The Rev. Martin Luther King Jr., yesterday set the goal for his mass camp-in in Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

"In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

We dare not be afraid of angry words
Or of your old or your young or your poor
Or your strong or your weak or your rich
Or your lean and your hungry everywheres.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

For the Father's love is more than we know
And our wonder, the force that created this world
Is forever生命的活力.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

The House is requested:

1. To stabilize production of crude pine gum, rubber, and other products.

2. To provide a guaranteed income, and housing legislation to accommodate families in Washington.

3. To refine the economic and social legislation to accommodate the poor.

The House is requested to pass the above proposals, and it is so voted.

Dr. King emphasized that it is long past time for America to get concerned over the Negroes' economic and social plight.

"Freedom is something the oppressed must demand from the oppressor...

Dr. King added that "We want to make it clear we are not building any coals.
d

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 nonviolent campaign plans for "nonviolent 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 asked whether African American leaders would 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 SNCC 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."

Conyers' "Pull Opportunity Act," co-sponsored by nine other House members, calls for spending $1 billion a year for a massive antipoverty fight, including education.

As to the tactics of his spring campaign, 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 over the Negro power to press Congress 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 because "people have built tent towns around Washington and not a law has been broken.

"All these 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 the poor, including guaranteed income families.

As to the House's continuing resolution, Dr. King said it is long past time for the House to pass a resolution looking forward to a better day.

"The absolute minimum," Dr. King said, his poor people's mobilization would demand a $10 a day minimum wage, 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 framework of the "nation's movement 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 over the Negro power to press Congress 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 because "people have built tent towns around Washington and not a law has been broken.

"All these 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 the poor, including guaranteed income families.

As to the House's continuing resolution, Dr. King said it is long past time for the House to pass a resolution looking forward to a better day.

"The absolute minimum," Dr. King said, his poor people's mobilization would demand a $10 a day minimum wage, 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 framework of the "nation's movement 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 over the Negro power to press Congress 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 because "people have built tent towns around Washington and not a law has been broken.

"All these 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 the poor, including guaranteed income families.

As to the House's continuing resolution, Dr. King said it is long past time for the House to pass a resolution looking forward to a better day.

"The absolute minimum," Dr. King said, his poor people's mobilization would demand a $10 a day minimum wage, 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 framework of the "nation's movement 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 over the Negro power to press Congress 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 because "people have built tent towns around Washington and not a law has been broken.

"All these 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 the poor, including guaranteed income families.

As to the House's continuing resolution, Dr. King said it is long past time for the House to pass a resolution looking forward to a better day.

"The absolute minimum," Dr. King said, his poor people's mobilization would demand a $10 a day minimum wage, 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 framework of the "nation's movement 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.
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 an 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 the Army to call in the leaders 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 Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, Committee on the Judiciary, will hold a hearing Wednesday, February 21, in Room 2704 of Longworth 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 1 day only, and to solicit 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 our 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. The plight of the survivors is a reminder of the advantage of offering a haven to the distressed and suffering, to the victims and refugees from disaster or tyranny, calls for expeditious action on our part.

CIVIL AIR PATROL

Mr. 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 forward-looking, responsible Members of this House see the opportunities for aiding the development of our national defense in the vast array of aerospace aviation.

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 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.

SHOCKING STATEMENTS OF YURI MASHIN

Mr. MCCLOXY. 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. MCCLOXY. 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 150 press reporters from around the world, Mashin stated:

"The Russian Government's use of the Olympic games as a platform for fomenting international discord recalls a similar attack by another totalitarian regime at the 1936 Olympics in Berlin, Germany. I am sure that no one has to remind Mr. Mashin of the outcome of those games nor of the far less peaceful and tragic competition that followed. Let..."
of 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. Let's stop expounding on subjects about which he obviously has little knowledge or understanding.

Mr. Mashin's statements should be roundly denounced.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Eight million boats are being operated on our inland waterways—with a 5 percent increase expected in their number this year.

While Americans are increasingly taking to the water, far too many are finding unexpected tragedy. Last year alone saw 321 boats killed in boating accidents.

I hope President Johnson's Recreational Safety Act of 1968 will provide needed protection for the boating public. It will help States establish and improve their boat safety programs to include removal of hazardous debris, boat operator education, safety patrols, and boat inspections. Also, the Secretary of Transportation will be empowered to establish and enforce safety standards for boat equipment and manufacture.

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

To continue the struggle against this often invisible menace, it is necessary to penetrate a wall of silence which often prevents law enforcement officials to obtain witnesses in organized crime cases. This is especially true in cases of corruption of Government officials. To break through this wall of silence and to compel the giving of testimony regarding activities linked closely with organized crime, the President has wisely called for an extension of special immunity provisions to four laws involved 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.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGALISITIC PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 19

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader about the program for the week of February 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 back to Thursday and then back 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 1967, also subject to a rule being granted.

Pursuant to the usual tradition and custom of the House, George Washington's Farewell Address will be read on the House floor as an opening program. This address is subject to a rule being granted.

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

BRITISH SUPPLIES FOR THE VIETCONG

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for
February 8, 1968

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

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

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

Mr. HAYS. If the British are bringing their ships into Haiphong, 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 the tears coming from every pore, insisted that if my amendment to the foreign aid bill was adopted to stop all trade with those supplying North Vietnam, we would lose a contract to sell—

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 perfectly 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.

It left us holding the bag while they, the British, go blithely on their devious ways.

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 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 379 Members of the House who voted for passage.

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

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

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

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 we 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. That is not only in the United States 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 the 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 379 Members of the House who voted for passage.

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

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

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

A PROGRAM FOR NARCOTIC ADDICTS AND ALCOHOLICS

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Unquestionably adequate federal gun control laws are necessary in order to protect the States from the tools of the criminal. The present indiscriminate mail-order sale of handguns and other lethal weapons permits them to be acquired easily by anyone including criminals, juveniles, narcotic addicts, mental defectives, and others whose possession of such arms constitutes 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, like many other cities among citizens 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 problem 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 urgent 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 223(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. Spoolhof, of Michigan.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker, on behalf of the House, is not present. Mr. ALBIESE, 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. 94]

Abbot, Gettys, Rostenkowski
Andrews, Green, Oreg., Roudebush
Ashley, Gurney, St. Onge
Ballenger, Idaho, Scherer
Brohlyll, Va., Hebert
Burleson, Harlingen, Selden
Clark, Hoboken, Okla.
Clausen, Jones, N.C., Selden
Don H., Jones, N.C., Selden
Cleveland, Kentucky, Selden
Corman, Mathias, Calif., Selden
Cramer, Moses, Teague, Tex.
Cunningham, Nichols, Ut
Davis, Wiss., Patman, Wampeter
Dawson, Pollock, Watkins
Devine, Pocatello, Wilson, Wash
Diggins, Rees, Charles H.
Eldred, Arlene
Ett, Reinecke, Wats
Everest, Reinsick, Wats
Foley, Elenor, N.Y.
Ford, Bowers, N.Y.
William D. Roosevelt

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBIESE). On this call roll, 37 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. ALBIESE). 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. ALBIESE) 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 the horse. 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 bruised 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 aid appropriation of $4 billion;

—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 many developing countries. The administration had announced last year that a major contribution to the war on hunger would be made as part of international efforts.

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 prevent 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.

Family planning 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 other governments 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.
United States stands ready to help those governments that recognize it and move to deal with it.

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

In 1963, the dollar outflow from foreign aid expenditures was over $600 million. Last year it was down to $270 million. I have already directed that even this small outflow be reduced by 1968 to less than $170 million. More than nine dollars of every ten dollars AID spends will buy American goods and services. And the repayments of prior loans will more than offset the small outflow from new loans. Moreover, our AID programs have a favorable long range impact on our balance of payments by building new markets for our exports.

6. Efficient Administration. Over the past years AID has reduced by twenty percent the number of U.S. employees serving overseas in posts other than Vietnam. Last month I directed a ten percent reduction in the number of U.S. military personnel 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.

- All 50 states exported American products financed by AID.
- The International Executive Service Corps operated 300 projects in which experienced American businessmen counselled local executives.
- Nearly 3,000 American scientists and engineers shared their know-how with developing countries under the auspices of VITA Corporation, a non-profit organization.
- More than 120 American colleges and universities contributed to AID technical assistance programs.
- Thirty-three American states supplied technical expertise to 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 Difficulties Meet at Punta del Este last spring to reaffirm a partnership which has already produced six years of accomplishment:

- The Nations of Latin America have lifted more than $115 billion, compared with $7.7 billion in American aid.
- Their tax revenues have increased by 30 percent.
- Their gross national product has risen by 30 percent.

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

Now we must do our part. Some nations, such as Venezuela, have prog­ressed so much that 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 has cut its dependency by 10% in 1967 and achieved an overall annual growth rate of 7%, 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, overcoming difficult finan­ciable and social reforms.

-Central America leads the way toward the economic integration so important to the future of Latin America. Some of these countries have 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 if 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 seeds we have provided 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 wealthier 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 in the past year. 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 11 more countries in the following years.

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

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

This is not a policy of withdrawal from Africa. It is a policy of concentration and of maximum encouragement of regional cooperation. A continent of 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 increased to meet 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 independ­
ence we are helping them to defend.

Stalemate resulting from prosperity and continuity of government was repeatedly destroyed, the peoples of Vietnam have achieved two major civil victories which rank with any gallantry in campaigns of terror, assassination and intimidation.

—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 1968 we have

—Improved 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.

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

—Concentrated our educational effort toward the Government's goal of virtually universal elementary education by 1971.

—Stressed, 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 emergency of two years will end 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 need in the developing countries of Asia. The United States has helped to make this resistance effective. We must continue to do so, particularly in Laos and Thailand.

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-

ues have doubled since 1965; exports have grown tenfold in the last seven years. Population growth has fallen from 2.8 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 stabilizing and rebuilding development 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. She is being overwhelmed 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 militarily effective efforts of the Republic of Korea and the Philippines to check 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 stabilizing and rebuilding development 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. She is being overwhelmed in our interest to provide it.

