heel-dragging polluters who tell you there's a price tag on clean air, 'I know, but it's cheaper than dirty air.'"

As you know, the major heel-dragging polluters who put a price tag on clean air are the members of the New York City Administration. In their own words, they must be told there is no excuse. Clean air is cheaper.

CONFERENCE RECOMMENDATIONS

On January 19, 1967, the first session of this Conference, as provided by law, made seven major recommendations.

Recommendations V, VI and VII related to industrial emission of sulfur oxide compounds, emission of carbon monoxide and emissions from Abex Corporation, Mahwah, N.J.

These recommendations have been generally followed.

The major Conference recommendations called for a regional air pollution control agency and action to cut the sulfur dioxide pollution that threatens all of us. Sulfurous

air pollution needs no description. It is the traditional air pollution depicted in Hell.

Recommendation I called for an interstate agency with legal authority to control pollution on a regional basis. New York and New Jersey have passed the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Compact, now subject to act of Congress.

The Conference found that our air is continuously more polluted by sulfur dioxide than the standard recommended by the Public Health Service.

Sulfur-rich fuels are the source of sulfur dioxide pollution. They are burned by power plants to generate electricity and by domestic, industrial and commercial plants for heat and other purposes.

Through power-plant use, sulfur-rich fuels contribute 40 per cent of the present sulfur dioxide pollution. Through domestic, commercial and industrial burning, they contribute another 50 per cent.

Recommendation III would ensure future use of low-sulfur fuel. The conference recommended that all approved new power generating facilities must have an assured 20-year supply of low sulfur fuel or must demonstrate effective control means.

Last year, on September 29, 1967, the New York State Air Pollution Control Board adopted Rule 200, which carries out this and other recommendations. (Rule 200 prohibits any new power generating facilities designed for fuel having a sulfur content of more than one per cent by weight after October 1, 1968, in Bronx, Kings and New York Counties and in the remainder of the New York City metropolitan area after October 1, 1969.)

Consolidated Edison is building a new facility on Staten Island. The company reports that the new plant will use low sulfur fuel and will include the latest air pollution control equipment.

Recommendations II and IV deal with existing polluters. The recommendations require use of low-sulfur fuel by October 1, 1969. (The recommendations require that fuel used by power plants should not contain more than one per cent sulfur by weight; oil used for heating or other domestic, commercial or industrial purposes should not contain more than 0.3 per cent sulfur by weight; coal used for heating or other domestic, commercial or industrial purposes should not contain more than 0.2 per cent sulfur by weight.)

On January 12, 1968, the New Jersey Commissioner of Health promulgated regulations requiring low sulfur fuel oils. (These regulations, Chapter X, limit sulfur content by May 1, 1968, to 0.3 per cent in distillate oil, 0.7 per cent in Number Four oil and 0.5 per cent in residual oil. By October 1, 1971, they require 0.2 per cent in distillate oil, 0.3 per cent in Number Four oil, and 0.3 per cent in residual oil.)

Unfortunately, New Jersey's regulations do not cover the sulfur content of coal, which is a major power plant fuel and continues to make contribution to both sulfur dioxide and particulate pollution. There is no excuse for this failure.

RULE 200

With Rule 200, New York State moved to comply with all the power-plant fuel recommendations. (Rule 200 limits power plant fuel to 1.0 per cent sulfur content in the Bronx, Kings and New York Counties by October 1, 1968, a year earlier than the Conference recommendations; and in other New York metropolitan counties by October 1, 1969.)

Rule 200 also carries out the Conference recommendation on low-sulfur fuel for heating and other domestic and commercial purposes. (Rule 200 prohibits use of fuel containing more than 0.2 pounds of sulfur per million BTU gross heat content (0.34 per cent sulfur by weight) in stationary installations by October 1, 1969, except for power plants.)

Consolidated Edison Company has de-

clared 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 Rule 200.

By last December, Con Edison had switched to fuel oil of one per cent sulfur. By April, 1968, its coal is expected 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 commend Chairman Luce and the Company for its progress. Con Edison's actions alone prove the soundness of the Conference approach.

However, in the fight against sulfur dioxide pollution, the New York City Administration has taken its stand with the polluters and against clean air.

Neither New York City'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.

(Under Local Law 14, coal and residual oil is limited to 2.2 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 2 oil would be limited to 1 per cent and Number 4 oil to 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 dioxide are in the heart of Manhattan, around the 121st Street air pollution sampling station. At the first session of this Conference, William H. Megonell of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reported that an 83 per cent reduction of sulfur dioxide pollution would be needed to meet the maximum permissible standards around the 121st Street station.

In its summary report of the first session, this Conference stated that to bring air quality up to minimum standards for 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 opposed Rule 200's limitations on 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 lower 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 impact of the proposed rule and suggest modifications."

Commissioner Heller pleaded for a system of interruptible gas and Number 2 fuel oil, which experts 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 for us."

Presumably by "us" he meant the real estate lobby and the City Administration's own heat and power plants.

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 methods.

As I said at the time of the Rule 200 hearings, the Administration has given a shocking defense of go slow abatement 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 constant threat of an atmospheric inversion, 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 will average two such 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 six days or more. The longer episodes are most likely to occur in the fall."

In a recent letter to me, Dr. John T. Middleton, 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, 1966. I pointed out that New York City received a warning of 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. New York City has publicized a network of air monitoring stations to report on rising pollution.

But it is obviously only part of the problem to know when the disaster is coming. It is also necessary to be prepared to do something about it.

Under the Clean Air Act of 1967, in the case of an approaching air pollution disaster, the Federal government can ask the Attorney General to seek an injunction to stop polluters. But such action obviously would take too much time to be effective in the rapid pollution buildup of most disasters.

Dr. Middleton testified recently before the House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development of which I am a member. He pointed out that Los Angeles has a workable warning system and action plan.

What about New York?

We know we are going to have some future air pollution disaster in New York. It may threaten the lives of hundreds or thousands. We will be warned of its approach. Yet New York City has failed to come up with a workable emergency plan that would stave off the disaster—no workable plan to stop polluters before pollution reaches the danger and death-dealing levels.

This is worse than shocking. This is criminal.

For the sake of the health and life of the citizens of New York City, this Conference must require that the metropolitan area, and particularly New York City, immediately develop a workable automatic emergency plan to prevent the next pollution disaster.

New York State has moved to comply with Conference recommendations; New Jersey has 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.

In its threat to health, 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. Prindle, Assistant Surgeon General, Director, Bureau of Disease Prevention and Environmental Control, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, said that the greatest danger from SO₂ is that it oxidizes rapidly to SO₃, which combines with moisture to form sulfuric acid mist. The membranes and tissues of the respiratory tract and the lungs would supply this moisture if SO₂, adsorbed on particulates, is breathed in and carried deep into the respiratory system. While the larger particles tend to be caught in the upper respiratory tract and many are expelled, smaller particles—those less than 5 microns in diameter (approximately 56% or 136,000 tons per year)—remain airborne indefinitely; they are small enough to be inspired deep into the human respiratory system.

Fine particulates accompany coarse emissions (such as from coal burning, incineration and some industrial processes) but also emanate from the burning of natural gas, fuel oil and vehicular fuels. Even when particulates are stringently controlled, those particles which do escape collection are smaller than 5 microns. A solution must be found for this danger to human health. I urge the Conference to make specific recommendations to deal with this problem.

Greatest densities of all types of particulate pollution are found in highly populated business and residential districts of Manhattan. 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. Manhattan emission 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 heavier concentration of power plants in New York City.

Manhattan is also a center of heavy densities of settleable particulates (concentrations greater than 35 tons per square mile per month) and suspended particulates (The 121st Street station rates a measurement of "heavy soiling.") Thus, where the largest number of people work and live, the highest concentrations of particulate pollution are found—where they can hurt human beings the most.

In the book, "Air Conservation," The American Association for the Advancement of Science notes that small particles may carry various damaging materials, including free radicals and gases. These pollutant particles can induce mutagenic effects similar to those caused by radiation. Thus, the synergistic 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. Insults to some portion of the respiratory tract by pollutants may alter the receptivity to infection or may permit infection to progress to overt disease. This is the part scientists and medical experts are beginning to assign to pollutants in the increase of respiratory ailments.

Another work, "Waste Management and Control," notes that "sensitivity to effects of sulfur dioxides is markedly increased by certain otherwise harmless aerosol particles."

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 \$3 billion a year in the

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 other surfaces.

Major sources

The polluters are now pouring a total of about 240,000 tons of particulate matter into the air over the 17-county area. This is about 9000 tons more than the amount cited in the Phase II Particulate Matter report. This increase is attributable mainly to the New York City municipal incinerators and to rock crushing 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 per cent. Motor vehicles contribute 14 per cent, industrial processes 10 per cent, and aircraft and shipping less than one per cent.

The major particulate polluters 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 heating 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 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 more than 100 tons per year.

These sources include 26 steam-electric power plants, 73 industrial sites (fuel, process, and incineration combined), 31 municipal incinerators, and 7 miscellaneous coal-burning operations.

These 137 point sources contribute 43 per cent, or 98,500 tons per year, of the particulate emissions in the area. Industrial point sources generate 38,300 tons of particulate per year, or 17 percent of the area total. Power plant point sources contribute 17 percent of the total particulate (39,000 tons), and the 31 point source municipal incinerators emit 19,000 tons of particulate, or 8.2 percent of the total.

I ask that this Conference make public a list of the 137 point sources of particulate pollution so citizens will know who is dumping how much particulate on them. This information should be made part of the record of this conference.

Stationary combustion of fuels and refuse burning are the two major producers of particulate pollution.

In stationary combustion, coal is the major problem. It supplies about 15 per cent of our heat but more than twice as much of our particles. Coal burning contributes about 34 percent of the particulate pollution. Fuel oil contributes something like 21 per cent of the particulate matter; natural gas less than 2 percent.

In stationary combustion, power plants are a major source.

Some local power companies have taken steps to reduce particulate emission from coal firing.

As well as moving toward low-sulfur fuel, Consolidated Edison Company is moving toward low-particulate fuel, from coal to oil and from oil to gas. It has received an increased permanent allocation of natural gas from the Federal Power Commission. It will start this spring to convert three plants in Manhattan, one in the Bronx and two in Brooklyn, from coal to oil.

In another demonstration of what can be done, Con Edison installed last April an electrostatic precipitator said to be 99% effective at the new Ravenswood Plant.

In stationary combustion, however, the largest source is not power plants but the burning of coal and fuel oil for residential heating. This burning contributes 22.5 per-

cent of the total particulates generated in New York City.

Thus in terms of fuel and stationary combustion, present requirements for cleaner, low-sulfur fuel are a step in the right direction.

This Conference must also recommend requirements that those who burn coal and fuel oil use fuel which generates less particulate matter or install adequate control and collection equipment. These requirements must cover both power plants and heating units.

Incineration

In New York City, incineration continues to be one of the major sources of particulates. In the City's central area, more refuse is burned and incinerators pour out more particulates per square mile than anywhere else in the nation.

Residential, industrial and commercial incinerators are major offenders. There are more than 12,000 apartment house, fuel-fed incinerators, each discharging more than a ton of particulate air pollution each year.

Few of the apartment house incinerators and none of the municipal incinerators are meeting the City's own emission standards.

At the present time, with the full knowledge of the Administration, almost every incinerator in New York City 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 New York City passed 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—a combustion chamber to raise burning temperatures to at least 1,400 degrees for minimal efficient burning and a scrubber to trap solids and 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.

Housing authority incinerators

On April 25, 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 publicity tour of the Authority's Robert Fulton Houses, which had been using upgraded incinerators for three years.

Then apparently the Housing Authority had some second thoughts—unpublicized. Although the City had estimated it would cost \$7,000 to upgrade each incinerator, the Housing Authority now claimed it would cost \$19,000 per incinerator or a total of \$23 million.

As of yesterday, the New York City Housing Authority reported that it had completed work on combustion devices for less than 1/2 (or only 305) of the 1,169 incinerators. It has contracted for, and begun work on, less 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 1,497 incinerators that must be upgraded by May 20, 1968.

Apartment house incinerators

Now I ask you to listen to the story of New York City's upgrading of apartment house incinerators.

On April 25, 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 responsibility of those who have both the financial ability and all the information they need to meet this deadline."

And he added, "The owner of every incinerator which does not have a valid certificate of operation will be served a notice that within five days the incinerator will be sealed."

But on May 20th, when the law went into effect, the Administration jumped several different ways, all at the same time.

Up until 1951 some apartments constructed in New York City were built with incinerators and some without incinerators. In 1951 the City passed a law requiring 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 1951 would not necessarily have to abide by the law. They could choose whether to upgrade their incinerators or to shut them down.

As he explained later, this 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 the first place."

But on May 21, after the law went into effect, Commissioner Heller permitted them to violate the law, apparently because no one 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 modern buildings. If they had not upgraded within five days, inspectors would seal incinerators. Landlords would be fined \$25 and billed for additional garbage collection.

But apparently the Air Pollution Control 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.

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 Corporation Counsel, a member of the same Administration as the Air Pollution Control and Sanitation Commissioners, promptly ruled that because of the new Code no one could be required to upgrade.

Then the Sanitation Department jumped in and pointed out that, if all incinerators were shut down, it could 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 discontinuing use of incinerators.

The Sanitation Commissioner pointed out that all this was predicated on his getting 800 new collection trucks to haul away the extra garbage. In late October, contracts were announced for \$11.6 million for 800 new trucks.

Both the City Administration and others have introduced amendments to Local Law 14 on incinerators. The Administration proposes three alternatives: upgrade, install a compactor or shut down. Councilman Robert Low introduced an amendment which would require all landlords by May 20, 1968, to either upgrade their incinerators or install compacting systems. Neither of the amendments has been passed. It is eight months since the May 20 deadline when all incinerators had to be upgraded.

Open burning

In a similar vein, the City Administration has taken steps to cut down on open burn-

ing. Local Law 14 prohibited open burning after May 20, 1967. But the Administration scoffed at the law and permitted open burning of timbers from pier and other projects.

Staten Island threatened to sue to enforce the law. Commissioner Heller halted the burning. Timbers piled up. In August, the Administration allowed burning, again in violation of the law, but further away from those who might sue.

This Conference must require the City Administration immediately to enforce the ban on burning, and immediately enforce upgrading or shutting down of private incinerators along with necessary steps to handle the additional refuse.

Municipal incinerators

But whether apartment incinerators are upgraded or closed, the City Administration remains the major lawbreaker and scofflaw in the City in its operation of municipal incinerators.

The 11 municipal incinerators, which are operating in violation of the Code, pour out about 40 tons a day of particulate matter for a whopping total of some 13,000 tons a year.

There is no need for this. Proven devices for control of particulate emissions include electrostatic precipitators and bag filters. Precipitators were invented in 1912, have proven themselves, have been used extensively in Europe on large municipal refuse-burning steam and power plants. Fiber glass bag filters have also proven themselves in industrial and other installations. Both devices have demonstrated efficiencies of more than 95 percent.

In 1965 spokesmen for the present Administration pledged immediate action to bring municipal incinerators within the law. On June 23, 1965, John V. Lindsay, Candidate for Mayor, said, "The City should put its own house in order."

Early in 1966, Mayor Lindsay set up his own Task Force on Air Pollution in the City of New York. That Task Force found, and I quote:

"The City is a gross violator of its own laws against air pollution . . . The City cannot expect to be taken seriously in its efforts to combat pollution unless it acts vigorously and promptly to reduce the film, smoke and poisons produced by the incinerators in its own waste disposal plants."

The Task Force reported the City must, "First, install effective air-pollution equipment on its incinerators or it must find other methods of disposing of garbage and waste."

Yet the City Administration has failed to act, has delayed and dawdled rather than forged ahead on upgrading municipal incinerators.

On January 4, 1967, in testimony before this Conference, Mayor Lindsay said:

"We are moving toward a major reduction of the fly-ash produced by our 11 municipally-operated incinerators with a pilot project under which we will get electrostatic precipitators for minimizing smoke and soot. The project is being financed with a \$218,000 grant from the Public Health Service, the first such award to any city for a demonstration project of this nature . . . We hope to obtain conclusive reports on the merits of the devices by the end of this year."

But after many well publicized promises, the City Administration failed to produce. The Administration, which had the money, was not even able to spend it in one whole year. The Administration literally wasted all of 1967.

On October 26, 1966, the City had asked for a demonstration grant to evaluate control systems for municipal incinerators. On January 1, 1967, the Federal government had granted the full amount requested, \$218,400

in Federal funds to be matched by \$72,900 of city funds. Under the grant the first year funds were to be spent by December 31, 1967. The Federal government scheduled a second year of support for \$149,750.

Leisurely, the Administration went out looking for a contractor, hired Arthur D. Little Company, then apparently found Little was not licensed in New York City, hooked up with another engineering firm which was licensed, and the whole year was gone.

On December 26, 1967, the City Administration has spent not one cent of the funds, and it requested an extension of the project so it would begin not in 1967 but in 1968, one year late. The Federal government agreed.

There is no excuse for such delay. Surely there is no excuse for failing to spend the money you have to do the job you say you want to do.

On January 5, 1967, Air Pollution Control Commissioner Heller testified before this Conference:

"The City's eleven large municipal incinerators, none of which can presently meet the requirements of the new regulations, will be improved drastically, and the emission from them will be reduced by at least 90 per cent."

Commissioner Heller added:

"The municipal incinerators must be upgraded by mid-1969, by law, but actually, progress will be faster. Thanks partly to a Federal grant, a pilot model will be in operation at one city incinerator within six months. The information to be derived from this pilot study will provide a firm basis for the selection of an efficient and economical device to control all particulate emissions from the city-owned incinerators."

All this would be funny if it were not so sad.

On June 29, 1967, the City Administration announced with considerable fanfare that it was, "moving to install electrostatic precipitators on two Sanitation Department incinerators in Brooklyn as part of the City's continuing war on air pollution."

The City said it was asking capital funds for precipitators at the South Shore and the Southwest Brooklyn Plant. It estimated that the two installations would take six to eight months. Give or take a month or two for what the Administration called, "formal approval by the Board of Estimate at its July 27th meeting."

Six months have gone by.

What happened to the precipitators?

In 1965, discussing the East 73rd Street Plant, the Department of Sanitation said it planned a test installation of a new type of multi-cone centrifugal separator for one furnace . . . "for completion in late 1966." But it did not get started in 1966.

On February 20, 1967, the Department announced with much fanfare that it had, "moved to install the Department's first scrubber device in its East 73rd Street burner."

But last week I visited the plant. Nothing has happened at the East 73rd Street plant.

Four of the City's 11 incinerators were built before 1938 and are obsolete by any standard. In 1965, two of the plants, Zerega Avenue, Bronx, and Flushing, Queens, were scheduled for abandonment when the new South Bronx Plant was completed.

In 1965 the Sanitation Department reported the South Bronx Plant was scheduled for completion in 1969. The Sanitation Department now reports—three years later, and one year before scheduled completion—that it will be at least two or three years before anyone breaks ground on the South Bronx Plant.

What happened?

The New York City Administration has administered a disaster in air pollution abatement and control.

With this kind of a record it is essential that this Conference require New York City to upgrade the municipal incinerators and install precipitators or bag filters. This Conference must require monthly reports and set a deadline of no later than the end of this year.

As the City Administration has proclaimed, cost is not a problem. For the citizen, clean air is cheaper. It will save hundreds of lives. It will cost less than dirty air.

CONCLUSION

I ask this Conference to require immediate action by the New York City Administration, including the actual use of granted Federal funds; immediate initiation of a workable plan of action for emergencies; upgrading or closing of apartment and municipal incinerators; and immediate compliance with last year's Conference recommendations for the sulfur content of fuels.

In addition, the Conference should require New Jersey 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.

The Conference should prepare a comprehensive emergency action plan for the entire New York-New Jersey 17-county area, to be implemented by phases as the level of pollutants rises.

Finally, the Conference should remain in continuing session, and regular reports should be submitted to the presiding officer. The Conference proved during the past year that it is a crucial vehicle for air pollution abatement in the New York-New Jersey inter-state area. If air pollution is to be significantly reduced, then the Conference's continuing jurisdiction is required.

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 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 the RECORD his testimony:

PARTICULATES 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 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 reviewed these data, I will confine this discussion to 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

matter billowing from boilers, incinerators, industrial processes, ships, jet aircraft and even a few open fires. These visible particulates include some smoke and soot from the incomplete combustion of fuels and solid wastes. Nevertheless, a major fraction is not combustible—coal ash, metallic foundry fume, rock dust, sulfuric acid mist and petroleum catalyst dust to name a few. This point is shown by the inventory and confirmed by aerial observations. Black smoke—indicating carbonaceous particulates—is overshadowed by more prevalent plumes of white, blue, brown, and grey particulate pollution.

Our engineers observed upwards of 150 sources of heavy visible pollution on routine surveillance flights over the 17 counties. They couldn't begin to count the sources of lesser visible particulate pollution.

But aerial reconnaissance doesn't provide finite 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 eight New York counties.

Minor adjustments have been made to the particulate inventory based on information received after the report was printed. Total particulate releases were increased from 230,000 to about 240,000 tons per year. These principally resulted from the upward adjustment of emissions from New York City municipal 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 dioxide. Stationary combustion fuels account for 56% of the total particulate while motor vehicles contributes 14%, refuse burning 19%, industrial processes 10% and aircraft and shipping less than one percent.

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 four major sources of particulate emissions in these areas. It can be seen that stationary fuel combustion is the largest source of particulate pollution in each area, although not so much in the outer New York counties as in New Jersey and New York City. We also note that industrial processes are significant sources in New Jersey and in the outer counties but relatively minor contributors in New York City. The burning of solid wastes generates considerably more particulate in New York than in New Jersey. Some 47,000 tons of particulate are generated in the eight New York counties annually by the burning of refuse, approximately 8 times more than in New Jersey.

Of the particulate traceable to stationary combustion fuel, coal is the major culprit. This chart shows that 34% of the areas particulate is generated by coal burning, 21% by fuel oil and a mere 1.5% by natural gas, the cleanest fuel. The combustion of coal generates much more particulate per unit of heat than does the combustion of fuel oil or natural gas. Coal, in fact, supplies only 15% of the area heat requirement, less than natural gas, far less than fuel oil. On an equivalent heat basis, for the medium and small user, coal burning discharges 20 times more particulate than fuel oil and 80 times more than natural gas. At steam electric power plants, particulates from coal burning are stringently controlled but still exceed those of oil and gas.

About three-fourths of the anthracite coal

is burned for space heating. A smaller although significant portion is burned by a few large industrial establishments located in New Jersey. Anthracite coal deservedly has a reputation for being cleaner than bituminous coal. Unfortunately, most anthracite coal is burned in boilers which are not equipped with any control whatsoever. On the average, only five percent of the particulate generated by anthracite burning is collected in air pollution control equipment. As a result, anthracite is credited with about 12% of the area's particulate emissions, about half of the quantity attributed to bituminous coal.

Most of the bituminous is burned in steam electric power plants. As compared to many areas of the country, local steam-electric generators are relatively well controlled, averaging about 95% collection efficiency. Nevertheless, even with the highest efficiency collection systems, utility boilers discharge some five times more particulate when burning coal than oil, and 20 times more particulate when burning coal than gas. During periods of equipment malfunction and during soot blowing, considerably greater quantities of coal ash are exhausted.

Recently, major steps were taken by some local power companies to reduce particulate emissions from coal firing. As we will discuss later in the Conference, there was a resultant decrease in air contaminants from power plants during 1967 which is not reflected in the 1966 inventory.

Most of the bituminous coal not consumed at power plants is burned in industrial boilers in New Jersey and Rockland and Westchester counties. Several of these boilers are equipped with intermediate range dust collection equipment. However, many are completely uncontrolled, such that the average collection efficiency is well below that of power generating stations. Industrial boilers discharge about five times more particulate per ton of coal than do power plants.

Emissions from properly functioning fuel oil burners are some four times greater than natural gas. Fuel oil burning is responsible for about 50,000 tons per year of particulate matter, 21% of the area total. These totals were calculated on the assumption that the fuel oil burners are operated at reasonable efficiency with average quantities of unburned materials discharged in the flue gases. If you happened to live or work near a poorly operated oil burning installation, you might take exception to our average emission factor.

Industrial processes account for approximately 10% of the particulate matter discharged in the study area. The largest portions emanate from New Jersey, where processes account for over 15% of the particulate, and from Westchester and Rockland Counties. There are wide variations in the degree of control employed at these industries. Some have high efficiency baghouses, electrical precipitators and scrubbers to provide better than 99% collection. There are others where control equipment is either inadequate or nonexistent. Most of the industrial sources are located close to major waterways—the Hudson River, Arthur Kill, Newark Bay, and the Raritan River. In these areas industrial processes represent a much greater particulate threat than in outlying rural areas.

As I noted earlier, the burning of solid wastes is responsible for over 47,000 tons per year of particulate, about 19% of the study area total. In the more densely populated portions of New York City, more refuse is burned and more incinerator-related air contaminants released per square mile than in any other urban area of the country.

The next bar graph shows that approximately 38% of the area's refuse is burned with the remaining 62% handled by landfill. In New Jersey landfill operations handle 87% of the solid wastes, in New York only about 50%. It follows that refuse burning is a much

greater particulate source in New York than in most portions of New Jersey.

Two-thirds of the solid wastes burned are incinerated in municipal incinerators. The rest is burned by industrial, commercial, governmental, and residential sources, much of it in apartment house flue-fed incinerators in New York City. Very few incinerators are sufficiently well-designed that they meet stringent emission standards such as those established by the City of New York.

In the next slide we see a municipal incinerator in operation. The particular unit is of better design than many in the area. Particulate emissions are notably less than from flue-fed units but still well in excess of the New York City standard. [None of these incinerators are yet equipped with high efficiency control devices.]

The view shown here is familiar to many—the stack of a flue-fed apartment house incinerator. Most of the existing 12,000 or more incinerators are located in the four more populous boroughs of New York City but they are becoming common in suburban areas. Such units were not designed with any consideration for air pollution control. The average uncontrolled flue-fed incinerator discharges about 25 pounds of particulate per ton of refuse, over six times the limit established by the City of New York. On an annual basis this totals more than one ton of particulate air pollution from each incinerator.

The 240,000 ton annual particulate emissions in the study area are attributed to a few large sources and to a great number of small sources. The fraction contributed by large or small operations depends on one's choice of limits. For our purposes a large or "point" source is defined as a site from which more than 100 tons of particulate per year are discharged to the atmosphere.

On this basis, 144 point sources were found in the 17 counties. These include 26 steam-electric power stations, 32 municipal incinerators, 77 industrial and related sites and 9 miscellaneous coal-fired boiler operations. Many of the industrial sites were point sources only because they burned coal. Using this arbitrary level—100 tons per year—we can ascribe about 50 percent of the area's particulate air pollution to point sources.