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 may 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 realistic 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 asked. Has America resigned her leadership of the cause of freedom? Has she abandoned to the weak and the striving who are depending on her help? The 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 no time to compromise our principles or research our traditions.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and submit them as a separate matter.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to
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FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and submit them as a separate matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Bogos. 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.

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

Encouragement of private enterprise has two facets. It takes the form of encouraging American private industry.
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The President has sent to Congress his proposed foreign aid program for fiscal year 1969.

It is a modest program requesting $2.5 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.

The AID request together with other foreign aid activities such as PL 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 done in the same field of activity by the United States in 1949.

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

AID REQUEST TO U.S. CONGRESS 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 $2.6 billion for this purpose.

The A.D. request, together with other foreign aid activities such as PL 480 food aid, contributions to multilateral institutions such as IDA, IDB, and the Asian Bank, and the Peace Corps, represents about 0.5 percent of U.S. GNP—only half as much as the target of 1 percent of GNP set by the UN and OECD. It is the smallest amount ever requested since the initiation of the program in 1948.

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 amount to 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 restore their faith in the light of the great needs of our fellow men all over the world but more importantly from the standpoint of our own national interest and security.

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

Not one of us here, I know, would turn our generous hand away from the sight of Lazarus. Yet outside these warm and comfortable halls, across the seas which surround our bountiful land, there are millions like Lazarus who need our help. Can we—the richest nation in the entire history of the world—turn away from them?

Let us not be mistaken. As we sow in this world, so shall we reap. It is equally true, as we plant, and 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. This effort will 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 CSF, a mix of corn, soybeans, and milk with vitamin that already may well have saved thousands of starving children in India and elsewhere from quickened death. Is there any cause more worthy of our attention and concern? Dare we ignore the irreparable damage which a lack of protein during the formative years can cause?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it may often seem to some that the nations of the world are growing apart, the more each one of them, the more they are united. Nationalism, lack of contact, lack of experience, lack of imagination, lack of mutual confidence, often stand in the way of cooperation.

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

I welcome what the President calls in his message on foreign aid "opportunities for the United States to add new momentum to these regional efforts."

For, as he has said previously, resources know no national boundaries. Rivers flow through many countries, transportation and communications networks serve different peoples, sources of electric power must be shared by neighbors.

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

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

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

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

We must grasp every opportunity to encourage and assist 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 an obligation or a 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 $80 million in fiscal 1966 on development operations. This amounted to 16 percent of its Gross national product. Compare Colombia's share of the $87 million provided to it by AID and you see that it contributed 11 times as much to its welfare as did the United States. India is another example. That same year it spent $7.3 billion on development projects—about 24 times the $310 million provided by AID.

Whether or not a country receives any assistance at all often hinges on its commitment to help themselves. 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 sounder principle—"With freedom by the people of these countries, who need our help, as their guide."—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 $200 million as a contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank. The nations of free Asia will need full fiscal support for a variety of economic projects that will mean a better life for all in that area of the world.

Second, we must authorize a contribution of $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.

So let us 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 most of the issues currently 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 outside of Latin America, a policy now enthusiastically encouraged by this Congress, for national rivalry no less than of poverty and ignorance is a classical cause of violence that benefits no one.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson’s admonition that this Government will continue to insist that self-help be a fundamental condition for all American assistance has been well put. The record speaks for itself. Most of our aid recipients have been moving toward their economic goals with leadership, energy, and determination. In fact, most countries now contribute an average of $6 for every dollar received from foreign aid.

Outstanding examples of how self-help pays off can be cited in the cases of Iran and the Republic of China—Taiwan—countries that have graduated from the ranks of lesser-developed status 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 food and is ensuring to itself an important role.

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 six 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 the 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.

Mr. Speaker, I am 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 welfare-within-their-power concept.

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 make 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 time has come for 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 research and development, research and development 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 retard physical development, 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 warmth 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 that underlie foreign policy?” Our critics at home and abroad have claimed that we have no foreign aid policy worth the name. I would invite them to study the eloquent statement which President Johnson made today on the subject of foreign aid.

Our President made clear that in the field of foreign aid our policy must be based on principles, not on expediency. He outlined six basic principles which I believe merit our close attention and support.

Events of recent weeks show that America must be flexible in our relations with other nations. Flexibility demands leadership, and President Johnson has underlined 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 shabby assumption that foreign policy comprises a series of isolated transactions.

Mr. Speaker, 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 make 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 time has come for 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 research and development, research and development 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 retard physical development, 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 warmth 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 that underlie foreign policy?” Our critics at home and abroad have claimed that we have no foreign aid policy worth the name. I would invite them to study the eloquent statement which President Johnson made today on the subject of foreign aid.

Our President made clear that in the field of foreign aid our policy must be based on principles, not on expediency. He outlined six basic principles which I believe merit our close attention and support.

Events of recent weeks show that America must be flexible in our relations with other nations. Flexibility demands leadership, and President Johnson has underlined 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 shabby assumption that foreign policy comprises a series of isolated transactions.

Mr. Speaker, I am vitally interested in the war on
I will continue to review carefully our foreign aid commitments. Our foreign policy must be flexible and must reflect our national security or position of leadership if we cut off foreign aid completely at this time. We do live in a dangerous world, and world problems increasingly call for our assistance, whether in giving our tax dollar or worse or our destiny as a free nation.

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

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

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

Fourth, priority for agriculture, health, and education: The critical areas of investment are the ones which will help the poor population achieve 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.

For the first time in the history of 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 assisting third 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.

Thus, I hope 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 of the major countries of 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 bright in cooperation with other aid donors and under leadership of international organizations. In Latin America, the whole of our AID program is devoted to the 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 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 major contribution to the 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 which all countries share 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 peaceful world for which all of us hope." 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 standards of living. Hardest hit by the ever-growing number of mouths to feed are the less developed areas of Asia, Latin America, and Africa, where two thirds of humanity lives.

Therefore it is most gratifying to me to know that along with food production the highest priority has been given to encouraging, support and strengthening of voluntary family planning programs in the developing countries. AID has also been supporting population studies and voluntary family planning programs in some 30 countries, and is expected to obligate $35 million for this work during this fiscal year, and even more next year.

But we must keep in mind that efforts to reduce the population explosion, though urgently needed, must be treated delicately. The family planning programs we assist must be host nation programs—note, not ours. For this reason, we should assist only when the developing country, having decided on the types of programs appropriate to its requirements, allows individuals freedom of choice whether to use the native 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 those countries themselves report to us.

Mr. Eilberg. Mr. Speaker, the President has set before us a bare-bones request for $76 million for Agency for International Development programs in the budget report. The nations of 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.

Nations and their leaders press forward. Farmers on the edge of survival have begun to leave their old ways and embrace the technological advances in the Western world. 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 if we lose sight of the established, the self-help. The important question is: How do we continue to build the peace, so that the people of the world can succeed unless we have a cooperative plan of action 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 theatre groups 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 life of our country.

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 reads 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 H.R. 11284 (H.R. 11284) to amend the organic act of the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, to provide for a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control, and for other purposes.

After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 11284, I shall lay on the table the bill S. 1124 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the 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, I shall lay on the table the Speaker's table the bill S. 1124 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of that bill 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 that in 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. 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 fire.

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 not even adequately. 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 expediently provided with the limited authorization proposed 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 fire departments to be used. 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 control programs 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 exist that warrant attention at the 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. The adoption of House Resolution 926 will make it a true servant of man in his constant fight against the ravages of fire.

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 refer to the investigation of fire prevention and control.

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:

1. The investigations of fires as to their causes; frequency of occurrence, and severity.
2. Research into causes and nature of fires, and the development of improved methods and techniques for fire prevention and control;
3. Public education on fire hazards and safety.
4. Fire information reference service;
5. Education and training programs for professional firefighters.

In addition, 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.

The bill proposes that 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 increased by $20,000 this year.

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

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

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

Let me read to you the departments of the Federal Government that so particulated: 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. Your fire equipment companies are constantly striving to improve the efficiency of their equipment with which, to put out fires and to control fires, and they are spending large sums in the area of research, building material companies—and they are referred to in the report—are spending huge sums of money to develop and research fireproof building materials.

I have something about this at firsthand because I am in the retail lumber business and have been all of my life. I have attended some demonstrations put on by the building material companies. I refer particularly to the Johns-Manville Co. I was at their place 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 on that floor. 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 building material that Johns-Manville had developed stopped the spread of the fire.

Many other companies in the building material industry—Ruberoic, 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 to help 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 budget. 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 increase in income taxes in 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.
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, 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.

There was a million-dollar plan.

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

Now, what has happened? They come along now with a plan not for $1 million but, as I understand it, for $10 million. In the budget 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 for fire research 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 adopting this rule.

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

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11234, 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, federal 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 many years. The peak 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. The problem faces 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. 11234 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, living, including fire prevention and control. The public would be taught about safety techniques and fire hazards. Firemen 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, 76 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 the right to do so. Am I 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 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 manner they believe to be the best in the light 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 procedures to the greatest latitude possible. It may be necessary for them from time to time to send members on an individual basis to other places and this is the cheapest and most effective way to do it.

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

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

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, and May, and nothing else. 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 Chairman [Mr. Roudebush], 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. Roudebush'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 year will be voted. 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 matters 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 the presidential directive on the rules made for the general classification service pay raise. Why is that?

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I may rise to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, to the request mentioned in the rule 78, that being a 2-year program and because we wish it to get underway as quickly as possible. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Farmer). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

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

Mr. DADDARIO. It is in order that there will not be a delay as the result of having people under the 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. It won from 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 provision to this bill it will tie the fire legal barrier to the extent of the fire 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. ANTHONY. I yield the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

So the resolution was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. REBERT Mr. CRANE.

Mr. BEARDSLEE of New York, Mr. MCDADE.

Mr. ST. ONGE Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. GETTSY Mr. KUYKENDALL.

Mr. FULTON Mr. LATTA.

Mr. GLENN Mr. HANCOCK.

Mr. RODGERS Mr. REINECKE.

Mr. ROSEN Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. ROSENTHAL Mr. CLARK.

Mr. CLEVELAND Mr. DAVILA.

Mr. CRANMER Mr. TAIT.