In this map, we see that point sources are generally distributed close to large population concentrations in New York City, Newark, and Hudson County. Also, we can see a clustering along major waterways; the Hudson, Raritan and East Rivers, Newark Bay, and the Arthur Kill. Many of the isolated point sources in New York State are municipal incinerators. In outlying areas of New Jersey, the sources tend to be industrial processes and coal burning boilers.

For purposes of the emissions inventory, the area was divided into 607 zones based on census tract boundaries and other grid systems. Aggregate emissions of point sources and area sources were calculated for each of the 607 zones in the 17 county area. Totals for each zone are listed in Appendix D of the report in terms of tons of particulate per square mile for an average calendar day in 1966. These zone emission densities were plotted on the map shown in this next slide. As was the pattern with sulfur dioxide, the core areas in and around New York City, Newark, and Jersey City had the greater densities. Additional heavy pollution areas are noted near major waterways. The red areas on the map represent emission densities greater than two tons per day/per square mile. Many zones in heavily polluted areas are well in excess of this figure; six zones in New York City have densities exceeding 10 tons per square mile per day. The average in Manhattan is almost 5 tons as compared to rural areas where densities are less than 0.10 ton per square mile per day.

It must be emphasized that the latter figures describe an average calendar day. On a winter day when maximum space heating

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 effect on humans 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 less than 20% of the area's particulate is greater than 44 microns in mean diameter. The rest is smaller than 44 microns, in the range 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 56% or 136,000 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 greater in heavily populated areas than in more distant suburbs. A great deal of the particulate total is in finely divided form capable of remaining airborne for extended periods and capable of concentrating in the atmosphere during adverse weather conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD 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:

FEBRUARY 1, 1968.

NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT ACTIVITY POINT SOURCES EMITTING MORE THAN 100 TONS/YEAR OF PARTICULATE MATTER—1966 ESTIMATE

The 144 point sources tabulated in the attached listing have been 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 119,000 tons of particulate annually.

At these 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 by the sources, and from non-confidential files of the co-operating agencies. Whenever specific emission data were not available, particulate 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 a knowledge of techniques for reducing emissions.

All sources within this area which released 100 tons of particulate matter annually may not be included; however, to the best of our knowledge this is a complete tabulation.

Some of the sources have informed us of operational changes which have reduced emissions materially below 1966 levels. Wherever such information was available, the list has been annotated.

Estimated particulate emissions (tons per year)

BERGEN COUNTY (7)	
Abex Corp., Mahwah	385
Allied Chemical Corp., Edgewater	373
Curtiss-Wright Corp., Wood-Ridge	214
Garden State Paper Co., Inc., Garfield	744
Hills Brothers Coffee, Inc., Edgewater	112
Incinerator, Hackensack	174
Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Bergen plant	3,468
Bergen County total	5,470

ESSEX COUNTY (6)	
Essex Chemical Co., Newark	125
Essex County Overbrook Hospital	125
Houdaille Construction Materials, Montclair Heights	119
Ironbound Incinerator Corp., Newark	312
Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Essex plant	1,036
Universal Grain Co., Newark	108
Essex County total	1,825

HUDSON COUNTY (19)	
American Can Co., Jersey City	352
Campbell Foundry, Harrison	231
Central Railroad Co., Jersey City service plant ¹	421
Central Railroad Co., Pier 18	703
Colgate-Palmolive Co., Jersey City	354
Corps of Engineers, vicinity of Statue of Liberty	130
Erie-Lackawanna Railroad, Jersey City	854
Humble Oil & Refining Co., Bayonne	365
Incinerator, Jersey City	660
Kearny Smelting & Refining Co., Kearny ²	165
Koppers Co., Kearny	630
Maxwell House, Division of General Foods Co., Hoboken	448
Metro Glass, Jersey City	165
Monsanto Co., Kearny	141
Owens-Illinois, Inc., North Bergen	220
Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Hudson plant	1,164
Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Kearny plant	1,954
Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Marion plant	129
Worthington Corp., Harrison	743
Hudson County total	9,829

MIDDLESEX COUNTY (19)	
American Smelting & Refining Co., Perth Amboy	1,134
Chevron Oil Co., Perth Amboy	1,087
FMC Corp., Carteret	127
Hercules, Inc., Parlin	1,204
Hess Oil & Chemical Corp., Port Reading	545
Incinerator, Perth Amboy	189
International Smelting & Refining Co., Perth Amboy	630
Jersey Central Power & Light Co., Sayreville plant	4,219
Jersey Central Power & Light Co., Werner plant	349
Johnson & Johnson Co., North Brunswick	104
Metro Glass, Carteret	100
National Lead Co., Perth Amboy	219
National Lead Co., Sayreville	2,423
Port Reading Terminal, Port Reading	328
Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Seward plant	3,671
Seaboard Coal Dock Co., South Amboy	739
Union Carbide Corp., Bound Brook	1,210

¹ Ceased operation in May 1967.
² Control equipment installed during 1967 will reduce emissions below 100 tons per year.

Estimated particulate emissions (tons per year)—Continued

MIDDLESEX COUNTY (19)—continued	
U.S. Gypsum Co., South Plainfield	372
U.S. Metals Refining Co., Carteret	808
Middlesex County total	19,458

MONMOUTH COUNTY (2)	
Incinerator, Red Bank	100
Nestles Co., Freehold	319
Monmouth County total	419

MORRIS COUNTY (4)	
Amerace Corp., Butler	281
Drew Chemical Corp., Boonton ³	580
Hercules Inc., Kenil	531
Picatinny Arsenal, Dover	6,795
Whippany Paper Board Company, Whippany	199
Morris County total	8,386

PASSAIC COUNTY (3)	
Laytham Foundry, Inc., Paterson	175
Manhattan Rubber Co., Passaic	1,090
Uniroyal, Passaic	962
Passaic County total	2,227

SOMERSET COUNTY (6)	
American Cyanamid Co., Bound Brook	870
Fanwood Crushed Stone & Uniset Asphalt Sales, Watchung	441
Houdaille Construction Materials, Inc., Bound Brook	1,059
Johns-Manville Products Corp., Manville	779
Ruberoid Co., Bound Brook	762
Veterans' Administration Hospital, Lyons	238
Somerset County total	4,149

UNION COUNTY (8)	
American Cyanamid Co., Linden	743
Cities Service Oil Refinery, Linden ⁴	125
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Linden	271
General Aniline and Film Corp., Linden	147
Humble Oil and Refining Co., Linden	1,440
Philadelphia Quartz Co., Rahway	407
Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Linden plant	1,028
U.S. Gypsum Co., Clark	306
Union County total	4,467

BRONX COUNTY (3)	
Consolidated Edison Co., Hell Gate Station	644
Incinerator, Zerega Avenue	1,449
National Gypsum Co.	147
Bronx County total	2,240

KINGS COUNTY (BROOKLYN) (8)	
Consolidated Edison Co., Hudson Avenue	1,956
Consolidated Edison Co., Kent Avenue	718
Incinerator, Greenpoint	1,839
Incinerator, Hamilton Avenue	1,875
Incinerator, South Shore	1,638
Incinerator, Southwest Brooklyn	1,839
Kings County Hospital	467
Taylor & Co.	109
Kings County total	10,441

RICHMOND COUNTY (STATEN ISLAND) (5)	
Burn-It Co. (offshore burning)	390
Consolidated Edison Co., Arthur Kill plant	948

³ Ceased coal burning during 1967, 1968 emissions will be below 100 tons per year.
⁴ Ceased operations in November 1966.

Estimated particulate emissions (tons per year)—Continued

RICHMOND COUNTY (STATEN ISLAND) (5)—CON.	
Nassau Smelting & Refining Co.....	110
Sea View Hospital.....	651
U.S. Gypsum Co.....	684

Richmond County total..... 2,783

NEW YORK COUNTY (MANHATTAN) (12)

Belleuve Hospital.....	628
Consolidated Edison Co., 59th Street plant.....	1,051
Consolidated Edison Co., 74th Street plant.....	1,105
Consolidated Edison Co., East River plant.....	3,211
Consolidated Edison Co., Kips Bay plant.....	435
Consolidated Edison Co., Sherman Creek plant.....	1,106
Consolidated Edison Co., Waterside plant.....	2,771
Incinerator, East 73d Street.....	1,239
Incinerator, Gansevort Street.....	1,886
Incinerator, West 56th Street.....	1,578
Incinerator, West 215th Street.....	1,629
New York City asphalt batch plant.....	214

New York County total..... 16,653

QUEENS COUNTY (6)

Consolidated Edison Co., Astoria.....	3,986
Consolidated Edison Co., Ravenswood.....	1,881
Incinerator, Betts Avenue.....	1,542
Incinerator, Flushing.....	909
Long Island Lighting Co., Far Rockaway.....	151
Phelps-Dodge Refining Corp.....	140

Queens County total..... 8,609

NASSAU COUNTY (14)

Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., Bethpage ^a	868
Incinerator, city of Glen Cove.....	146
Incinerator, city of Long Beach.....	165
Incinerator, Garden City.....	117
Incinerator, Merrick.....	960
Incinerator, New Hyde Park.....	360
Incinerator, Oceanside.....	750
Incinerator, Sanitary District No. 1.....	345
Incinerator, town of Oyster Bay, plant No. 1.....	800
Incinerator, village of Freeport.....	237
Incinerator, village of Hempstead.....	131
Incinerator, village of Valley Stream.....	112
Long Island Lighting Co., Barrett.....	1,220
Long Island Lighting Co., Glenwood.....	304

Nassau County total..... 6,515

ROCKLAND COUNTY (9)

Incinerator, town of Ramapo.....	144
Lederle Laboratories, Pearl River.....	537
Letchworth Village, Haverstraw.....	208
New York Trap Rock Corp., West Nyack.....	185
Orange and Rockland Utilities, Inc., Lovett Plant.....	3,548
Orangeburg Manufacturing Co., Orangeburg.....	371
Rock Industries, Haverstraw.....	1,446
Rock Industries, Tomkins Cove.....	1,933
Rockland Material Corp., Suffern.....	669
U.S. Gypsum Co., Stony Point ^a	225

Rockland County total..... 9,266

WESTCHESTER COUNTY (12)

Consolidated Edison Co., Indian Point.....	103
FDR Veterans Administration Hospital, Montrose.....	129
Incinerator, city of White Plains.....	238
Incinerator, Mount Vernon.....	150

^a Fuel change will reduce 1968 emissions below 100 T/Yr

^b Emissions total being reviewed.

Estimated particulate emissions (tons per year)—Continued

WESTCHESTER COUNTY (12)—continued	
Incinerator, New Rochelle.....	385
Incinerator, village of Port Chester.....	150
Incinerator, Yonkers.....	549
Otis Elevator Co., Yonkers.....	715
Refined Syrups and Sugars, Inc., Yonkers.....	2,520
Sing Sing Prison, Ossining.....	205
Standards Brands, Inc., Peekskill.....	883

Westchester County total..... 6,027

^c Ceased operations during July 1967.

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 opportunity to visit with a colleague from the State of Michigan Congressman MARVIN L. ESCH. We were comparing notes as to the citizen reaction concerning the *Pueblo* incident and recent developments in Vietnam as we both have been in our districts recently.

At that time, Congressman ESCH 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 ESCH 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 ESCH's complete letter to the President follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1968.

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 communications from 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 and 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 conflicting testimony and statements by members of the Defense and State Departments and White House officials. They arise not only out of the seizure of the *Pueblo*, but also from the greatly increased activity and strength of the widespread enemy attacks in South Vietnam. To this date, neither the public utterances by you or these two departments have provided 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-

defined and well-supported replies to inquiries, such as these I make, are demanded if your Administration can hope to overcome the crisis of confidence rampant in our land today.

Recognizing the limitations of military security, I request that you make public your replies, wherever possible, and where not possible that you present your answers to Members of the appropriate committees in the Congress.

1. Was the *Pueblo* in international waters when she was seized? Had she previously intruded in North Korean Territorial waters? There was direct conflict in the U.S. position between the first statement by Ambassador Goldberg before the United Nations that we had "never" intruded on Korean territorial waters and the subsequent doubts raised by Mr. Rusk and Mr. McNamara on February 4. If there was serious doubt, as reflected in the Rusk-McNamara statement on February 4, why did we take a categorical stand before the United Nations indicating otherwise? Does this not lessen our stature among other nations and reduce our ability to deal with them on a basis of mutual trust?

2. It has been reported that there were a number of clear warnings that action of this type might be taken by the North Koreans. In light of this, what action was taken to prevent this incident? Were contingency plans made to handle a renewal of hostilities in Korea?

3. There have been seemingly contradictory statements by Ambassador Goldberg and Secretary Rusk regarding the nature and frequency of communications between the *Pueblo* and American sources before and during the capture. What was the exact nature of those communications from the first approach of the North Korean patrol boats until the docking at Wonsan Harbor?

4. It has also been charged that high government officials with decision making power were not informed of the crisis until the capture was a fait d'accompli. What provisions are made for delegation of authority to protect our forces, or to assure that decision making officials are promptly informed?

5. There has been considerable concern regarding the valuable monitoring and top secret equipment aboard this vessel. Were provisions made to destroy sensitive equipment? Have any efforts been made to prevent the North Korean government from conducting salvaging operations at the site of the seizure or have we attempted to salvage the equipment ourselves—both to protect the secrets it may contain and to prove the location of the seizure?

6. Is there any definite evidence to connect the *Pueblo* incident with the greatly stepped up Vietcong activity and attacks? Was this an effort on the part of the Communists to divert our attention and to sap our strength in Vietnam?

7. Is there any information which leads to the supposition that further Communist aggression and incidents are to be expected in other SEATO nations?

8. Do you envision any changes in policy regarding the protection and armaments and deployment of other intelligence ships?

There are also serious questions regarding the stepped up Communist activity in South Vietnam, the Viet-Cong capture of a number of provincial capitals, and the apparent failure of the Thieu government to maintain the stability of South Vietnam.

9. To what degree does the current crisis in South Vietnam reflect the lack of political and military stability? How could our previous assessments, including your optimistic account in your State of the Union address, be so inaccurate?

10. Why do discrepancies in casualty figures continue to exist? What assurances do we have that the number of "enemy" killed does not include South Vietnamese civilians? Are we to believe Defense Department spokes-

men in Vietnam who have consistently maintained that the casualty figures were actual body counts or Mr. McNamara's admission that they are only our best estimates under battle conditions?

11. Has there been a direct effort to minimize the civilian casualties during the past several days? What 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 American television last week is appalling to the American conscience. In what way are we working with the South Vietnamese government to demand that the Geneva Convention articles regarding prisoners of war be observed? I fully recognize that there are atrocities perpetuated upon American military personnel and Vietnamese civilians by the enemy, but do not believe that this gives us the license to commit or condone willful atrocities of our own or of the South Vietnamese.

13. Reports of widespread corruption, extensive blackmarket dealings and failure of the government to heed the need for social reform are commonplace and have not been contradicted. There is also deep concern about the failure of the Thieu government to commit its own troops to battle and the extensive practice of South Vietnamese young men avoiding military duty by bribing their way out. These problems have grown worse, not better, through the four years of the war. What, if any, action has the South Vietnamese government taken to correct these deplorable situations?

14. Are we, or are we not, continuing private negotiations with North Vietnam regarding 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 beginnings of a stable and free Vietnam—free 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 independent nation, surely our defense of that independence is in vain. If our government cannot be forthright and honest in its communications to the world and to its people, then surely our troops serve in vain.

Such a crisis demands an answer. I await your reply.

Respectfully,

MARVIN L. ESCH,
Member of Congress.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. HANLEY. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President has submitted to the Congress his proposals for Federal expenditures for the coming year. As has been the case in the past few years, the proposed expenditures for the national defense and for the war in Vietnam constitute the largest single category. Forty-three cents out of every dollar proposed to be spent in the coming fiscal year will be devoted 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 various subcommittees of the House Appropriations Committee will soon be engaged in intensive review of these requests.

The principal concern of the Congress throughout 1967 was with the budget, or more accurately, with the nondefense or domestic portion of that budget. It had seemed quite evident during 1967 that the Congress would be giving no serious consideration to the President's request for additional revenue. The President wanted a 10-percent surcharge; that is, an additional 10 percent of the income tax liability of most of the individual and corporate taxpayers in the country. Roughly, the President was asking for an average additional tax of 1 penny on every dollar of income.

Tax increases at any level of government never muster overwhelming and enthusiastic support. At one time, we were told that this additional tax of 1 penny on every dollar of income was very necessary because of the increased costs of the war in Vietnam. At another time it was suggested that the additional revenue would substantially reduce inflationary pressures and curb the increase in the cost of living.

I regret that I was not a Member of Congress in 1964 when final action was taken on the Tax Reform and Reduction Act. The tax liability of individuals was reduced by \$6.1 billion in 1964 and \$9.1 billion in 1965. Rate reductions and reforms combined to cut tax liabilities by an average of 19.4 percent in 1965. That economic growth which the tax reduction program stimulated continues even today, and it is expected that this prosperity alone, with no increases in tax rates, will produce an additional \$11 billion in Federal revenues.

As the Congress prepares for another extensive battle of the budget, it is important to realize what Congress accomplished with regard to the budget for the current fiscal year, 1968.

Congress reduced appropriations for the current fiscal year below appropriations made by Congress for the previous fiscal year, 1967, by almost \$1.3 billion.

It is important to remember that there is a difference between what the Congress appropriates for a given fiscal year and what the administration actually spends during that year. Appropriations made in 1 fiscal year may well end up being spent in succeeding years. In regular appropriation bills for this fiscal year, Congress reduced appropriations below the President's budget by \$5.8 billion. Also Congress enacted a special reduction in fiscal 1968 budgeted obligations designed to assure reductions of not less than \$9 billion, including proposed expenditures involved in the cut of \$5.8 billion. The net effect of all this was a reduction of not less than \$4.1 billion in proposed expenditures for the current fiscal year.

It must, of necessity, follow that reductions and postponements in Federal expenditures find their way to the local level. When we respond to the sentiment to reduce spending, we must also view the specific impact of such a decision.

In my district, the Onondaga County

Division of Traffic Safety had been anticipating a Federal matching grant from the Department of Transportation in the amount of \$81,000 for a program to promote traffic safety. The amount that will be received will be closer to \$13,000.

Local educational agencies will have to adjust and scale down programs which they expected to implement as a result of the Federal financial assistance promised in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Communities and States will be required to slow down their efforts to construct improved wastewater treatment plants because Congress and the administration did not make good on the promise of financial assistance provided for in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

All of us here are aware of the national and local implications of sizable reductions in the Federal budget. Congress, in its wisdom, left to the administration and the various Federal agencies the responsibility of dividing up the major portion of the expenditure reductions for the current fiscal year. It would seem to me that the Congress, since it enacts into law all of the Federal programs which need funds to be effective, ought to make the specific judgments about which programs are to be funded and which are to be reduced, postponed, or perhaps even eliminated.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has suggested that Congress create a Government Program Evaluation Commission. I support this idea, and I have cosponsored legislation to bring such a commission into the great problem which is facing the Congress.

Our gigantic military budget continues to grow. An additional \$3.3 billion is being requested for the coming fiscal year. I think that we realize that there is no concrete indication that this situation is going to change in the near future. Congress must face up to the responsibility to develop effective, intelligent, and extensive guidelines for expenditure control. I think that the work of a Government Program Evaluation Commission would be invaluable in this effort. There are literally thousands of Federal activities and programs, and the Congress has need for the best thinking it can find to develop an intelligent system of priorities to phase out nonessential programs, to stretch out or postpone spending on less essential programs, and to move vigorously on those domestic activities which continue to be of the utmost importance.

Unquestionably, there will be congressional cuts in the proposed budget for the coming fiscal year. The Congress, hopefully, will make greater use of the pruning knife and forsake the irresponsible use of the meat ax in its approach to the budget. Proposed expenditures will be closely examined, and efforts will be made to find the best areas for reduction and postponement.

CIVIC DINNER IN TAMPA HONORS SAM GIBBONS FOR WORK IN EDUCATIONAL FIELD

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. 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 the gentleman is one of the outstanding members of the Committee on Education and Labor and has played an important part in the enactment of many of the landmark education bills of the past several years. It is a natural sequence of his prominence in this field, and his close association with leaders in education, that the Honorable John W. Gardner, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, made the major address at the dinner in honor of our colleague, Mr. GIBBONS.

I believe the House will be interested in the Secretary's remarks on this occasion and I include the text thereof:

REMARKS BY JOHN W. GARDNER, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, 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 achievements that have made the last few years so memorable. He has won the respect and affection of his fellow Members of Congress and of the Executive Branch.

So when you invited me to participate in this tribute, I was proud to do so.

Sometimes I think we haven't taken to heart all the implications of self-government. 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 ignored the country's problems or 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 consequences of bad governing are unchanged. If the American people refuse to face the problems of the nation, or if they believe that hatred and anger will solve those problems, or if they lack strength and courage under stress, then they will govern badly. And the nation will suffer.

Our Founding Fathers concluded that the best form of self-government is a representative government, and that is what we have. So the first and most crucial way that the people must exhibit wisdom is in selecting their representatives.

In sending Sam Gibbons to Congress you have chosen well. And I do not say that in a partisan spirit. As many of you know, I am a completely non-political person.

Now if you are to be good rulers of this self-governing society, you will have to do more than choose able leaders. You yourselves must face honestly the critical problems confronting the nation today.

My present job has given me a close-up view of the domestic issues facing this Nation. I'd like to talk to you about those issues, and about some of the things we're doing, in and out of government, to cope with them.

The domestic problems which concern the Federal Government today are of direct interest to you as individuals. How can we provide decent schooling for our children? How can we increase the supply and compe-

tence of teachers? When your sons and daughters are ready for college, will there be a place for them? Will there be jobs for those who want to work? Will there be peace or violence in our communities?

It doesn't require the instincts of a reformer or the eye of a muckraker to detect social evils in this land today. All it requires is the ability to follow the newspapers, to scan the data on infant mortality among the poor, to read the crime statistics, to see the many signs of urban disintegration, to observe the bitterness of racial conflict, to sense the mood of the people.

Despite such dramatic evidence, those problems have an unreal quality for the comfortable American who lives on a pleasant street in a pleasant suburb. It's easy for him to believe that the problems are someone else's, not his.

But we cannot have communities that are half sound and half unsound. Social decay and unrest cannot be sealed off. They inevitably affect the whole community and the whole nation. It won't be a decent society for any of us until it is for all of us.

In short, the first step for every citizen is to acknowledge that the problems are real and of direct concern to him. The second step is to recognize that the problems are exceedingly complex. Anyone who tells you that there are obvious, easy solutions is telling you lies. There are no simple answers. There are no easy victories.

Having admitted that the problems are real, having recognized that they are complex, we must then face the fact that they cannot be solved by hatred or rage or cynicism or self-pity on the part 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 calmly and constructively.

Millions of Americans are engaged in that work today—and the man we are honoring tonight is prominent among those who are 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. For 2½ years I have spent my days with people in and out of government who are concerned with education, health, social services, rehabilitation of the handicapped, care of the mentally ill, education of gifted children, the problems of the cities and so on. The people I have seen in my travels around the country are 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 expenditures for education and for health have both tripled in the brief period that President Johnson has been in office. The great programs 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, an extraordinary rise in our concern for these fields, and a remarkable increase in our commitment to certain goals.

The idea of the worth and dignity of the individual is thousands of years old. But embedding that idea in social and political institutions has been a painfully slow process. It is still slow.

Our own history is instructive. No nation had ever before expressed so clear a concern for individual freedom and fulfillment as was expressed in our founding documents.

Yet it was not until 1865 that we freed the slaves. It was not until the early years of this century that we outlawed child labor. It was not until 1920 that women were allowed to vote. It was not until 1954 that the Supreme Court outlawed segregation in the schools. And degrading poverty and discrimination still exist in this free and prosperous land.

No one can say that we moved with impetuous haste to make real our commitment to individual dignity. But we have moved. The social programs launched in the past several years are a new chapter in that long history. The most dramatic feature of this recent chapter is the breadth and penetration of the efforts that are being undertaken.

Passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was the culmination of years of controversy over the question of Federal aid to education. And it was only one item a flood of legislation launching programs in every aspect of education.

In the past half dozen years economists have shown that funds expended on education are to be thought of as an investment rather than as consumption. They have shown that the release of human potential is good strategy for a nation that seeks to assure its continued dynamism and forward thrust. For a modern society, wholly dependent on human skill and creativeness for its vitality and productivity, education at every level and in every form is essential.

In other words helping people to improve themselves not only serves our deepest convictions as Americans, it makes this a more vital society.

We have seen an awakening of the national conscience with respect to education of disadvantaged children. For the first time there is widely shared understanding that inadequate early education often condemns the youngster to a life of hopelessness and perpetuates the culture of poverty.

But concern for the economically disadvantaged is only a facet of our larger concern. We're learning new ways of coping with all of the varied circumstances in which human potentialities are blighted.

Let me give you a simple example. In the past half dozen years we have seen a revolution in our treatment of handicapped children. And I'll wager that very few of you are at all familiar with those developments.

We value equality of opportunity. What kind of equality of opportunity can there possibly be for a child who is born blind, or mentally retarded, or crippled? Yet until very recently, neglect is the only word I can find to describe our dealings with such children. There were good people working on these problems, to be sure, but we didn't give them the resources to do the job.

Now the resources have been made available. Research can be done, clinics built, teachers trained. 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 and had to have his leg amputated above the knee. When the wound was healed he was fitted with his first artificial 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 got a pat on the head and then a nudge "Now, run!" And the boy ran the length of the room.

Not too many years ago that boy would have had to hobble around on a crutch 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 child amputee centers across the country.

I could give you many similar examples involving blind children, deaf children, children born with brain damage, and so on. We

are working on prevention of such conditions; we are working on improved methods of treatment; we are working on rehabilitation. As a result, youngsters who might have been condemned to lives of uselessness and dependence are becoming self-sufficient citizens.

This is one of the great American tasks—to save every child who can be saved, to help every child who can be helped, to heal the sick, to lift the fallen.

The avenues of individual fulfillment should be open to everyone. No one should be shut out from the life of the society.

It is an ideal to which we have often been grievously unfaithful.

In the past several years the nation has made a major effort to correct that infidelity. The effort has produced fierce controversy, as such efforts must. The gains achieved have been modest, and painfully fought for. We have a long way to go. Yet in the long history of the nation only the brief period 1933-1937 presents anything comparable in scope and seriousness to the contemporary effort.

Now let me say a word about the past and the future.

I was reminiscing with friends recently about my boyhood in California some 45 years ago.