Mr. CULVER Mr. OWEN.

Mr. CUMMINGS Mr. WATSON.

Mr. DAVIS, Wis. Mr. O'NEAL.

Mr. DAWSON Mr. WATTS.

Mr. WILSON Mr. POLOWSKI.

Mr. DIGGS Mr. CLENAHAN.

Mr. LEWIS Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. EVERETT Mr. REES.

Mr. FORD Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. FRASER Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. LESNICKI Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. SLOAN Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. SLADE Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. SMITH Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. SNOW Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. TAYLOR Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. TULISIN Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. WAYNE Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. WILSON Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. WILCOX Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. WATSON Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. WEBSTER Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. WHEATON Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. WILSON, Calif. Mr. REINHARDT.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. REBERT Mr. CRANE.

Mr. BEARDSLEE of New York, Mr. MCDADE.

Mr. ST. ONGE Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. GETTSY Mr. KUYKENDALL.

Mr. FULTON Mr. LATTA.

Mr. GLENN Mr. HANCOCK.

Mr. RODGERS Mr. REINECKE.

Mr. ROSEN Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. ROSENTHAL Mr. CLARK.

Mr. CLEVELAND Mr. TAIT.

Mr. CULVER Mr. OWEN.

Mr. CUMMINGS Mr. WATSON.

Mr. DAVIS, Wis. Mr. O'NEAL.

Mr. DAWSON Mr. WATTS.

Mr. WILSON Mr. POLOWSKI.

Mr. DIGGS Mr. CLENAHAN.

Mr. LEWIS Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. EVERETT Mr. REES.

Mr. FORD Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. FRASER Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. LESNICKI Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. SLOAN Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. SNOW Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. TAYLOR Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. TULISIN Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. WAYNE Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. WILSON Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. WEBSTER Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. WATSON Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. WEBSTER Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. WHEATON Mr. REINHARDT.

Mr. WILSON, Calif. Mr. REINHARDT.
Mr. Devine with Mr. Hansen of Idaho. Mr. Fraser with Mr. Dawson. Mr. Andrews of North Dakota with Mr. Biester.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRUTH IN LENDING ACT OF 1967

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 5) to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions 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, MOOREHEAD, 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 25 to March 1, 1968, as "LULAC Weeks".

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. The Chair rises and asks 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, the Secretary of the Army, and other Federal agencies, to conduct 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 in fiscal 1968 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 a 50-50 split in total costs, the Federal Government's share would be $510,500.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution. The study and inventory of our estuaries and the waters of the Great Lakes are valuable for sport and commercial fishing, wildlife conservation, recreation, and scenic beauty, and for other purposes.

The study is authorized over a 2-year period; $750,000 in fiscal 1968 and $250,000 for fiscal year 1970. The resolution was agreed to.

The previous question was ordered. The previous question was ordered. 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.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Ball] 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 period our fire 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.

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 damage will be something in the order of $2 billion a year, or better. Mr. Chairman, if we want to keep 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 Italy.

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 II 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 airplane fires, ship fires, forest fires, and industrial fires. The people who are doing that work now will be the corps around which the work will be performed in the future.

Title II creates a National Commission on Fire Prevention Control which will develop recommendations on which to base the future direction of our efforts to solve the fire problem. Title II was offered as a separate bill by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Barr], and it fitted properly within the consideration 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 will be to know who are most concerned with the causes and nature of fires—people who represent the building material industry, people who build firefighting apparatus, people who are engaged in the insurance business, and people who 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. Mossman] a bill providing for congressional representation and that is included in the legislation.

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

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

I note that during the course of debate on the rule, it was said that we are performing some $11 million worth of fire research work in certain agencies of the Government. At the hearings, testimony 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 local firefighters and the like—they who are most concerned with the problem—sage to that major task lies before us.

The demonstration projects by fire are 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 it is a problem that is handled by 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 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. Barr] to establish a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control.

Fourteen statements were received for the record. Virtually all of the witnesses were in agreement that considerable work must be done to reverse our losses. The subcommittee and the 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. 11384 seeks to meet these two needs. Title I of H.R. 11384 authorizes a comprehensive fire research and safety program, within the Department of Housing and Urban Development, by the National Bureau of Standards. The Bureau has been engaged in fire research and safety work for more than 60 years, and its experienced research staff will make up the core of professionals necessary to perform the functions under this bill. Title II of the bill creates a National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control which will develop the knowledge and recommendations on which to base the future direction of our efforts to solve the fire problem.

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

First, investigation of the causes, frequency, and severity of fires; Second, research on the causes and nature of fires, and on better ways to prevent them; Third, education of the public on fire hazards and safety techniques; Fourth, education and training for those who must fight fires; Fifth, demonstration projects 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 have the dual purpose of investigating 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 individuals having some 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 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 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. Rousselot).

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 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 strongly 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 teaching courses in the 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 report of this organization testified before our committee and, while expressing dissatisfaction with title I of the bill, indicated that if the bill contained title II—which it now does—this would largely overcome the objections of the NFPA. The association has since sent letters to every Member of Congress putting its views on record in opposition, and I must say that this is most disturbing. It is consistent with the testimony provided to us and to the Senate committee.

Regardless of this latter situation, however, I believe it is pertinent to point out that the NFPA is not itself a research organization and 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 NFPA 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 Senate Committee and was investigating the tragic fire that took place at Brooks Air Force Base in Texas in connection with a special atmospheric demonstration being carried out there in an oxygen atmosphere.

That fire took the lives of two Air Force men, one of whom was from my own district.

I know that the gentleman from Connecticut, as a member of the great Committee on Science and Astronautics, has also been following closely the tragic fire that claimed the lives of three astronauts. We found in our investigation, and I am sure the gentleman found in his, that actually when it comes to detailed research into questions of the flammability of fabrics, the generation of flash fires generally, and things of that kind that had a bearing on those two tragedies, had not necessarily been pursued.

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 the agencies of the Government most directly concerned, but also to local fire coordinators, and fire agencies in local communities, so that all of them may benefit by knowing more of the capabilities of local fire departments, the behavior of fire-resistant materials, the nature of flammability itself, and so on.

I think the 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 response to his remarks. 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. I believe the Committee on Education and Labor is doing this. I believe 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 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 this for years fires at sea were generally fought by trying to isolate the compartment in which the fire was located and then turning super-heated steam into it. Researchers have shown that this is the thing you do not do, possibly because that steam contains quantities of gaseous oxygen that help to stimulate the fire. And yet that was the accepted way of fighting fire for many years. Today they either use foam or fog or hermetically seal it, if that is possible, and let the fire burn the oxygen out.

There is a great deal we must learn in this field. Having learned it, we must provide the necessary leadership and the facilities to fire-fighting establishments throughout the country.

I, too, wish to compliment the gentleman who headed the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BAZIL), 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 magnificent and successful subcommittee of the House, and to say that when the gentleman from New York referred to the fire at Brooks Air Force Base, he was touching on a base which is in my district and was pointing to an area of need. More importantly, the creation of 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 this field.

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 the committee and all his colleagues for bringing this bill up for consideration of the House.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from Connecticut for his pioneering work on this subject. I am particularly pleased, 4,000 injured, and 876 million dollars of property damage occurred. At the time, the handling of ammonium nitrate was not considered dangerous nor the substance particularly flammable.

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 the mixture of gasoline vapor which exploded. Debris fell on another gasoline barge in the train and it afire. Fortunately, one was killed.

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

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

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

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. A fire in a steel factory in 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 on our techniques. As a result, in recent years and months, more than a dozen firesmen 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. We can bring the best minds we can find, find 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.

I, too, wish to commend the gentleman from New York has skillfully pointed out the problems in the cities. I would like, because of this emphasis and support of this bill and indicate this a crying need to save lives.

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 support of this bill and indicate this a crying need to save lives.

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. 1248, 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 this at the time. For this reason the fire research and safety bill is important; it is necessary for the better protection of the American people.

The National Fire Protection Association reports that in 1966 there was a 24-percent increase over 1965 in fires in the United States and Canada killing three or more persons; and that the number of fires resulting in property damage increased 12 percent. These must be approximations, yet they indicate that we are not making progress in combating this national problem. There were 91 fires in the United States in 1966 that cost $750,000 or more in property damage. We cannot, then, 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. The report for the fiscal year 1967 shows a fire loss of $2.55 billion, 323 deaths, and 1,452 injuries. This includes the loss experience of 58 Federal departments and agencies, controlling approximately $9.8 percent of the total Federal property valuation of over $347 billion.

The conclusion of the Council is that:

The continuing toll of lives and property losses due to unwanted fire definitely points out the need for all Federal agencies to review and evaluate their own programs for 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 examine our existing programs, fire protection, 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 Bill.

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 in the United States today. Fire prevention and firefighting is conducted at the local level. Standards in training of personnel, including 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.

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, including 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 lives and property resulting from fire. The continuing toll of lives and property resulting from fires in the United States today reflects the hazards that accompany our higher standard of living, and points out the need for all Federal agencies to cooperate in 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, 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.

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 estimate by the National Fire Council for 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 strive for far greater safety efforts as our living standards rise, if we are to eliminate excessive loss of life due to fire.

There are a number of public and private institutions that are active in the field of fire prevention and safety, including the National Association of Fire Chiefs, the National Fire Protection Association, and others who 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 a few industries and 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, accidents, deaths, and loss of property caused by fire in the United States today is second only to the damage and injuries caused by automobile accidents. 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 to protect ourselves against obsolescence, lack of up-to-date information, equipment and facilities.

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.

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 Commissioner James Ryan, President of the Uniform Fire Commissioners, and John Carihin, on behalf of the fire officers group, have been most helpful.

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 design and manufacture 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, but I believe we must look at the National Bureau of Standards and what they do, because in my opinion they are completely squandering a lot of the taxpayers' money in many of their other endeavors.

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

I 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 research 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, which 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 shall 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. DODD), 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 better defense 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 $230 million.
In view of our Nation's critical economic posture, it is my intention at the appropriate time to offer an amendment to reduce the authorization by 75 percent—to $5 million for the 2 years.
This figure is well within the bounds of the President's budget.
I want to stress, however, that my amendment will reflect only a necessary concern for economy and should in no way be connected with 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 billion 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 far does that of England against the threat of fire.
Yet in terms of percentage of GNP, the total United States 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 result of real thought and 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. DODD), 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 broadgauge study of the Nation's problems with reference to fires. That Commission at the end of 3 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, 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—title II 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. GROSS. So, title I will have ended at the end of 2 years?
Mr. BELL. Yes, title I will have ended at the end of 2 years. Under the title II, the National Bureau of Standards will take over the responsibilities, 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—title II 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, 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. BELI. 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 Ohio upon his very fine statement.

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 1968.

I would like to say again, Mr. Chairman, the measure has lost of lives and property involved in fires on the basis of dollars and cents. I say this, because we had over 4,000 homes destroyed by fires. This is to be taken into consideration along the face of the efficiency of the fire department of the city of Philadelphia. Yet, 88 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 Aeronautics 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 in the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control. I am also pleased to see that this provision is incorporated in the Senate-passed companion bill, S. 1124. This Commission, to be appointed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Commerce, and 18 other members to be appointed by the President, will study problems and proposals in this field and pave the way for future intensive research. When our Subcommittee on Housing held hearings on this resolution last year, I was impressed with the widespread public support and particularly with the intense interest and support of Members of Congress, the House, of course, 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 Aeronautics and 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 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. Petri. Mr. Chairman, you have heard the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Bell]. I describe to you the intent of H.R. 11284. He has told you how much each year configurations 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 for fire prevention.

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 many of our communities. 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 these, 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 most significant problem that faces the welfare of thousands of Americans.

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

Mr. Mosman. 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 go ahead with additional 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 all 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—33 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 are not only more dangerous—"fireworks" or "firecrackers" 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 the "sparks" or "fireworks" that do not always call for research. It is then that much of the work of the committee that much is yet to be learned about handling and controlling the "sparks" or "fireworks" that do not always call for research.

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 many of the things that we have been doing, some things that we have considered the best way of handling fires have turned out, after a bit of research, to be quite wrong; in some cases they have even been aggravating factors—using superheated steam in closed spaces is an example.

The third and final point I wish to emphasize is that titles I and II of this bill are actually supplementary. They are not overlapping activities. Title I provides for an attack upon immediate problems which we have already identified. Title II, which sets up a study commission for a limited time, is designed not to accomplish anything but to identify the needs in the matter of fire research, but to develop recommendations concerning other phases of the overall problems, such as improving equipment, analyzing
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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. 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 speak of 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, this may 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 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 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 in the prevention and control of fires. The Department of Defense is spending $1,745,000; armed services, $2,105,000; Department of Agriculture, $3,558,000; Atomic Energy Commission, $1,500,000; 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 organ? I think, 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, not merely because of the costs of Vietnam.

One of my main concerns is that the American people are not further burdened 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 accomplished 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, too, that establishing the proper organizational setup which would result in the centralization of knowledge gained from Federal fire research programs already in existence. This would be more desirable, because it is feasible 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 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 environment.

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 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 and I are going to vote 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 setup which would result in the centralization of knowledge gained from Federal fire research programs already in existence. This would be more desirable, because it is feasible 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. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

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 not an enormous amount, 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 background of 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 I believe that in 21 years I have supported the Federal land-managing agencies has been strengthened.

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

The fire prevention and protection financing is needed, I am satisfied that the fire protection of privately owned forest lands and many of the small communities in my district.

This program is one of the outstanding 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 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. FASCHELL, 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 exceeded $1.8 billion. These statistics become even more alarming when we realize that the annual loss by fire amounts to approximately $20 billion and the direct material loss of property exceeds $40 billion. 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 efforts and to 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 advise 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 1970, and the 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 not recall the recent fires that were the Penthouse Restaurant in Montgomery, Ala., and the Chicago Convention Center fire, and the resulting loss of lives and property. In light of these recent developments, I feel that esteemed colleagues will join me in support of this bill.

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

The Clerk reads 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 in this country is needed to provide for fire suppression, for the prevention of fires, and for the investigation of fires to determine their causes, frequency of occurrence, severity; and other pertinent factors.

Sec. 102. (a) The Secretary shall establish a 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 education programs and coordination.

AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM
Sec. 105. The Act entitled "An Act to establish the National Bureau of Standards, approved March 3, 1901," is further amended by adding the following sections:

"Sec. 16. The Secretary of Commerce (hereafter 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 and control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage;

(3) Educational programs to-

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

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

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

(5) Educational and training programs to improve... among other things;

(6) The efficiency, operation, and organization of fire services, and...

The history of the modern fire service and the controlling unusual fire-related hazards and fire disasters; and...
TITLE II—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

Sec. 201. The Congress finds and declares that the problem of life loss and property damage 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 by utilization of the services of the Federal Government and of the states, 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 policies and procedures throughout the country in the light of existing and foreseeable conditions. It is the purpose of this title to establish, support and encourage through study and investigation of this problem with a view to the formulation of recommendations whereby the Nation can reduce the death, injury and property loss 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 shall be of such qualifications as the President shall determine, but at least four shall be exceptionally well qualified by training or experience to carry out the functions of the Commission. The President shall provide for the representation of the views of individuals and organizations of all areas of the United States concerned with fire research, education, and control, including representatives drawn from Federal, state, and local governments, industry, labor, universities, labor unions, 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, a member 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 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 and for improving the fire services of Federal, state, and local Governments. In conducting such study and investigation the Commission shall—

(1) consider a number of ways in which fires can be more effectively prevented through technological advances, construction techniques, and effective supervision and inspection procedures; and

(2) undertake an analysis of existing programs administered or supported by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government and of ways in which such programs might be strengthened so as to lessen the danger of destructive fires in Government-assisted construction, development, or improvement of the Nation's cities and communities; and

(3) undertake an analysis of existing fire suppression methods and effective supervisory, training, and educational fire-service personnel;

(4) undertake 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;

(5) analyze the administrative problems affecting the efficiency or capabilities of local fire departments or organizations; and

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

(b) In carrying out its duties under this section, the Commission shall report the results of the functions carried out by the Secretary of Commerce under sections 16 and 17 of the Act of March 3, 1961 (as added by the second section of this Act) to the President and to the Congress.

(c) The Commission shall submit to the President and to the Congress a report with recommendations for legislation 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) The Commission or, on the authorization of any agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including an independent agency, or any Governmental 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 33 of title 5, shall, in his discretion, determine the classification and grade of any Federal employee, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including an independent agency, serving in the Commission.

Sec. 205. (a) Any member of the Commission, including a member appointed under section 203(b), who is a Member of Congress, while on official business of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received in his regular capacity, except reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in connection with the performance of duties vested in the Commission.
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.

Mr. DADDARIO. I urge its acceptance by my colleagues.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I have said about his amendment, I will accept it. I have no opposition to it.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, may we strike the requisite number of words.

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

The amendment was agreed to.
Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to yield further.

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 any 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 the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:--

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross

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

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offerred by Mr. Gross: On page 3, line 17, strike out "salary of such employees.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can be talked out of this amendment, if the gentleman from Connecticut will give me his attention, but it seems to me this is a wide-open invitation to empires building by the process of construction. I am surprised at the 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 the bill would get through 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 experience.

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 large number of employees on the payroll when it is possible, with the oversight of the committee, to hold down the employment, to hold down the number of superordinates 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. 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 any 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 the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:--

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

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

The question was taken; and the SPEAKER announced that the eyes appeared to have it.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors. The Sergeant at Arms will call the 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  Pritchghuey Meeds
Adams  Priedel  Meek
Addabbo  Fulton, Pa.  Miller, Calif.
Adler  Fuhrman, Tenn.  Mink
Anderson  Puqua  Minn
T. Appling  Gandy, Ga.  Missouri
Annunziato  Gallagher  Moore
Ashley  Gardiner  Moorhead
Aspinall  Garms  Monge
Bates  Gilbott  Moyer
Belcher  Gonzales  Murphy, Ill.
Bell  Green, Oreg.  Myron
Bennett  Green, Pa.  Myers
Bentson  Gross  Nader
Bingham  Grover  Napel
Blainless  Quayle, Del.  Nays
Blandin  Queral  N. Y.
Boggs  Ruckelshaus  N. Y.
Boland  Hamilton  N. C.
Bolton  Hammer, Tenn.  Neah
deso  Hancock  Netherlands
Braesco  Hanley  Patman
Brooks  Harley, Wash.  Pendleton
Brock  Hansen, Wash.  Perley
Brooks  Hauck  Perkins
Browne  Broomfield  Philbin
Brown  Broomfield, Mass.  Pickle
Browne, N.C.  Bryan, Ohio
Bush  Hechtrng, Iowa  Pursell
Button  Hickenlooper  Quie
Byrne, Pa.  Hollifld, N. J.  Quay
Cable  Holland  Roettig
Canal  Horton  Rohrman
Cooper  Howard  Ronan
Carter  Hugate  Rhode, Pa.
Casey  Hunt  Roberts
Chabot, Ohio  Johnson, Calif.
Chebanne, Colo.  Johnson, Calif.
Collins  Jorgenson, Minn.  Johnson, Ohio
Connors  Jorgenson, Minn.  Johnson, Ala.
Danko  Kauppinen  Johnson, Ala.
Delderen, Jr.  Kazen  Johnson, Ala.
Dent  Kelly  Jordan, Ala.
Derwinski  Kiehl, Calif.  Kauffman
Dole  Kienzler  Kaufman
Donahoe  Kinkaid  Kennedy
Dorn  Krogh, N. J.  Kernan
Dowdy  Kruesi  Kirby
Dowling  Lembke  Korza
Dulski  Leach  Kosterman
Dwyer  Leach  Kosterman
Edwards, Calif.  Leach  Kosterman
Edwards, Le.  Long, Md.
Edmondson, Calif.  Long, Md.
Edwards, Calif.  McCarthy  Texas, Tex.
Ellberg  McClary  Tener
Ellender  McEachin  Thompson, N. J.
Ehsh  McDonald, Pa.  Tiernan
Ehrenfried, Tenn.  Pfeifer  Toole
Falken  McFaul  Tongue
Farrar  McFaul  Toole
Farbstein  McEvilly  Udall
Farrell  Mazzio, Calif.  Udall
Felder  Mazzio, Calif.  Udall
Field  Mcllwain  Udall
Flood  Mathias, Md.  Udall
Foley  Matsunaga  Udall
Gage  McFarland  Udall
Gerald R.  Mayne  Udall
Gentry  Mayne  Udall
Getz  Mayne  Udall
Gigliotti  Mayne  Udall
Gould, Calif.  Mayne  Udall
Gross, Calif.  Mayne  Udall
Gross, N. J.  Mayne  Udall
Griffith  Mayne  Udall
Griffiths  Mayne  Udall
Grimes  Mayne  Udall
Grilli  Mayne  Udall
Grogan  Mayne  Udall
Gross  Mayne  Udall
Grose  Mayne  Udall
Grotzke  Mayne  Udall
Grotzke  Mayne  Udall
Green, Mass.  N. Y.  Mapes
Green, Pa.  Myers
Griffith  Gross  Nader
Grshop  Gross  Nader
Gross, Calif.  Gross  Nader
Gross, Calif.  Gross  Nader
Gross, Calif.  Gross  Nader
Grubb  Gross  Nader
Grubb  Gross  Nader
Grubb  Gross  Nader
Gruenther  Gross  Nader
Gruenewald  Gross  Nader
Gruenewald  Gross  Nader
Gruenewald  Gross  Nader
Gutterman  Gross  Nader
Gutterman  Gross  Nader
Gutterman  Gross  Nader
Gutterman  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
Gutierrez  Gross  Nader
The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DADDARIO