It seems like another world. Was it really a less complicated world, or does it only appear so in the golden light of memory? In retrospect, it does seem to have been a safer, simpler, more orderly and humane existence. But then I call to mind that there were problems in those days too. I'm not thinking of the elderly neighbor of ours who said over and over that he didn't know what the world was coming to with things like flying machines and jazz music and skirts that showed women's ankles and all the young people running around in tin lizzies. I am thinking, rather, of the fact that a baby born in 1912—the year I was born—had an average life expectancy of 50 years. (I'm living on borrowed time.) A baby born today has an average life expectancy of more than 70 years. In 1915 out of every 1,000 live births, 100 infants did not survive their first birthday, as against 23 today. TB caused 117 deaths per 100,000 as against four per 100,000 today. The mentally ill were outcasts. Child labor was widespread. Old age and poverty were almost synonymous. Industrial accidents caused a rate of injury and death that would shock any modern corporate executive.

So we mustn't be misled by memories of a golden yesterday.

Each generation has its own problems. We had no right or reason to expect that our generation would be uniquely free of them. And in fact we have our full share—and then some.

But we can cope with them—if we are sufficiently honest to face up to them, if we can deny ourselves the joys of hating one another, and if we have the stamina and steadiness to hold to our deepest purposes through times of confusion and controversy.

President Johnson has said, "... A nation may accumulate dollars, grow in power, pile stone on stone—and still fall short of greatness. The measure of a people is not how much they achieve, but what they achieve."

What do we want to achieve? Let me close this talk with a few brief words on that subject. I believe that large numbers of Americans have in recent years come to some kind of decision as to the sort of society that they really want.

We found ourselves coming into a period of unprecedented prosperity, and we decided that prosperity wasn't enough. We found ourselves in a period of extraordinary technical achievements, and we decided that technical proficiency wasn't enough.

We decided that what we really wanted was a society designed for people.

—a society in which every young person could fulfill the promise that was in him;

—a society in which every person, old or young, could live his life with some measure of dignity;

—a society in which poverty, disease and ignorance tyrannize no longer;

—a society of opportunity and fulfillment. Every individual is of value.

That defines the purpose of our efforts. That's the purpose of all our trials and errors, and seeking and finding. It's to enhance the individual human being. That's easy to lose sight of, especially when we're talking of huge government programs, but *their* only legitimate purpose is to create the conditions in which individual lives may be lived humanely.

We should never forget the central purpose of laws and government in a free society—that is to make the world manageable so that the individual human being may have 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 COLUMBIA 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 press was 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 all of us, and we feel that our Federal City law-enforcement 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 in 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 combatting 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 top law enforcement officials are together in their resolve to fight the common enemy—crime in our city.

NEWS RELEASE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, FEBRUARY 8, 1968

The following statement was released jointly today, by Director of Public Safety, Patrick V. Murphy, and Chief of Police John B. Layton.

The assignment 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 the number two position in the Department, Executive Officer.

Assistant Chief Wilson has filled one of the four Assistant Chief positions and will be responsible for one of 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 which come under his control. The creation of the position of Director of Public Safety has strengthened and facilitated police operations by placing a representative of 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 and harmoniously in planning the efforts of the Department for the future. I look forward to a continuing fruitful working relationship, and appreciate Chief Layton's pledge of loyal support in our attempt to make this fine police department ever better."

Chief Layton stated:

"I have long had great pride in the Metropolitan Police Department and the accomplishments of its members over the years. I am proud to be its Chief.

"In these times of great change I have looked forward with confidence to what I think can be greater accomplishments for our city under Mayor Washington and Deputy Mayor Fletcher as they move to reorganize and revitalize our City Government.

"In this connection, my role as operating head of the Department was made clear by Mayor Washington on the appointment of Mr. Murphy as Public Safety Director and has been reaffirmed by both Mr. Murphy and the Mayor's Office.

"I pledge to the Mayor, his Deputy, Director of Public Safety and the citizens of this community my best efforts to make this excellent Department an even better one."

REVIEW OF CIVILIAN NUCLEAR POWER PROGRAM

Mr. HAYS. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on Labor Day in Wheeling, W. Va., President 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 public safety 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 distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, 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 recently read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that as of the first of this year there were 15 operating nuclear powerplants in the United States, 21 others under construction, firm orders placed for an additional 40, plus 12 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 at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on page 81 of England's white paper entitled "Fuel Policy" published last November is this paragraph:

As regards the Atomic Energy Authority's research and development expenditure, the royalty at the rate of 0.14d. per kwh to be paid by the generating Boards to the Atomic Energy Authority on AGR's in the second nuclear power programme 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 Magnox and AGR systems, but it is expected to cover amply all forward avoidable costs likely to be incurred by the Atomic Energy Authority in further development work for the second nuclear power programme.

Based on this unique plan to recoup a portion of Federal expenditures that have been channeled into the development of nuclear reactors, and mindful of the enormous Government investment that will be required if the Atomic Energy Commission's projected 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 powerplants.

The tax rate of 0.14 mill 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 75 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 homeowners.

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 1954 to provide for an excise tax on electrical energy produced in nuclear powerplants

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 1954 is amended by adding thereto the following new section:

"SEC. 4103. Tax on electrical energy produced in nuclear powerplants. There is hereby imposed upon electrical energy produced in nuclear powerplants and sold by the producer thereof for domestic or commercial consumption a tax equivalent to 0.14 mills 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

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.

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, I believe, developed the label of "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 of Representatives and the situation is changed. Congress, in short got back into the act. And, even though still outnumbered three to two, I believe that the Republicans in the Congress helped write a constructive record of legislation.

On the one hand, the minority Republican Party, with the help of some southern Democrat House Members fought all year for fiscal sanity in Government—trying to head off the disastrous effects of inflation which massive Federal spending and huge red-ink de-

ficits bring on. Although we were not entirely successful, we did manage to save taxpayers some \$5.9 billion this year.

These cuts in President Johnson's requests amounted to \$2.5 billion in military appropriations and \$3.4 billion in nonmilitary spending.

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 Democratic House Members voted against 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 mean what we say, that between the minority party and the people there is no credibility gap.

We have given our unhesitating support to every requirement and need of fighting forces in Southeast Asia and our Armed Forces elsewhere in the world.

We have battled for legislation to make our streets and homes safe again.

The continuing transfer of governmental authority, responsibility, and control from Washington to the States 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 our main objectives and our accomplishments. 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 the way. We have shown what our party stands for and what we believe should and must be done.

In many respects, this year has been a year of education for the American people. I believe the lessons we have tried to teach are important ones and that coming events will prove them accurate and true.

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

before us again, as it has been for many years in the past. The object of that attention is the foreign aid program. Like many other interested citizens, both in the Congress and in the public at large, I have become increasingly concerned about the present status and future prospects of the whole foreign aid project. As we all know, last year the foreign aid appropriation passed the House by a very small margin—eight votes if I recall correctly. It is not difficult to discern from these figures that the future of the foreign aid program is doubtful at best.

I have given a good deal of thought as to what factors are contributing to this deterioration of support for the program. And I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the problem is at least twofold. First, and most important, the focus of the aid program has not changed sufficiently as the nature of the problems to which it is directed has changed. The focus of the highly successful Marshall plan was economic recovery. The focus of the program in the early 1950's was military and economic. Today, the program's emphasis is primarily economic, and to a lesser extent military. But, Mr. Speaker, these elements may be—I believe that they are—losing their relevance in the 1960's as we are confronted with different and rapidly changing problems throughout the developing world.

Second, while I know that the polls tell us from time to time that the majority of the American people support foreign aid, I am not convinced that this is true. Whatever popular support there is, it is soggy to say the least, and limited to the few groups that have made it their business to be concerned. If the program is to be continued—and I am convinced that it must be—its popular base must be extended and solidified. If we are to accomplish this it is imperative that we make clear to the American people just what it is that this program is supposed to accomplish—what it is realistic for us to expect can be accomplished through the aid program.

But, Mr. Speaker, how can we explain to the American people something that we apparently do not understand ourselves? The goals of foreign aid as they are presented to us are nebulous at best, and contradictory at worst. It is not enough to say that our aim is to combat world communism; to win and maintain friends for the United States and for democracy; or to help relieve some of the world's miseries. What is needed now is a major rethinking about the whole aid effort.

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, they cannot be treated in the same way. 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 with a lack of political maturity, the process of economic development has been and will be impeded unless new ap-

proaches 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. SCOTT] in the other body, on January 25, 1968. The resolution would authorize the creation 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 balance between specialized knowledge of existing foreign aid programs and fresh insight concerning their future shape and direction.

The main purpose of the joint committee would be to undertake a thorough and comprehensive study and reevaluation of foreign aid with a view toward developing such recommendations 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, ways and means 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 this year. The committee's study should in no way interfere with 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 long range affair and unless 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, the President's message relating to veterans' and servicemen's benefits reflects the logic and necessity of our expanding existing programs and resolving inequities in the GI bill.

There is no question that we should do all we can for our fighting men. It is imperative that we consider raising the long outdated ceilings on servicemen's insurance and home loan mortgages at the earliest possible time.

The programs for education, employment, and rehabilitation will greatly expedite the veteran's reintegration into civilian life as well as benefit the society as a whole. Such programs reflect not only the need for meaningful, rewarding work for our young adults, but also consider the favorable impact of such training on the intricate social and economic problems existing in our country today.

The continuation and expansion of programs initiated under the administration's directives to give veterans a full appraisal of their benefits through readily available counseling and guidance services will insure that the purpose of these benefits is served.

I urge full and careful consideration of each of these points with a view toward assisting and providing incentive to those who have given such service to their country.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT

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 there and 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 institutionalization 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 informed comparison of sections 103 and 104 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 HEARINGS

S. 355—Requires each standing committee (except Appropriations) to give public notice of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing at least 1 week before the hearing 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, as per recommendation of Final Report (page 11): "9. Each committee shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of hearings at least 2 weeks in advance of the commencement of the hearings unless the committee determines that there is good cause to begin the hearings at an earlier date."

Time was reduced to 1 week by adoption of Senate Amendment No. 53—See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 3, page 3224.

SECTION 103 (A) "B". OPEN HEARINGS; BROADCASTING OF HEARINGS

S. 355—Requires committee hearings (except Appropriations) to be open to the public unless the committee determines that the testimony to be taken may relate to a matter of national security, may tend to reflect adversely upon the character or reputation of any individual, or may divulge matters 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 exceptions provided in S. 355 the wording "or except when the committee determines that, for any other urgent reason, such hearings should not be open to the public." re 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 granting such approval, after the committee, by record vote of a majority of the members of the committee, have adopted a rule to permit such approval of such broadcasts, provided that the hearing is to be broadcast as a public service, without commercial sponsorship, and further provided that no objection by a witness is made to the broadcasting of his own testimony.

Original bill language conformed to the following recommendations of the Final Report (page 10): "5. Hearings shall be open to the public except when a majority of the committee determines that testimony may either bear on national security matters or tend to reflect adversely on the character or reputation of the witness or others. 6. Hearings may be televised and broadcast at the option of the chairman with the approval of a majority of the committee under such rules as the committee may impose to insure fair treatment to all concerned."

See Senate Amendments No. 59, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 3, page 3224, and No. 73, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 3, pages 3400-3401.

(Note: No rule of the House prohibits telecasting and broadcasting of committee hearings, meetings, or of proceedings on the floor. It is a matter of the Speaker's interpretation.)

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 digest of such statements for use by committee members.

Bolling—Provision deleted. Reid—Deletes provision for staff 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 brief summaries of their arguments." Deletes provision for staff digest of statements.

Original language of bill conformed to recommendation of Final Report (p. 11), as follows: "11. Each committee shall require all witnesses appearing before it to file, at least 2 days before their appearance, written statements of their proposed testimony unless the committee finds good cause for the failure to file such a statement. The staff shall prepare digests of such statements for the use of committee members."

See Senate Amendment No. 54, 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 day's hearing, if so requested by committee, staff shall prepare summary of that day's testimony for use by committee members. (Summaries may be printed in committee hearings on approval of chairman and ranking minority member.)

Bolling—Provision deleted. Reid—Provision deleted. Print No. 3—Provision deleted.

Original bill language conformed to mandatory language of Final Report recommendation (page 11), as follows: "13. 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, printed as a part of the committee hearings."

See Senate Amendment No. 55, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 3, pages 3225-3226, and Fulbright Amendment, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 4, pages 5373-5376.

SECTION 103 (A) "E". MINORITY RIGHT TO CALL WITNESSES

S. 355—Provides minority right to have chairman call witnesses selected by minority during at least one day of hearings if majority of minority members so request.

Bolling—Essentially same as S. 355; request must include ranking minority member. Reid—Same as S. 355. Print No. 3—Provision deleted.

See Final Report page 11: "12. In the event hearings have been called by a committee, the minority shall be entitled on request to call witnesses of its choice during at least 1 day of the hearings." Original bill language contained the word "on" instead of "during," which was restored by Senate Amendment No. 74—See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 2, page 2841.

SECTION 103 (A) "F" AND "G". POINTS OF ORDER ON HEARING PROCEDURE; EXEMPTION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES

S. 355—Subsection "f" provides that no point of order shall lie against a measure reported in conformity with requirements of the new section, subsection "g" provides that the requirements of the new section shall not apply to the two Committees on Appropriations.

Bolling—Same. Reid—Same. Print No. 3—Deletes point of order; retains Appropriations waiver.

Subsection "f" added by Senate Amendment No. 36, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 2, page 1718. For Subsection "g", see Hayden Amendment, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 5, pages 5642-5643.