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

The motion is to reconsider the bill S. 1124.

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

The Clerk read the following:

"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 to establish a program to stimulate the provision 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 1968 Act and to enhance a national fire research and safety program including the gathering of comprehensive fire data, an assessment of fire research programs; fire safety education and training programs; and demonstrations of new approaches and improvements in fire prevention and control, and reduction of death, personal injury, and property damage. Additionally, it is the sense of Congress that the Secretary shall establish a fire research and safety center for administering this title and carrying out its purposes, including appropriate fire safety liaison and coordination.

"OTHER MATERIALLY PROGRESSIVE ACTIONS AND MOVEMENTS."

"Sec. 102. The Act entitled 'An Act to establish the National Bureau of Standards, approved March 3, 1901, as amended (15 U.S.C. 271-276), is further amended by adding the following:

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

"(1) investigations of fires to determine the cause, 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) educate and train the public and the appropriate fire-related hazards and fire disasters; and"

"(2) projects demonstrating—"

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

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

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

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

"(1) fire safety and fire protection education and science curricula; and"

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

"Sec. 17. With respect to the functions authorized by section 10 of this Act—"

"(a) Grants may be made only to States and local governments, other non-Federal public agencies, and nonprofit institutions specifically authorized by or in accordance with the provisions of the total of the 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, 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 or agencies for the payment of any such functions and, as necessary or appropriate, delegate any of his powers under this section or section 19 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 304 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 539)."

"(d) The Secretary is authorized to require any Federal department or agency to supply such statistics, vital 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 the departments and agencies engaged in administering programs related to fire safety shall, to the maximum extent practicable, cooperate in order to insures fully coordinated efforts.

"(e) The Secretary is authorized to establish such standards, criteria, and procedures and rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or appropriate to the administration of such purposes under this Act, including rules and regulations which—"
"(1) provide that a grantee will from time to time, but not less often than annually, submit to the Commission a report of activities funded under section 16, and
"(2) provide for fiscal control, sound accounting practices, and periodic reports to the Secretary regarding the application of funds paid under section 160."

"NONINTERFERENCE WITH EXISTING FEDERAL PROGRAMS"

"Sec. 103. Nondisplaced. The Commission 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. 101. The Congress finds and declares that the growing problem of the harm to 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, and that an increasing proportion of the population resides but it is also of national concern in smaller communities and rural areas; that the means for controlling and preventing destructive fires has become progressively more complex and frequently beyond public and local capacities; and that there is a clear and present need to explore and develop more effective fire control and fire prevention methods throughout the country, in the light of existing and foreseeable conditions. It is the purpose of this title to establish the Commission to undertake a thorough study and investigation of this problem with a view to the formulation of recommendations whereby the Nation can reduce its losses from fire and prevent the fires caused by fire in its cities, suburbs, communities, and elsewhere.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION"

"Sec. 102. There is hereby established 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 shall be individuals who (1) shall be eminent and distinguished in knowledge, experience, and ability in the field of fire prevention, (2) whose services are for the public good (3) to provide representation of the views of individuals and organizations of all areas of the United States concerned with fire research, safety, control, or prevention, including representatives drawn from Federal, State, and local governments, industry, labor, universities, labor, fraternal, and other institutions or organizations. Not more than six members of the Commission shall be appointed from the Federal Government, except that the President may designate the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Commission.

"The Commission shall have four advisory members composed of—

"(1) two Members of the House of Representatives to be members of the same political party and who shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives,
"(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.

"(e) 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 of 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 comprehensive analysis of which fires can be more effectively prevented through technological advances, construction techniques, and inspection procedures;

"(2) an analysis of existing programs administered or supported by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government and of ways in which such programs could be strengthened so as to lessen the danger of destructive fires in Government-assisted 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 them, including designing and soliciting the necessary personnel;

"(4) an evaluation of present and future needs of training and education for fire-service personnel;

"(5) a consideration of the adequacy of current fire communication techniques and the suggestion for improvement of the apparatus and equipment used in controlling fires;

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

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

"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 its functions under 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, any 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 prescribed by the Chairman, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule positions and grades, the Commission may—

"(1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such staff personnel as he deems necessary, and
"(2) to procure temporary and intermit-
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 (Mr. Dingell) to report the bill H.R. 25, which is now before you for consideration.

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. Blakely 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 estuaries and the waters of the Great Lakes.

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

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

H.R. 25 dates back to September 23, 1965, when the gentleman from New York, Congressman Tenzes, introduced legislation—limited in scope—which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to determine the potential of the estuaries for the protection and conservation of the estuaries-wetland area of Hempstead-South Oyster Bay, Long Island, N.Y.

Subsequently, I and several other Members of Congress introduced legislation—broad 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 February of last year I again introduced legislation on this subject—H.R. 25, which is now before you for consideration.

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

As a result of the lengthy hearings and discussions which ensued, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries deemed it desirable to strip from the bill those controversial provisions and report a bill which would still provide the best possible means for protecting our Nation's estuaries 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 potential 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 maintain the navigational channels for sport and commercial fishing, wildlife conservation, recreation, and other purposes. The bill H.R. 25, with Mr. Blakely in the chair.

Section 2 of the bill would require the Secretary of the Interior—in consultation and in cooperation with the States, the Secretary of the Army, and other Federal agencies, in planning uses of the lands and waters of the Great Lakes.

For the purpose of the study, the Secretary would be required to conduct this study in consultation and in cooperation with the States, the Secretary of the Army, and other Federal agencies, in planning uses of the lands and waters of the Great Lakes.

Further, this section would require the Secretary of the Interior to recommend to Congress, in the report accompanying the bill, the establishment of a system of co-operative intergovernmental agencies, protection, rehabilitation, and development of our Nation's estuaries, including the land and waters of the Great Lakes.

In studying such areas, the Secretary would be required to give consideration to whether any land or water area within the Great Lakes could be adequately 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 on the legislation, 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 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 on the legislation, 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 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.

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 and the N.Y.S. Fish and Game Department—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 enter into similar agreements with public owners of estuaries 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 to commercial and industrial development, and to the rehabilitation of the navigational channels in those areas.

Section 5 of the bill would require the Secretary to report on the legislation, including the land and waters of the Great Lakes.

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 actions which will conflict with the agreement 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 question the most vital part of our environment. The Chesapeake Bay is, perhaps, the most important estuary 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 feeding ground for humpback whales. 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 bottom with new channels, as we span its surface with bridges, as we reshape its shores to suit the needs of industry or the convenience of man, we shall inevitably, 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 of Southern Louisiana, Buzzards Bay, the long coastal shorelines of the Great Lakes, and their 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 re-established. We care for our greatness, we must deal not only with our public works, our highways, our transportation, our ventures into space, the physical facilities which house our population, but also with our natural environment. If we fail to develop compatible 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, then we are violating the cleanness 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 cannot 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: Are we to share 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, it gives recognition to the estuarine areas. It devotes 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 here is to stimulate actions 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 as an added 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 and management programs or State programs of a parallel nature. This legislation, in itself, is a new adventure in conservation. The success of our efforts here will be a measure of how well this program is integrated into other conservation efforts carried out by State, Federal, and private interests.

In closing, I would urge my colleagues to support this bill which holds great hope for the time-honored 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 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 waters of the tributaries and the fresh waters of the runoffs meet the tidal waters, or salt waters of the sea.

Mr. KYL. Would the gentleman define, 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 vast wetlands 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 estuaries not only the parts of the ocean waters 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. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman of language make it 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 Albermarle and Pamlico Sounds of North Carolina, Chesapeake Bay—these are some of the areas.

I would add further that one can conceivably 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 the question about this, I would ask the gentleman these two questions.

Am I right in assuming that those areas which by their dictionary definition are caused by the flow of large springs are not to be considered 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 determined 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. KERR). Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, my district will be a beneficiary of the research and study. I hope that the study will be helpful so that we will be able to determine its conclusion will be reached by the commission which is established by this bill to look into the relationship of the estuarian areas to the wild life and to the fish that spawn within these areas and which fishermen find their way to the marketplace and on to the tables throughout our country.

It is very important that this relationship be understood.

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 any area that has 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 the 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 further? Perhaps we could ask the author of the pending bill, the gentleman from Iowa, to explain it in more detail.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, 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 with regard to the appointment of an official or agent to 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 16, he will find that under this bill any 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—for the Long Island Wetlands area—subject to appropriations and after action by the Congress, enter into agreements for the purchase of that land, which will be the responsibility of 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 the 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 the estuarine bill. I wish to make it clear at the outset that I am a staunch 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 16 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. Dwyer introduced the following bill:

There is the answer as to how the Great Lakes got in.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, we will let Mr. Dwyer 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—
So it was the intent of the committee, as I believe it is in the interest of the Congress, that for purposes of this bill the Great Lakes should be included.

Mr. FELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield for a short question to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to demonstrate to the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Massachusetts they are not the only ones who have a concern. In the report from the Corps of Engineers we find this language: we believe that all references in the draft bill to waters of the Great Lakes should be deleted. These waters have problems, but they differ greatly from the aesthetic, recreational, and fish and wildlife problems with which the bill is designed to deal.

I support this idea of conservation, but I believe by putting the Great Lakes in we will diminish the money and activity which will be necessary in the coastal areas.

Mr. FELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan for a short answer.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, the greater沿海 areas. Estuaries, Everybody has known as estuarine areas of the Nation, which are along the seacoast.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to take this conversation away from the Great Lakes for a few moments, because its main thrust is what was generally known as estuaries areas of the Nation, which are along the seacoast.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill, which is essentially a study bill of the estuarine areas. A year ago I made the statement that 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 statement that changes, 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 Towns of Hempstead and Oyster Bay, both of which towns I have the pleasure of representing here in the Congress.

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 were not 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 in the State 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 States 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 wetlands.

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 good work he is doing 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 statement.

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's statement is entirely correct. The report does differ somewhat from the language.

Mr. WYDLER. I should like to point out to the chairman of the committee that 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 set the whole bill. With regard to the second paragraph 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 set the whole bill.

Mr. WYDLER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WYDLER. I just want to get these things on the record.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to get four questions answered for the record, if I may, with the chairman of the subcommittee.

The first question is: Is it a fact that under the legislation as will be finally passed here today any State in the Nation will have to be a party to any agreement within that State under this bill?

Mr. DINGELL. Well, it would have to be a party to those agreements between the Federal Government and the local government. For example, in the management of estuaries which will be completed prior to the completion of the whole study reports 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 completed before agreements can be entered into. Under the amendment that will be offered, that does not have to be done. However, be­
in lands may be acquired by the Federal Government, the study must have to be completed and the Congress must act to app­proach 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 local government 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 present time, there will be no letter dealing with this point from the Secretary of the Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentle­man has expired.

Mr. WYDLER. 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, and whether any partial study of any sector or will the Secretary of the Interior in entering into an agreement under partial studies have to follow the procedures outlined in section 2 of the bill for agreements to be entered into after any general studies.

Mr. DINGELL. Under the language of the amendment which will be offered, the action of the Secretary with regard to entering into agreements for the management, development, administration, and management 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 whether or not the Secretary will 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. REID and Mr. REID], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PELLY], and the chairman of the subcom­mittee, the gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the gentlemen from Washington [Mr. PELLY] and the gentle­men from New York [Messrs. Wydler, Groves, and Tener] for their initiative and the views of the States and the local agen­cies.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. WYDLER. I thank the chairman. 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 gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the gentlemen from Washington [Mr. PELLY] and the gentle­men from New York [Messrs. Wydler, Groves, and Tener] for their initiative and the views of the States and the local Federal agencies.

I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. WYDLER. I thank the chairman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 25. In my judgment, the bill before us, considerably re­vised, represents the consensus of the House on this vital conservation measure. It It is estimated that, in 1960, at a cost not to exceed $350,000 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 marine ecosystems, comprise many natural resources, including large populations of wildfowl, such as ducks, geese, swans, rails, and snipe. Many of our most valued commercial species of fish spend at least a portion of their lives in estuarine areas, including prawns, menhaden, bluefish, oysters, soft clams, blue crabs, and diamondback terrapins. It is estimated that, in 1960, estuarine-dependent seafood resources were valued at over 90,000 commercial fish­ermen at the rate of about $1.1 billion pounds.

Specifically, in terms of the Long Is­land wetlands, the area comprises ex­tensive areas of salt and brackish water wetlands, and includes 18 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 these areas and the demand for these resources is in­creasing. A report by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service indicates that some 19 percent of the Long Island wetlands have been destroyed between 1935 and 1964, and an accelerated rate of wetlands de­struction 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 an important step—and, 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. Sim­ilarly, I am aware of 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 in 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 provision to include the Secretary of the Interior permissive authority to enter into an agreement for the manage­ment, administration, and develop­ment of publicly owned estuarine areas. The amendment, in effect, would authorize the acquisition 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 the lands covered by such 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, I do wish to call to the attention of the distinguished chairman of our Sub-committee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation that this bill has taken exceedingly great pains to provide all parties every opportunity to make their views known. Every possible effort has been made, 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:

-plus, 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 30, 1968, 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. These 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.

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. Tenzler) who originated the fight to preserve our estuaries.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the sub-committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), for yielding this time to me.

However, Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the entire 5 minutes, because I shall not undertake to repeat that which has already been said, but shall ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, however, I should like to address myself to one matter related to the point which Mr. Dringell has already raised, and I quote:

"...it is a matter of grave concern to the highest degree that we are 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."

Mr. Chairman, until today, hopefully, if this legislation is passed, the Federal Government was not allowed to use its expertise or to plan 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 but, instead, utilizing 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 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.
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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 Interior Department 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 who 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 includes representatives from the States of Michigan, Kansas, Nebraska, Wisconsin, South Dakota, Maryland, Iowa, Colorado, North Dakota, Minnesota and Illinois.

It is important to note that the provisions of H.R. 25 authorize 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 yesterday’s hearing before the 89th and 90th Congresses I testified and I have made speeches on the House floor stressing the importance of Long Island’s wetlands. I have pointed out that when I moved to Long Island’s south shore in 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 throughout the United States of valuable resources throughout the Nation.

More and more of our local communities are now realizing the importance of preserving open space and recreational areas. They are recognizing the urgency of providing for expert planning and maintenance of their remaining natural resources. Efforts are now being made by local 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 States and localities before it is too late.

After this legislation is enacted, the complex of Long Island’s wetlands in Nassau and Suffolk Counties may become the model of estuarine areas which the study and inventory is completed. Prior studies in 1961 and 1965 of the Long Island wetlands are referred to in the committee report on H.R. 25 and have called these the most important spawning grounds for fish and waterfowl on the North Atlantic coast.

Other areas will be studied and the voice of the people in each area who want their resources protected and preserved will be heard. If their voice is not heard, what legacy will they leave to their children, other than a filled 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 advocate of 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—should not be confused with, or regarded as, a method of superseding existing State conservation laws or local control of lands or wetlands. These agreements are adequate. It is important to note that the provisions of H.R. 25 authorize 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.

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. While the public controls the fishery, better the unique value of estuaries and coastal wetlands, the time draws nearer when long-term ecology rather than short-term economic pressures, will determine the fate of our public lands. The bill is still of some value.

When introduced last March, it had widespread support of the purposes and intent of H.R. 25:

Mr. Chairman, I insert in the record at this point a number of recent newspaper commentaries consistent with 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 salt of the ocean once provided a haven for man. For other species, they are still the survival zone. Here nearly two-thirds of the American bald eagle nests, sea birds, sea turtles and shellfish spawn. Here are found oysters, shrimp, clams and crabs. And here waterfowl and land 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 only of today. We are doing to the wetlands what industry has done to our rivers. We are destroying the last vestiges of pristine nature, destroying the last vestiges of pristine nature, possibly for the sake of a little known species of duck or a little known species of duck or an endless stream of acreage for real estate developers. We are destroying the last vestiges of pristine nature, possibly for the sake of a little known species of duck or a little known species of duck or an endless stream of acreage for real estate developers. We are destroying the last vestiges of pristine nature, possibly for the sake of a little known species of duck or a little known species of duck or an endless stream of acreage for real estate developers.

Wetlands forever in a public conservation trust. The bays, estuaries and coastal wetlands where the fresh waters of a river meet the salt of the ocean once provided a haven for man. For other species, they are still the survival zone. Here nearly two-thirds of the American bald eagle nests, sea birds, sea turtles and shellfish spawn. Here are found oysters, shrimp, clams and crabs. And here waterfowl and land birds live and migratory birds rest on their journeys.

It is important to note that the provisions of H.R. 25 authorize 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.

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. While the public controls the fishery, better the unique value of estuaries and coastal wetlands, the time draws nearer when long-term ecology rather than short-term economic pressures, will determine the fate of our public lands. The bill is still of some value.

When introduced last March, it had widespread support of the purposes and intent of H.R. 25:

Mr. Chairman, I insert in the record at this point a number of recent newspaper commentaries consistent with 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 salt of the ocean once provided a haven for man. For other species, they are still the survival zone. Here nearly two-thirds of the American bald eagle nests, sea birds, sea turtles and shellfish spawn. Here are found oysters, shrimp, clams and crabs. And here waterfowl and land 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 only of today. We are doing to the wetlands what industry has done to our rivers. We are destroying the last vestiges of pristine nature, destroying the last vestiges of pristine nature, possibly for the sake of a little known species of duck or a little known species of duck or an endless stream of acreage for real estate developers. We are destroying the last vestiges of pristine nature, possibly for the sake of a little known species of duck or a little known species of duck or an endless stream of acreage for real estate developers. We are destroying the last vestiges of pristine nature, possibly for the sake of a little known species of duck or a little known species of duck or an endless stream of acreage for real estate developers.
Although our town now has its own conservation program in conjunction with the state (which does not understand that vast economic and sports interests involving fish and wildlife are dependent upon our wetlands' central role in migration), the program could evaporate easily, as times change and strong pressures grow to make use of the wetlands in some form other than their normal function. This town state program is merely a mutual agreement, with no lasting legal protection, and can be cancelled by the town's board or by town voters. 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, or for the dredger and developer. We have no ownership or control, but merely a voluntary agreement for studies, management advice, financial assistance, etc. Our town helped torpedo the last session of congress in order to weaken it under the guise that local control is better than federal—but the entire federal proposal is voluntary! We need federal involvement as watchdog help, if for nothing else—our town history proves this.