SECTION 104. COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSION

S. 355—Under rules of both houses, no standing committee of either house may sit, without special leave, while its house is in session. Both Appropriations Committees are exempted from this prohibition, as are the House Committees on Government Operations, Rules, and Un-American Activities (see Rule XII, para 30). S. 355 amends present procedure to provide that standing committees of the House may conduct hearings while the House is in session if prior consent therefor has been obtained from the Speaker and Minority Leader. (Same exemptions as above.) Standing committees of the Senate, except Appropriations, may sit for any purpose while the Senate is in session by obtaining consent from the majority and minority leaders.

Bolling—No change in language for Senate. In the House, committees would have to obtain prior consent of Speaker and Minority Leader only if the House was in session "in other than a situation of general debate," meaning consideration of amendments and voting. Reid—No provision. Print No. 3—Same language as S. 355 except that in the House, committees would have to obtain the prior consent only of the Speaker.

See Final Report page 13: "16. Committees shall be permitted to conduct hearings during floor sessions by obtaining consent of the majority and minority leaders or their representatives."

Sec. 104 was amended on Feb. 1 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 2, pp. 2247-2248) 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 extraneous matter.

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. SHRIVER, of Kansas; Congressman ROBERT T. STAFFORD, of Vermont; Congressman CHARLES W. 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 next year. The Executive Director of the Scientific Manpower Commission, 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 first 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

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 all students who are not in high school or 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 student 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 so that all local boards 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 international 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 U.S. citizens abroad 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 for many reasons 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 retaliatory action by 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 Europeans and other foreign nationals to visit the United States.

It has been officially estimated that four times as many foreigners as actually visit our country have incomes which would permit them to do so. But it is not surprising that they fail to do so—and that most of the traffic is in the other direction—in view of our miserly expenditures in the past to publicize our tourist attractions abroad and to provide necessary facilities for foreign travelers in the United States.

Visitors to this country find neither the multilingual tourist services, such as information and guided tours, nor the decent lodging, food and transportation at moderate costs that are easily available in almost every other major tourist area in the world.

As for publicizing the many attractions which we do offer, U.S. expenditures for travel promotion are about equal to those of Canada or Ireland and less than those of France, Great Britain, or Mexico. The U.S. Travel Service, created in 1961, has operated on pitifully inadequate budgets of about \$3 million a year.

The bill I am introducing, which has been introduced in the other body by a bipartisan group of 12 Senators, would increase the USTS budget to \$15 million, including \$10 million to promote foreign travel to this country and \$5 million to inaugurate a domestic travel program. It would give new responsibilities to the USTS in such areas as developing a national travel policy, coordinating the present tourism activities of various Federal agencies, and encouraging the improvement of domestic travel and tourist facilities.

It also provides \$2.5 million for a much-needed inventory of U.S. tourist resources to be carried out by a newly established National Tourism Resources Commission.

My new bill complements another proposal—H.R. 14779—which I cosponsored last month to attract European visitors to the United States by means of "travel incentive stamps."

Mr. Speaker, these proposals offer a constructive alternative to current talk about restricting travel by Americans outside the Western Hemisphere.

The New York Times noted in an editorial Wednesday that—

The Administration would be wise to place far greater emphasis than it has yet done on programs to attract foreign visitors to the United States. Here is a virtually untapped source of dollars, embodying the positive principle of encouragement to travel instead of the negative approach thus far adopted.

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, and promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally, and by otherwise encouraging and facilitating travel within the United States (including its possessions for the purposes 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 stimulate and encourage travel to and within the United States for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities and as a means of promoting friendly understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and the United States;

"(3) encourage the development of tourist facilities, low-cost unit tours, and other arrangements within the United States for meeting the requirements of all travelers;

"(4) foster and encourage the widest possible distribution of the benefits of travel at the cheapest rates between foreign countries and the United States and within the United States consistent with sound economic principles;

"(5) encourage the simplification, reduction, or elimination of barriers to travel, and facilitation of travel to and within the United States generally;

"(6) collect, 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 State and local governments, and with private organizations and agencies, with respect to programs undertaken pursuant to this Act, and (C) achieving the effective cooperation of Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, and of private organizations and agencies, concerned with such programs."

(2) by inserting before the period at the end of section 3(b) the following: "and shall not otherwise compete with the activities of other public or private agencies";

(3) by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 4", and by inserting at the end of such section 4 a new subsection as follows:

"(b) The Secretary may appoint two assistant directors for the purpose of this Act. Such assistant directors shall be compensated at the rate provided for GS-18 in the Classification Act of 1949."

(4) by redesignating 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 otherwise experienced in tourism research, promotion, or planning. The Secretary shall appoint a chairman from among such members. The Commission shall meet at the call of the Secretary.

"(b) The Commission shall make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of—

"(1) determining the domestic travel needs of the people of the United States and of visitors from other lands at the present time and to the year 1980;

"(2) determining the travel resources of the Nation available to satisfy such needs now to the year 1980;

"(3) determining policies and programs which will insure that the domestic travel needs of the present and the future are adequately and efficiently met;

"(4) determining a recommended program of Federal assistance to the States in promoting domestic travel; and

"(5) determining whether a separate agency of the Government should be established to consolidate and coordinate tourism research, planning, and development activities presently performed by different existing agencies of the Government.

The Commission shall report the results of such investigation and study to the Secretary not later than two years after the effective date of this section. The Secretary shall submit such report, together with his recommendations with respect thereto, to the President and the Congress.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be necessary to assist the Commission, 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.

"(d) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving 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 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(e) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$2,500,000 for the purpose of this section."

(5) by striking out "\$4,700,000" in the section redesignated as section 7 and inserting in lieu thereof "\$15,000,000"; and

(6) by striking out "International Travel Act of 1961" in the section redesignated as section 8 and inserting in lieu thereof "International and Domestic Travel Act of 1968".

[From the New York Times, Feb. 7, 1968]

TOURIST TAX

The Administration's program for reducing the \$2 billion drain generated by American tourists may have been devised with the best of intentions, to interfere as little as possible with the traditional freedom of travel, to avoid penalizing students and teachers and yet to cut down on the excessive outlays of those who have plenty of money to spend and have been spending it freely abroad. But despite some good features, this ingenious and complicated proposal seems so full of

holes that it looks more like something hastily devised to help get the White House off the balance-of-payments hook than as legislation it seriously expects Congress to adopt.

The 5 percent excise tax on all airline fares and a similar tax on all ship tickets outside the Western Hemisphere, as well as a lowering of the duty-free allowance to a nominal \$10, are reasonable and practical proposals. But the more important part of the plan, that imposing temporary taxes on spending abroad, appears to be neither reasonable nor practical.

While it certainly has its faults, the American tax system has proved more successful than most because of the excellent record of voluntary compliance of taxpayers. The proposed new tourist taxes would make a mockery out of the established principle of voluntary compliance. If Americans are to be asked to estimate their travel expenses and are subject to spot checks to determine just how much money they are taking with them, they will inevitably fall into the kind of evasive practices that have become almost normal in some other countries. Such a result could thoroughly undermine taxpayer morale and morality.

The Administration's proposal would be expensive and ineffective as well; it would almost surely result in retaliation by other countries. There is also the danger that Americans would be tempted to place funds abroad, adding to the outflow instead of reducing it.

While the 5 percent transportation tax and the lowering of the duty-free limit are worth adopting, the Administration would be wise to place far greater emphasis than it has yet done on programs to attract foreign visitors to the United States. Here is a virtually untapped source of dollars, embodying the positive principle of encouragement to travel instead of the negative approach thus far adopted.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks today, I am including title II, part 3 of the comparative analysis of congressional reform bills that has been prepared by the Republican task force on congressional reform.

In my judgment, this study of the specific provisions of relevant bills is of great value to all of us who are deeply concerned about the need to institute a number of urgent reforms in the operation of the Congress.

It would be my hope that the Rules Committee will take action in the near future to report out a reform bill that is essential to the efficient working of this body. Our failure to adopt meaningful reforms year after year does little to enhance the confidence of the American people in the Congress.

The material referred to follows:

TITLE II: PART 3—THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS

Sec. 231. Committee hearings.

Sec. 232. Budget review.

Sec. 233. Committee action.

Sec. 234. Passage of bills.

Sec. 235. Rollcall vote required on measures changing compensation of Members of Congress.

SECTION 231(A). APPROPRIATIONS HEARINGS TO BE OPEN

S. 355. Provides for open hearings of both Appropriations committees unless 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 individual, or may divulge matters deemed confidential under other provisions of law or Government regulation.

Hearings may be broadcast by radio or TV under rules adopted by the committee (either house).

Bolling: No provision.

Reid: Same as S. 355.

Print No. 3: Provision deleted.

(NOTE.—See Final Report page 32: "7. Appropriations hearings shall be open except where the committee determines that an executive session is necessary because national security matters will be involved in the testimony to be given at a particular hearing." A technical amendment was adopted by the Senate to conform language affecting Appropriations committees with language applying to other committees—see Section 103(a) "b".)

SECTION 231(b-f). HEARINGS ON THE BUDGET AS A WHOLE

S. 355: Requires both Appropriations Committees to hold public hearings on the budget within 30 days after its transmittal. These hearings are to examine particularly (1) the basic recommendations and budgetary policies of the President in the presentation of the budget, and (2) the fiscal, financial, and economic assumptions used as bases in arriving at total estimated expenditures and receipts.

Committees are required to receive testimony from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of BOB, and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors. (Hearings may be joint.)

Each Member of the House and Senate is to be furnished with a copy of the printed transcript of these hearings.

Subsection (f) repeals '46 Act relating to the legislative budget.

Bolling: No provision.

Reid: Same as S. 355.

Print No. 3: Same as S. 355.

(NOTE.—Section not amended by the Senate. See Final Report page 31: (5) Within 30 days after the submission of the executive budget, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors shall appear before the Appropriations Committee of each house to give testimony and answer questions as to overall budgetary considerations, assumptions in arriving at revenue and expenditure totals, and such other information as will be of assistance to the committee in acting on the budget requests. This testimony shall be printed immediately following their appearance. At the option of the Appropriations Committees, this appearance may be made before a joint hearing of the committees. (4) Section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 providing for a legislative budget shall be repealed.)

SECTION 232. BUDGET REVIEW OF MULTIAGENCY PROGRAMS

S. 355: Directs Appropriations Committees, or a duly authorized subcommittee of each, to review the budget for each fiscal year for the specific purpose of examining and reviewing multiagency programs; that is, those programs for which estimated expenditures or proposed appropriations contained in the budget are to be made by, or under the control of, two or more Federal agencies.

Bolling: Same. (Sec. 221 of Bolling bill.)

Reid: Same.

Print No. 3: Requires the full committees to make "selective examination and review."

(NOTE.—Section not amended by Senate. See Final Report page 32: "6. The Appropriations Committees shall examine multiagency programs through review by the full committees or designated subcommittees.")

SECTION 233—PROXY VOTING—COMMITTEE REPORTS

S. 355: Subsection (a) makes applicable to the Appropriations Committees of both houses the same 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 consideration 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 have been 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 consider any analysis or study of cost and/or program effectiveness conducted by other Senate or House committees or the executive branch. All reports shall make reference to such studies. . . .")

"10. Committee reports on supplemental and deficiency appropriations bills shall include a comprehensive explanation of why the request is of an emergency nature and could not have been made in the current or the next regular appropriations bill. Fiscal responsibility is best exercised by the regular process of appropriating through annual bills. Programs should not be continuously funded through deficiency and supplementary bills in the absence of a compelling necessity to do so."

(Subsection (a) was amended by the Senate to make the proxy voting language applicable to the Appropriations Committees the same as that to apply to other committees. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 4, p. 5385.)

Ex-officio membership on House Appropriations subcommittees

New Section 222 of the Bolling bill provides that the ranking majority and minority member of each standing legislative committee of the House shall be ex-officio members of subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee which fund programs under the jurisdiction of standing legislative committees on which these two members sit.

SECTION 234. ROLL CALL VOTE ON APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

S. 355: Requires yea-and-nay vote on final passage of an appropriation bill in both House and Senate. (Requirement does not apply to the adoption of conference reports on appropriation bills.)

Bolling: No provision.

Reid: Same as S. 355.

Print No. 3: Requires yea-and-nay on final passage of any "general appropriation measure."

(NOTE.—Section not amended by Senate. See Final Report, page 33: "9. There shall be a yea-and-nay vote on final floor passage of all appropriations bills in each house. Such

a vote shall not be required on conference reports.")

SECTION 235. ROLL CALL VOTES ON COMPENSATION OF SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES

S. 355: Requires that any measure containing a pay raise for Members of Congress must be considered separately and approved by a roll call vote.

Bolling: No provision.

Reid: Same as S. 355. (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. 113, pt. 3, pp. 4125-4127, accepted by voice vote.)

New provision—Reid bill

New Sec. 235 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 for such programs for a fiscal year early enough in the fiscal year to permit the recipients to use the funds effectively and economically during the year."

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 to exercise the suffrage 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 be more apt to place the national interest above parochial and special interests. I agree with this observation.

There are a number of other reasons that can only lead one to conclude that our 18-year-olds should be given the right to vote. The age group of 18 to 21 carries the main burden of fighting our wars and maintaining the defense and security of our Nation. They stand re-

sponsible for the welfare of the families they bring into the world and for whom we allow the legal right to enter into binding written contracts such as wills, leases, insurance, and real estate agreements.

This group also stands responsible for their actions in our adult courts of law and for the lives of other citizens who travel on our streets and highways, for we allow 18-year-olds the privilege to operate motor vehicles. The 18-year-old can enter our civil service and pay substantial taxes to the Federal Government—but he lacks a voice and a vote in deciding who shall be the policymakers of the Government for whom he works and supports.

In short, we have offered the 18-year-old citizen our assistance, our good wishes, our advice and admonitions, the right to fight and die for their country in battles chosen by their elders, the right to make certain decisions provided they do not conflict with their elders' wishes—all these and more have been given freely, but we except them from the right to vote.

I am convinced that we in the Congress must make a sincere effort to bridge the wisdom and experience of age and the vitality and enthusiasm of youth. It is my conviction that by giving 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 present prospects of its youth. This nation is increasingly dependent on the opportunities, capabilities, and vitality of those who are soon to bear its chief responsibilities." Professor Clinton Rossiter in "Goals for Americans," 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 good voters, 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 will soon bear the burdens we now share 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 eighteen 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

House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by Congress:

“ARTICLE—

“SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States who have attained the age of eighteen years to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of age.

“SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

HIGHER FHA RATES WILL COST HOMEBUYERS HEAVILY AND REDUCE HOUSING CONSTRUCTION

Mr. PATMAN. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, there has been much talk about placing higher interest rates on American homebuyers.

Much of this talk has come from well-meaning persons who are seeking answers that will revive the Nation's homebuilding 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. Somehow in the desperation to find an answer to our homebuilding woes, high interest rates have been glorified.

Mr. Speaker, the answers to the decline of home construction are not simple, so quick, and so pat. And thank goodness, all of them are not so expensive.

Mr. Speaker, high interest rates on FHA mortgages would be one of the most tragic and misguided steps that could be taken under the current circumstances. Higher interest rates on FHA mortgages are not the answer.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, there is not one shred of economic, social, or political evidence to support the idea that high FHA interest rates will solve our homebuilding problems. The contrary is true. High interest rates, if the Congress is foolish enough to grant them, will have the opposite effect. Over the long haul, these higher interest rates would be destructive to the homebuilding industry and the homebuying public.

The proposals that have been publicized call for the Congress to give up its traditional and longstanding control over interest rates on Government-insured housing programs. In the place of this statutory control, the Congress

would give the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development full discretionary power to set interest rates at whatever level he deems necessary on FHA programs.

Mr. Speaker, these proposals would, overnight, raise the cost of housing at least 11 percent. For the average homebuyer, 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 homebuyer under these increased interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I urge those who are promoting this idea to slow down, to stop and look just where this will lead us. 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 rates will increase the flow of funds. In short, 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 markets. Invariably, 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 actually decreased following an increase in the interest rate. A study printed in hearings dated June 12, 1967, by the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee states on page 47:

The history of the flow of new credit into the mortgage market indicates that higher 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, and rising prices during 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 funds. 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 special category in our economy. As we consider any changes in the FHA interest rates, we must consider this overriding fact.

For example, it must be remembered that housing 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 often turn to 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 funds in long-term mortgages. 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 again 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 Home Loan Bank 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 housing mortgage field.

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 mortgages 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 units, particularly low and moderate income units.

Like Fannie Mae and FHLB, 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.

FHA INCREASE WOULD TRIGGER GENERAL INCREASE IN ALL GOVERNMENT INTEREST RATES

Mr. Speaker, under the current proposals, the FHA rate would probably be moved to at least 7 percent.

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 would 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 massive upward surges in rates on municipal bonds and similar securities. Conventional mortgages likewise would keep pace in front of the FHA rate.

POINTS AND DISCOUNTS

In proposing an increase in the FHA rate, many have argued that this would reduce the number of points or discounts that the seller now pays on 6-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 contentions 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 periods of tight money. Judged by past 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 points 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 will 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 mean an immediate increase of at least 11 percent 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 and 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 charges.

Faced 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 Governor Sherman Maisel, 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.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTIVE TO RAISE STATE USURY LAWS

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 just raised its rates to 6½ percent. States with 6-percent limit are: Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia. Six other States have usury limits set at 7 percent and 12 others at 8 percent.

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 recently passed truth-in-lending 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 rates 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.

Undoubtedly, an 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 89-597 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 enacted in the second session of the 89th Congress and renewed in the first session of the 90th Congress. This is legislation which has been fully supported by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Bureau of the Budget, and all 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 homebuyer—"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 the interest rate question. 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 home-seller.

LOOKING BACK AT TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. RANDALL. 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 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 comments which I feel should be made before consideration by the House-Senate conferees.

The first thing is to compliment my fellow Missourian, the gentlewoman from St. Louis, LEONOR 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 of consumers. Her work was 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 strengthening amendments so 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 he was defeated in 1966. One week 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 the bill finally clears the conference committee and 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 harsh blow as their defeat of 1 week ago.

Before we are too hasty to pass 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 I enthusiastically supported the 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 or the borrower.

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 unscrupu-

lous 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 upon credit for its prosperity 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, those 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 find they have been 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-percent 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 encouraging to see the bill 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 requirements 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 practice, 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 business from deadbeats. Yet 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 committee amendment to exempt the first \$30 from a worker's wages and to limit the remainder over \$30 to 10 percent of the total wages due. But in supporting this provision I realized that this amendment, while granting needed protection to certain wage earners, could and perhaps would in many instances deny State courts the power to enforce their own garnishment laws.

In our own State of Missouri, 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 and challenge whether Congress 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 pres-

ent 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 to legislate on the subject of wage garnishment. But yet I cannot be completely satisfied that wage garnishment has the same kind of interstate characteristics that apply to most bankruptcy proceedings. I am not sure the commerce clause gives Congress the right to legislate in the field in which State law does apply with such a great variety of applications.

For instance, Texas has a statute that specifically prohibits the garnishment of wages. Dozens of States have varying degrees of exemptions. At the extreme other end is Mississippi, which I understand provides no exemptions. In other words, Mississippi has no limits as to the amount that may be garnished from a worker's wages. Repeating, I voted for the garnishment provisions in principle, but must entertain serious doubts whether it can stand up under a well prepared challenge in court.

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 device which enables the seller of large ticket merchandise such as major appliances, 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 only to be jarred or shocked by the discovery that the 24th or 36th is much higher than the others.

In recent years this practice has been extended beyond automobiles even into the field of real estate. Far too frequently the time-payment purchaser who has been faithful with all of the monthly payments of \$50 or \$100 suddenly finds that the last payment is \$500 or \$1,000. It may well be that the Federal Reserve Board through regulation for enforcing 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 the consumer fully understands 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 enlarged 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 there will always be those borrowers who are so desperate that unless there is a strong legal prohibition, they will 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 State statutes to define usury and to prohibit interest rates in excess of their definitions. The important point is that some of the States seem unwilling to enforce these 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. Again, I support this effort in principle, although it is my belief that if there is a court contest it may be successfully challenged as to its constitutionality.

It was interesting to observe during the debate that at each stage of the discussion, opposition to the strengthening provisions seemed to fizzle out or sort of dissolve without a very strong or sustained fight by the opponents. At one stage the opponents of this legislation argued that providing borrowers with information as to how much they are asked to pay for credit would compel merchants and retailers in particular to make onerous and burdensome numerical calculations. They allowed that this would be an unreasonable or expensive burden that would lead to a great expense that would have to be absorbed by the business community.

It was even suggested at one time that this would be so burdensome as to materially reduce the profit that could be made from a sale. I felt then and I remain of the opinion that in this computer-oriented age it is possible to turn out interest tables that turn out virtually every set of credit arrangements, at very lost cost. The argument presented in the face of such new computer techniques was not very convincing.

Just a brief comment on the issue of the amendment which would exempt the revolving retail store charge accounts and also the amendment which would exempt transactions for which the interest charge is less than \$10. I supported the effort to eliminate both these exemptions upon the premise that if we are to label this Consumer Protection Act honestly as a "Truth in Lending Act," then it should cover all such credit transactions and truthfully tell the borrower or purchaser the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

If we could sum up in a few words the object of this bill it would be to say its mission is to provide consumers with relative information. If a man borrows \$550 from a loan company and has to repay \$50 a month for 12 months, the true rate of interest should come out to

a figure of about 17 percent. The important point is that these rates should become a matter of information communicated by the lender to the borrower so that he may know how much he is asked to pay for credit and thereby have an opportunity to compare the terms offered by competing retailers. Whether it is a loan of money or credit extended by stores for an installment purchase, the principle is the same.

It seems to me as I look back we should not confuse what we have done as imposing a limit on the rate of interest that may be charged. Historically, some of the attempts to prohibit "usury" seem to have failed. In my opinion, Congress should not repeat its mistakes and attempt to enforce interest 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 transaction. Even now it is hoped no Member of Congress or his constituents will 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.

As one wag who was seeking to be funny observed a few days ago, "now that we have truth in lending, maybe Congress should next turn its attention to the task of finding some way to establish and then enforce truth in borrowing." Returning to the serious side, the bill we passed last week was a great triumph for the consumer. As we compliment the floor manager, Mrs. SULLIVAN of Missouri, we should not forget former Senator Douglas who launched the campaign several years ago to arouse the public to the misleading nature of most credit and interest charges.

Let us all hope that the conference committee when it seeks to work out the differences between the weaker truth-in-lending bill passed by the Senate last year and the much stronger bill passed by the House this year, will accept the House version rather than that of the Senate which would allow revolving credit charge accounts to continue to advertise the low and misleading monthly interest rate and which would also exempt credit charges of \$10 or less, to exclude all purchases under \$100. The Senate bill would not deal with the garnishment problem or carry a so-called loan shark amendment. The stronger House version is superior to the Senate bill and our conferees should stand fast for the House passed version of the Consumer Credit Protection Act.

POULTRY INSPECTION

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-

tleman from New York [Mr. Dow], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH]—in introducing H.R. 15146, designed to remedy the deficiencies in our present national system of poultry inspection. This is the bill referred to by the President in his consumer message to this session of Congress, and I can think of no three gentlemen who have attempted to do more to aid the American consumer than those cosponsoring 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 the 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 slaughter is 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 in calendar year 1966, in about 900 poultry slaughtering and processing plants.

The remaining 13 percent—or 1.6 billion pounds—of the Nation's poultry supply not slaughtered and processed in federally inspected plants is 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 provide for poultry inspection 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 laws, as such.

And what is the situation with regard to intrastate poultry inspection?

Yesterday, the Department of Agriculture released findings of a survey of 97 nonfederally inspected plants, made to determine the adequacy of plant and facility sanitation.

The survey results indicate that of the 97 plants checked, only 37 of the plants

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 should be commended for its position 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 measure 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 by their yeoman efforts in obtaining 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 pioneered 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 my 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 compre-

hensive 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

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 with respect to reducing 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, 1965, 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 unfavorable balance of payments, however, still remains with us, and the resolution being introduced today represents one area in which this situation potentially can be improved without having an unfavorable 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 presently is 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 fleet to expand significantly the volume it 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 monetary medic. For transportation can apply the tourniquet and furnish the plasma.

This, then, is what I and the other cosponsors of this resolution seek to accomplish. Hopefully, as a result of its subsequent approval by the House, it will serve 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 90th Congress is the lapsing 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 and passed by the Senate, offered an opportunity for fulfilling 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. CLEVELAND], 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 legislative 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 interest that some of the sections follow closely a few of the recommendations which I made in the task force-authorized book, "We propose: A Modern Congress"—McGraw-Hill, 1966. These rec-

ommendations 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. 243. Agency reports.

PART 5—LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES

Sec. 251. Cost estimates.

Sec. 252. Appropriations on annual basis.

Sec. 253. Committee jurisdiction.

Sec. 241. GAO assistance to committees

S. 355. Directs Comptroller General, at the request on any committee or joint committee, to designate employees of GAO to explain to and discuss with the committee or its staff any report made by the GAO which would assist the committee in its consideration of proposed legislation (including requests for appropriations) or its review of any program within its jurisdiction or of the activities of any Federal agency within its jurisdiction.

Bolling. No provision.

Reid. Same as S. 355.

Print No. 3. Essentially same as S. 355. (The obligation to explain and discuss GAO reports with committees is placed directly on the Comptroller General on the theory that his authority to delegate this responsibility is implied.)

NOTE.—Section not amended by Senate. See Final Report page 34: "11.(a). GAO representatives shall be available to meet with the Appropriations Committees and legislative committees to discuss their reports as they may affect agency budget justifications or proposed legislation."

Sec. 242. GAO reports to committees

S. 355. Directs Comptroller General to deliver copies of GAO reports to Congress to the Committees on Appropriations and Government Operations and "any other committee . . . which has jurisdiction over any program or part thereof, or any Federal agency, which is the subject of such report."

Bolling. No provision.

Reid. Same as S. 355.

Print No. 3. Requires CG to deliver copies of GAO reports to the Appropriations and Government Operations Committees and to such other committees as may request specific reports.

NOTE.—Section not amended by Senate. See Final Report page 34: "11.(b) GAO reports made to Congress shall be delivered as a matter of course to the Government Operations Committees, the Appropriations Committees, and the affected legislative committees. The review of these reports shall be a function of the committee's review specialist."

Sec. 243. Agency statements on GAO reports

S. 355. Requires that whenever the GAO has made a report which contains recommendations to the head of any Federal agency, the agency shall, in connection with the first request for appropriations for the agency submitted to the Congress more than 60 days after the date of such report, submit a written statement to the Appropriations Committees of both houses of the action taken by the agency with respect to the recommendations.

Bolling. Adds that copies of reports also go to Government Operations Committees. (Sec. 231 of Bolling bill.)

Reid. Same as S. 355.

Print No. 3. Strikes provision.

NOTE.—Section not amended by Senate. See Final Report page 34: "11.(c). Agency justifications shall include reports on action taken pursuant to GAO reports."