There are some important meetings to resolve the problem coming up soon in Washington, when congress reconvenes in late January. Write this week to: 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, Mineola, New York
- National Audubon Society
- North American Wildlife Foundation
- National Wildlife Foundation
- Sierra Club of America
- The Wilderness Society
- The Ian Watson 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 Conservation Commission
- Long Island Fisherman Association
- Long Island League of Salt Water Sportsmen

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


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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: If I hope that we will see in this session of the Congress the long overdue action in support of your dedicated efforts to save Nassau as principal vanishing of the state and the South Shore by supporting the legislation.

[From the Nassau (N.Y.) Herald, Jan. 18, 1968.]
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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 ways 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. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have made it clear at the 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 estuarine area problem is 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 agreement, unless 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 estuarine areas. 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 necessary 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 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 incorrect. 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.

Does the identification 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 what is an estuarine area and place it under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior?

Mr. DINGELL. I 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 allowing those which flow through States and which do not within those States, enter a body of salt water; is that correct?

Mr. DINGELL. The language is very clear 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 it is redefined at that 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. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Groves].

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.

There are those of us who have not really been close to the work which has been done on the estuary 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 our feet wet in the 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 I urge the incorporation of a great deal of the wetland areas along our coast and the Pacific coast.

I am happy to support my friend, the chairman, and the other gentlemen who have spoken on this bill.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Blatnik].

Mr. BLATNIK. I appreciate the gentleman's generosity in yielding time. There is pressure on all of us to get this bill on the way.

H.R. 25, as originally reported by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee was acceptable legislation insofar as I am concerned. It was arrived at after long and intensive discussions and compromises between all interested parties.

This bill, as such, is far reaching in its scope. It affects many segments of our Nation's industries. The bill is wide in its scope. Under the definition of "estuary,"

Indeed, one such study now going on
In fact, it covers a much larger area than estuaries. It includes the land adjoining the Great Lakes and all of our coastal waters.

The study of estuaries 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 take possession of the State or any subdivision thereof for the purpose of acquiring any estuarine land, 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 these 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 we thought was the 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 purpose of acquiring any estuarine land and also the 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 the funds 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 is to approve the amendment as presented by the gentleman from Michigan, that is, on the one hand, to require the Secretary to study the question of acquisition of estuarine areas and, on the other hand, revenue 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 is to approve the amendment as presented by the gentleman from Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Blatnik, for his remarks.

Mr. BLATNIK. I understand the gentleman. Let us take the intracoastal waterway from the Atlantic Intracoastal Canal, and the Gulf Intracoastal Canal. You have there navigation and marshlands. They are all related. There is the question of flood control and augmentation of flow, channel improvement, stream improvement, banks, flow increase, or flow augmentation. These are simple undertakings of managing wetlands, to preserve them from encroachment, and to keep up the fish and wildlife.
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Interior. In essence, it adds another layer of administration an individual must pass through before securing final permission to dredge in a designated area. The Army is merely charged with the addition of protecting the public waters, under the Flood Control Act of 1899. That question was not considered at the time. I would like to pursue some of the questions asked by the gentleman from Texas. Mr. TENZER for his efforts in connection with the Long Island wetlands area. 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 jurisdiction where the demands placed on the individual applicant seem somewhat questionable. The memorandum of understanding now before us, is the product of discussions between the Army, the Corps of Engineers, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Commerce, concerning the actions 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. 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 Army, 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 you that it is my understanding 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 has been executed with the understanding that previously and historically the Federal Government, through the Army Corps of Engineers, had jurisdiction over the waters, under the Flood Control Act of 1899. That question was not considered at the time. If they fail to do that, $70,000, shall be funded by the applicant. 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. A survey shall be conducted by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Corps of Engineers, or other appropriate agencies to map major wetlands areas as an integral part of the dual permit section previously in the legislation, and people can or cannot dredge. That is why I question the wisdom of eliminating the identification of major wetlands at the beginning of this 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. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that H.R. 25 is before us today. Measures to conserve the Nation’s wetlands and estuary areas are long overdue. We are finally beginning to appreciate the importance of estuaries and estuary-reserved areas 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 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 co-sponsored, to the floor. Our colleague from New York [Mr. Tenzier] 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 present century, and probably one-fifth of the total wetlands area had been spoliated 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 Tenzier 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. A survey shall be conducted by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Corps of Engineers, or other appropriate agencies to map major wetlands areas as an integral part of the dual permit section previously in the legislation, and people can or cannot dredge. That is why I question the wisdom of eliminating the identification of major wetlands at the beginning of this 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.

A second provision which can only weaken the intent of the legislation is...
section 2(a)(3), providing that, in carry­
out the inventory of the Nation’s estuari­
areas, the Secretary of the Interior, the Sec­
etary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the
ecological, esthetic, and navigational
values—their value for commercial and
industrial development. It is careless and
industrial exploitation that has necessitated prohibi­
tion of wetlands to keep in mind further com­
mercial exploitation in its 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 manage­
ment 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
Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask
an amendment to this section to extend this authority will be adopted. It is also
unfortunate that the question of actual acquisition of wetlands by the Secretary has been deferred for further study.

Nevertheless, this legislation is another
necessary step toward the proper manage­
ment of the Nation’s natural resources.

The health of our river and coastal areas cannot be regained once these areas have been eroded and contaminated.

Mr. PASSELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity of recording my support for this 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 estua­
ry, as a land form, to the status of mountain wilderness, wild rivers, the
seashore, and other areas already protected under existing conservation legis­
lation.

The rapid influx of population along our national shoreline has posed a clear threat to the preservation and manage­
ment of coastal natural areas. Seventy-
five percent of our population now live in States bordering the sea­
dee, Gulf, and great lakes. Without the subsea­
continents, and the marshes of the Great Lakes.

New effective nationwide controls have so far been applied against filling and
and land reclamation which are continu­
ally eroding these estuaries. Filling and dredging 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 earth-moving work. Frequently coastal land values have soared, and estua­
aries have justifiably been turned into prime residential and industrial sites.
Many speculators, however, have been buying up relatively cheap marshlands, and selling them for millions of dollars in a few 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 many
parts of the Nation, the protection of fish life to the vacation industry is enor­

It seems to me that the protection of a reasonable number and distribution of estuaries and their wildlife is a sound and
promising both from the economic standpoint and the conservation objec­
tive 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.

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 Con­
gress finds and declares that many estuaries
in the United States are rich in a variety of
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 United States, and the need to
develop these estuaries to further the growth
and development of the Nation. In connec­
tion with this purpose, Congress finds and
declares that estuaries of the Nation and in conse­
quently the benefits resulting to the public
shall be declared to be the policy of Congress
that estuaries shall be protected, conserves, and
restored 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 and/or
by contract a study and inventory of the
Nation’s estuaries, including without limita­
tion coastal marshlands, bays, sounds, sea­
bays, and their intertidal waters, and the
adjacent waters of the Great Lakes. For the
purpose of this study, the Secretary shall consider, among other factors, (1) their wildlife and recrea­
tional potential, their ecology, their value to
the marine, anadromous, and shell fisheries
and their esthetic value, (2) their importance
and role in maintaining water quality, flood
control, and erosion control, their mineral value, and
the value of submerged lands underlying the
waters of the estuaries, and (3) the value
of the submerged lands adjacent to the
waters of the estuaries.

Such studies shall be conducted with the
ultimate objective of establishing estuarine
reserves and establishing a nationwide system of estuarine areas
which shall be acquired by the
United States, the States, or any political subdivision of the
States or by any political subdivision or agency thereof.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior shall, not later than January 8, 1969, submit to the Congress through the President a report of the
study conducted pursuant to this section,
together with any legislative recom­
mendations that the Secretary deems
necessary with respect to the feasibility and desirability of establishing
a nationwide system of estuarine areas, the
conditions and means for considering the
need to protect, conserve, and restore these
areas, and such development may include the
administration and development of the estuarine
lands and waters which are generally
depicted on a boundary map dated September
15, 1968, 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
United States, the States, or any political subdivision of the
States or by any political subdivision or agency thereof.

Such agreement shall, among other things, provide that the State of New York or the
political subdivision or agency thereof
shall have responsibility for the
administration and development of the estuarine
areas, and such development may include the
construction, operation, installation, and
maintenance of buildings, devices, structures, and other equipment necessary to
adequately and reasonably accomplish the objectives of this Act.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior, in con­
duction with the States and the
Secretary of Agriculture, 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 as the... of subsection (a) of this section for the administration, management, and development of publicly owned estuarine areas, and authorize the Secretary to... a method of conserving the Nation's estuarine areas. The Secretary shall make recommendations therein. The report authorized by... 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... and roads, and other improvements, and such... their estuaries and their natural resources, and their importance for commercial and industrial developments, and all project planning and proposals for financial assistance under the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669 et seq.), the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act (94 Stat. 450), as amended, shall be... by the agencies 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.

Such agreement may provide also that the Secretary shall share in an equitable manner in the cost of managing, administering, and restoring estuaries in accordance with the purposes of this Act. In approving grants made pursuant to said laws for the acquisition of all or part of any such area, the... and conditions as he deems necessary to assure that the permanent protection of such areas, including such 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... the authority of any Federal agency to carry out any Federal project hereafter or hereafter authorized within any estuary.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

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

The Clerk read the amendment as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL; Strike out line 25 on page 18 and line 1 on page 19 and all that follows 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 the purposes of such subdivision or agency is first approved by the... of such program shall be in such agreement 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 already authorized by a State or by any political subdivision thereof: Provided, That, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, 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 area is not authorized by a State or by any political subdivision thereof: Provided: That, with the approval of the... is completed subject to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of section 2 of this Act. Such agreement shall, among other things, authorize the Secretary to go into big land development projects or big alterations of these wetlands. 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 which I am familiar could be best managed and restored. 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 they harbor... 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. WYDLE], that it was the intention by this amendment to permit a broader agreement than just, let us say, one subdivision... 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 test is whether 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 their previous action 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 authorize projects 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. I do not think we are 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,
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. DINGELL. If the amendment was discussed during 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 understanding in this 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 of striking language that would do away with congressional review of any proposed contractual agreements between the Secretary of the Interior and local subdivisions of government. 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 that these bodies of water will be handled very carefully by 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. CASEY. 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 this amendment, they must consult and coordinate very carefully with other Federal units of government, such as the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation and other agencies of that sort. They must also consult with the Department of Agriculture and all of the others to make sure that the administration is done in the best possible way and that the views of all the Federal agencies are considered.