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 the bill or joint resolution for the then current and for the next 5 fiscal years (or the duration of the proposed legislation, if less than 5 years), and a comparison 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 impracticable.

*In the case of a measure affecting revenues, such report shall require only an estimate of the gain or less in revenues for a period of 1 year.

If the report accompanying a bill or joint resolution does not comply 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) . . . Committee reports on all new legislation shall include a projection of costs for the next 5 years or for the authorized duration of the program if it is less than 5 years. The estimates shall include a comparison of the committee's cost estimate with that of the executive branch. Final consideration of new legislation shall be subject to a point of order in the absence of this projection."

Section 251 was twice amended by the Senate, adding the language of paragraphs starred above. See Congressional Record of Feb. 15, Amendments No. 79, pp. 2004-06, and No. 62, pp. 2006-08 respectively.

Sections 252 & 253. Annual 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,

(1) to endeavor to insure 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 its jurisdiction which is not appropriated for annually to ascertain whether such program could be modified so that appropriations therefor would be made annually; (subsection b)

(3) to make a complete review periodically of grant-in-aid programs. (subsection c)

Section 253 defines legislative jurisdiction.

Bolling. No provision.

Reid. No provision.

Print No. 3. Modifies all subsections of Sec. 252 to emphasize that the requirements are optional with the committees; other provisions same as S. 355.

NOTE.—Sections not amended by Senate. See Final Report page 35: "12 . . . (b) Each legislative committee shall survey fixed obligation programs under its 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 appropriations review." (See paragraph 1 above; subsection a.)

INEQUITY IN INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. SHRIVER. 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. SHRIVER. 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 sympathetic responses which admit 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 lies in 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 that 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. Such legislation is overdue, and I would hope that the Ways and Means Committee will find the time during this busy year to hold hearings on this proposal and report it favorably to the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MATHIAS of California (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for February 7 and 8, on account of official business.

Mr. GUDE (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. FEIGHAN, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ERLBORN) to revise and 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. DULSKI 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. CAREY to follow the remarks of Mr. DADDARIO.

Mr. RANDALL in two instances.

Mr. PETTIS immediately following Mr. BELL on H.R. 11284.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ERLBORN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHWENGL.
Mr. CEDERBERG.
Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. PELY in two instances.
Mr. HUNT in two instances.
Mr. ADAIR.
Mr. WHALEN.
Mr. FINO.
Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.
Mr. ZWACH.
Mr. DERWINSKI.
Mr. BROCK in three instances.
Mr. MILLER of Ohio.
Mr. BRAY in two instances.
Mr. COLLIER in two instances.
Mr. GERALD R. FORD.
Mr. BERRY.
Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.
Mr. HARVEY.
Mr. DOLE.
Mr. KUPFERMAN in five instances.
Mr. McCLORY in two instances.
Mr. McDONALD of Michigan.
Mr. BOB WILSON in three instances.
Mr. MORTON.
Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BRASCO.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. IRWIN in two instances.
Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania.
Mr. WILLIS.
Mr. TAYLOR in two instances.
Mr. DANIELS in three instances.
Mrs. KELLY.
Mr. BROOKS.
Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee.
Mr. ADAMS in two instances.
Mr. GALLAGHER in four instances.
Mr. SELDEN in two instances.
Mr. FRASER.
Mr. HOLIFIELD.
Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.
Mr. O'HARA of Michigan in two instances.

Mr. TUNNEY in two instances.
Mr. MCCARTHY.
Mr. KIRWAN.
Mr. CORMAN.
Mr. DINGELL in five instances.
Mr. CELLER in two instances.
Mr. GIAIMO.
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. COHELAN in two instances.
Mr. FLOOD in two instances.
Mr. FEIGHAN in five instances.
Mr. RYAN in three instances.
Mr. WHITENER.
Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances.
Mr. BARING.
Mr. SHIPLEY.
Mr. FRIEDEL.
Mr. ASHLEY in two instances.
Mr. ADDABBO in four instances.
Mr. PICKLE.
Mr. ST. ONGE in two instances.
Mr. DENT.
Mr. BARRETT.
Mr. ROSENTHAL.
Mr. HÉBERT.
Mr. RARICK in four instances.
Mr. HENDERSON in two instances.
Mr. YOUNG.
Mr. VAN DEERLIN.
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. RESNICK.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following titles was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

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; 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 signed 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. 13094. 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 87-256 (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 examination 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 ROTC flight instruction 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 703(b) of title 10, United States Code, to make permanent 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 to provide security measures 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(d) 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; to 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 Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation titled "Alcoholic and Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Amendments of 1968"; to the

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1497. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on measures being taken to control the emission of air pollutants from Federal facilities, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 90-148; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1498. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, by providing for temporary injunctions or restraining orders for certain violations of that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1499. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by increasing the penalties for illegal manufacture and traffic in hallucinogenic drugs (including LSD) or other depressant and stimulant drugs, including possession of such drugs for sale or other disposal to another, and by making it a misdemeanor to possess any such drug for one's own use except on a valid prescription; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1500. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on employee personal property claims settled during calendar year 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 241(e), title 31, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1501. A letter from the national corporation agent, Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., transmitting the financial statement of the Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., for the period August 1, 1966, to July 31, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 84-224; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1502. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide criminal penalties 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.

1503. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Bureau of Prisons to assist State and local governments in the improvement of their correctional systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1504. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request for supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1968 (H. Doc. No. 254); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1505. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting a report setting forth all the judgments rendered by the U.S. Court of Claims for the year ended September 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 791(c) of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1506. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3 of the act of November 2, 1966, relating to the development by the Secretary of the Interior of fish protein concentrate; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

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

lien on those vessels for their wages (Rept. No. 1092). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. 2191. A bill to authorize the use of the vessel *Annie B.* in the coastwise trade; with amendment (Rept. No. 1093). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 2192. 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.

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 criminal penalties 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 their 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 arising out of loans made, guaranteed, or insured under chapter 87 of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 15218. 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. CORMAN:

H.R. 15219. A bill to permit persons discharged from the uniformed services before October 1, 1949, for service-connected disabilities of 100 percent to apply for and, if qualified, be awarded retired pay under chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COWGER:

H.R. 15220. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics 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 congressional statement on a national educational policy and to direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to initiate a comprehensive study on the formulation of a plan to implement such policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 15222. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code to provide that a family separation allowance shall be paid to any member of a uniformed service assigned to Government quarters providing he is otherwise entitled to such separation allowance; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

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 for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 15225. A bill to place in trust status certain lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 15226. A bill to authorize the establishment of 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 overtime compensation for postal field service employees, to eliminate compensatory time in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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 to the several States such primary authority and responsibility with respect to the management, regulation, and control of fish and wildlife on lands owned by the United States and to specify the exceptions applicable thereto, and to provide procedure under which Federal agencies may otherwise regulate the taking of fish and game on such lands; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 15229. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the Federal Government to bar the employment in defense facilities of individuals believed disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. RARICK:

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 Commandant of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College to award the degree of master of military art and science; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

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 prescribe 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 in 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, social, and legal problems and opportunities which the Nation faces as a result of medical progress toward making transplantation of organs and the use of artificial organs a

practical alternative in the treatment of disease, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of regional and community 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. 15238. A bill providing for the addition of the Freeman School to the Homestead 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 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year, the granting of national service life insurance to certain insurable war veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 15240. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15241. A bill to amend section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 15242. 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. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 15243. A bill to amend section 226 of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the hospital insurance benefits program for retired policemen and firemen who have attained the age 65 but do not otherwise qualify for such coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 15244. A bill to provide additional protection for the rights of participants in employee pension and profit-sharing retirement plans, to establish minimum standards for pension and profit-sharing retirement plan vesting and funding, to establish a pension plan reinsurance program, to provide for portability of pension credits, to provide for regulation of the administration of pension and other employee benefit plans, to establish a U.S. Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 15245. A bill to establish the Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area in the States of Utah and Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 15246. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe safety regulations for the transportation of natural gas by pipeline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 15247. 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. McCARTHY:

H.R. 15248. A bill to require air carriers to inspect for destructive substances all articles taken aboard certain aircraft operated by them in air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 15249. A bill to establish a Crime Compensation Commission to aid persons injured or the dependents of persons killed during the commission of a felony in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 15250. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Fed-

eral service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 15251. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 15252. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the elimination of political influence in the appointment of postmasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 15253. A bill to provide for certain minimum payments to States from receipts derived from national forests located within such States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 15254. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that the effective date of reduction or discontinuance of pension by reason of the death of a dependent shall be the last day of the calendar year in which the death occurred; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15255. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that the amount of the proceeds of mortgage insurance paid to the insured or his beneficiary equal to the indebtedness against the property insured shall be excluded from determinations of annual income for pension or dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15256. A bill to amend 38 U.S.C. 111(a) to increase the rate of reimbursement of travel authorized Veterans' Administration beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15257. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that amounts inherited from bank accounts jointly or separately owned shall not count as income for death or disability pension or for dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15258. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increased dependency and indemnity compensation to widows in need of the regular aid and attendance of another person; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 15259. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increased pensions, disability compensation rates, to liberalize income limitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 15260. 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. WYDLER:

H.R. 15261. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 15262. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Negro History and Culture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 15263. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 15264. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax exemption for interest on industrial development bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 15265. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself and Mr. Moss):

H.R. 15266. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to encourage persons who are primarily committed to broadcasting and who have established interests in particular market areas to acquire station licenses and permits, to protect the public domain by insuring that such licenses and permits will be granted to persons pledged to carry out their fiduciary responsibilities to the public and serve its best interest, and to prevent this free privilege from being abused by persons engaged in spectrum profiteering; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. Moss, and Mr. OTTINGER):

H.R. 15267. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for regulation of television networks to assure that their operations are in the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLURE (for himself and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho):

H.R. 15268. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use in the 1969 National Jamboree, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WYDLER (for himself and Mr. GROVER):

H.R. 15269. A bill to provide for the construction of a Federal building in Nassau County, N.Y., and for financing the acquisition, construction, alteration, maintenance, operation, and protection of public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. NIX, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. RESNICK, Mr. REUSS, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 15270. A bill to provide for the designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital in Jackson, Miss., as the Medgar Evers Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY (by request):

H.R. 15271. A bill to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Spokane Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 15272. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the Federal Government to bar the employment in defense facilities of individuals believed disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 15273. A bill to insure a reasonable opportunity for all electrical utilities to participate in the benefits of nuclear power; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 15274. A bill to amend section 101(a)(27)(D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:

H.R. 15275. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, in regard to the obligation of Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to the States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 15276. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 15277. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, and related acts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

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. SHRIVER:

H.R. 15279. 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 residence of the taxpayer and paid pursuant to a policy insuring such residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. O'KONSKI, and Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland):

H.R. 15280. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Public Education Act; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 15281. 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.J. Res. 1073. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EILBERG:

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. HARSHA:

H.J. Res. 1075. 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:

H.J. Res. 1076. 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 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. TIERNAN:

H.J. Res. 1078. Joint resolution proposing and amendment to the Constitution of 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. FARBSTAIN:

H.J. Res. 1079. Joint resolution to direct the Federal Communications Commission to study the ways in which commercial broadcasters can be required to provide financial support to nonprofit public educational broadcasters; 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. GETTYS):

H.J. Res. 1081. Joint resolution providing, until October 1, 1969, for flexible interest rates for mortgage insurance programs and continuing certain low-rent housing assistance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STUCKEY (for himself, Mr. BRAY, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. DOWDY, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. BARING, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. OR-

TINGER, Mrs. BOLTON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. RARICK, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. BEVILL):

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. RANDALL, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. QUIE):

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. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 636. 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. 637. 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. 638. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the interest of peace in Vietnam the Government of the United States should only 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. SCHWENDEL:

H. Con. Res. 639. 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. MAILLIARD, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. PELY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. GROVER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MORTON, Mr. LENNON, Mr. KEITH, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. REINECKE, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ST. ONGE, and Mr. DELLENBACK):

H. Con. Res. 640. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to reducing the balance-of-payments deficit 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. KARTH, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HEUSTOSKI, Mr. GALIFIANAKIS, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. KYROS, Mr. HARDY, Mr. MACHEN, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. FALLON, Mr. GUDE, and Mr. BLANTON):

H. Con. Res. 641. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to reducing the balance-of-payments deficit 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. BRADEMANS:

H. Con. Res. 642. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to participation by the States and local political subdivisions in the celebration of the bicentennial of the American Revolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

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. 1060. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to U.S. ratification of the Conventions on Genocide, Abolition of Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, and Freedom of Association; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H. Res. 1061. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to U.S. ratification of the Convention on Genocide, Abolition of Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, and Freedom of Association; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COWGER:

H. Res. 1062. 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 Panepinto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15283. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Vitale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15284. A bill for the relief of Marie-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 Domenica Gagliano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15287. A bill for the relief of Stefano Inzalaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15288. A bill for the relief of Ciro Guastella; 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.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 15290. A bill for the relief of Blandjoen Tan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 15291. A bill for the relief of Walter V. Biagiolini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 15292. A bill for the relief of Bernardo Calamba Sy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 15293. A bill for the relief of Francesco Ardito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 15294. A bill for the relief of Habibollah Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 15295. A bill for the relief of Michael Gregory Grammatopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15296. A bill for the relief of Charalambos Stavarakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 15297. A bill for the relief of Mr. Milton Stamatakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15298. A bill for the relief of Mr. Polecarlo DeCarolis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 15299. A bill for the relief of Casimiro Greco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H. Res. 1063. Resolution for the relief of Charles J. Culligan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.