Mr. BLATNIK. That gives me much more assurance than the committee would have unless the amendment any estuary area in which a study has been completed would be immediately eligible for this process of contractual agreements between the local government and the Secretary of the Interior, 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 subsequent agreement 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 conference 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 may be an amendment whereby 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 completed 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 our safeguards of the jurisdiction of the authorizing committees of the Congress and our interest in some of these areas.

Mr. CASEY. 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 before us, but 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 be done by the Congress and not by the Secretary of the Department of the Interior. I move, therefore, that this amendment be stricken from 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 the expenditures of money in the 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 can enter into a more thoughtful consideration of these specific developments under the terms and the provisions of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, all we need is an agreement on the part of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, the President of the United States, and the State and local governments as to the specific meaning of national parks and State and national estuaries. As I read and construe this legislation, there is no limit on that. 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.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the author of the bill, the very able gentleman who has pioneered in this field, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], if he can assure me of the fact as to the intent as contained in the clause of the report which appears, beginning on page 34, to the general effect that there is no intent to give any legality to such law?

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

Mr. CASEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas that the amendment 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 me, 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 of the Secretary of the Army of 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 intention of the Congress to confer 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 so far 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 conveyance by this legislation on the two Departments to enter into agreements.

Mr. CASEY. At the beginning of the debate, 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. EDMONDS. 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 of concurrence in the instance 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. EDMONDS. 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. EDMONDS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I ask for the purpose of asking a question of clarification on this point by the gentleman from Michigan. The gentleman would not be proposing that the Secretary of the Interior under existing law 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 and the local subdivision of the government for the management of those wetlands? This would not permit lands owned by the States to be purchased with Federal money by the States, and then be managed more or less according to the criteria and procedural requirements set forth by the Federal Department of the Interior; is that possible?

Mr. DINGELL. I will say to my good friend from Minnesota that in the consideration of this legislation that the gentleman did not go into the question of whether States could go into the land and water acquisition funds. This legislation does not, I will say to my friend from Minnesota, in any way change the authority of the States under the land and water conservation fund.

I would assume—and it would be my private expectation—that unless the land and water conservation fund very clearly permits this kind of activity, that the Secretary would not allow anything such as that to be done. But he does not generally allow this matching of funds with Federal funds, which is essentially what would take place there.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman comment further on the amendment which has been offered that says that the Secretary shall share in an equitable manner in the cost of managing, administering, and developing such areas?

Mr. DINGELL. No, I have not made that statement. It was my general expectation 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. EDMONDS. 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 altered to accommodate the peculiar circumstances that might exist there.

Mr. EDMONDS. Is the gentleman talking of a State where the resources are limited or is he talking of a locality?

Mr. DINGELL. A State 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 concurrence of the Secretary would allow something such as that to be done. 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. EDMONDS. So that if there is any 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 take the money and pay for the local subdivision of the 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 might get nowhere—might just delay action in the hope that it could be made by the political subdivision and not the State. I do not know the particular circumstances—the question with regard to management differs very greatly in each State and the economic desirability again differs very greatly from State to State.

There are occasionally States which under no circumstances would enter into an agreement.

You want to remember that there are many, many checks and balances in the language of this amendment. The President has to agree. The other Federal agencies have to agree. The Budget of the Senate and the House, the Budget has to agree. The Department of Agriculture 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. That is still correct. I would like to ask the gentleman a question as to the effect of the legislation as to what does the gentleman mean by "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 go into the bill, 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.

Mr. KEITH. Yes, Mr. Chair. I would like to put 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 Budget of the Senate and the House, the Budget has to agree. The Department of Agriculture 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.

Mr. KEITH. That is still correct. I would like to ask the gentleman a question as to the effect of the legislation as to what does the gentleman mean by "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 go into the bill, of course, the judgment would have to be made by the political subdivision and not the State. I do not know the particular circumstances—the question with regard to management differs very greatly in each State and the economic desirability again differs very greatly from State to State.

There are occasionally States which under no circumstances would enter into an agreement.

You want to remember that there are many, many checks and balances in the language of this amendment. The President has to agree. The other Federal agencies have to agree. The Budget of the Senate and the House, the Budget has to agree. The Department of Agriculture 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.

Mr. KEITH. That is still correct. I would like to ask the gentleman a question as to the effect of the legislation as to what does the gentleman mean by "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.
The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Mr. DINGELL, the Committee substitute amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

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 amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Brookz).

The amendment was concurred in.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Rogers).

The amendment was concurred in.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. George).

The amendment was concurred in.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Ford).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Cain).

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Brookes).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Ford).

The amendment was concurred in.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. George).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Ford).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. George).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Ford).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. George).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Keating).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Keating).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. George).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Ford).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. George).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Keating).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Keating).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Ford).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. George).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Keating).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Ford).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. George).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Keating).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Ford).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. George).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Keating).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Ford).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. George).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Keating).

There was no objection.
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 request of the gentleman from Florida 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 officials 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 of racketeers; 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, which account for 11 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 the statutes specify a concerted assault on organized crime activities, clearly prosecutions would be facilitated and convictions of major crime leaders could be obtained by the FBI. The statutes 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 freedom to their most extreme, illogical, and ridiculous extent. 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 to the maintenance of 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 amend­ ing 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 re­ monstrated with the Court against these hasty and dangerous decisions, but to no avail. It is therefore left to the Con­ gress to take action to redeem the in­ tegrity of the U.S. Government and to prevent the obvious damage these deci­ sions threaten to do to us. I ask unanimous consent which will authorize the Government to bar from employment in defense facilities individuals believed disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other sub­ version. 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 an attempt to attempt to re­ verse the Court's ruling in the Robel case, and I am sorry 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 Alli­ ance for Progress will celebrate its sev­ enth anniversary in 1968. It continues to be one of the most successful of our foreign aid programs. The Latin Amer­ ican nations have responded readily to the idea of self-help which is the corner­ stone of our aid program, and their determination to help themselves is evi­ dent 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 the fund for peace—Public Law 480. This assistance supplements, but does not substi­ tute for, the efforts of the people of Latin America to become self-reliant. Latin America's leadership, the labor, and most of the money come from the coun­ tries themselves.

The Department of State, with contribu­ tions from other members of the multilateral Inter-Agency Alliance for Progress, has recently pre­ pared the yearend review of the Alli­ ance for Progress which reports on this program's activities during 1967. I would like to include a brief summary of this review in the Raccoon for the benefit of 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 over the annual average of $528 million during the past six fiscal years—1962 through 1967—amounting to $7,291 million. This includes AID loans and grants, Food for Freedom, the Social Progress Trust Fund, and the Peace Corps, for 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 announce­ ment from the U.S. Department of Agriculture which maintains the Latin American Agricultural Production Program. 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 1967 Index are over and above Latin America's 2.9 percent annual population growth rate.

LATIN AMERICAN COOPERATIVE FLOURISH

US-AID missions are likewise continuing their assistance in the organization and man­ agement 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, with a membership of 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 $2 million in small loans, to reach a new total of $35 million in interest-bearing loans for farm supplies, education, health, and household. The rural electric cooperatives have been organized in twelve Latin Ameri­ can countries. AID's loan assistance of about $50 million in the past 3 years has contrib­ uted has financed rural electric co­ operative operations in Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Costa Rica, Nicaragua and Peru. More than 20 pilot cooperatives now serving

* For comparison purposes, agricultural production in the years 1957-1959 is equiva­ lent to 100 in the Index ratings.
more than 40,000 families are in various stages of 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 authorized credits for long- and medium-term loans, medium-term credits, and short-term insurance for exports to Alliance countries totaling $161.1 million for the year ending in September. Funds insured over the previous year was an all-time record since. Every dollar of this credit assistance was earmarked for goods and services needed to further the Alliance.

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 Alliance spirit.

Since its inception the Partners program has generated a flow of more than eight million dollars in material and technical assistance to Latin America from the private sector of the United States. Activities include an exchange of teachers and students through scholarships and in-service training programs; business and industry programs including technical and commercial relationships, projects to promote food production and to strengthen democratic institutions.

During 1967 five conference series sponsored by the U.S. Agency for International Development brought together about 3000 business, finance, and labor leaders to discuss the purpose of overcoming the critical protein shortage and developing marketing techniques for protein-rich food supplements.

Other developments: 15 nationwide nutrition surveys were completed in Latin America in 1967, sponsored by the United Nations World Food Program. A $5 million grant supported through the Alliance for Progress, 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 and mothers were assisted.

During 1967 four U.S. industrial firms under AID service contracts undertaken high-level studies in Latin America for the purpose of overcoming the critical protein shortage and developing marketing techniques for protein-rich food supplements.

AID has assigned a specialist in each country to follow developments in the food population field and assist local government programs, on request.

During 1967, AID program assistance loans are now available for prospective and other necessary devices.

In 1967 commodities valued at more than $110 million were channeled through Food for Freedom programs in Latin America. About 48 percent of this amount supported programs conducted by voluntary agencies, involving some 12 million recipients.

CONGRESS, 1968

Mr. SCHWENGL, 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. SCHWENGL. 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: Senator Edmund S. Muskie and Representatives Melvin A. 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 thought it worth reading 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 9:00 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 Thurston B. Morton, Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Representative Melvin F. Laird, Representative Hale Boggs.

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

ANNOUNCERS: At 6:36 this evening the House of Representatives adjourned. The Senate followed suit fourteen minutes later. The 1st Senate, in color, the National Educational Television Network presents "Congress '68." In the studios of WETA, in Washington, Dick McCutchen.

ANNOUNCER: Before we list the important bills the sessions we're going to try to describe the process by which a bill becomes law. Some members of the Congress will analyze that record in the light of the needs of the nation.

Here are the essentials: Action on a bill may in most cases be initiated in either house, but let us suppose our lawmaker is a Congressman or Senator and analyze that record in the light of the needs of the nation.

Now, returned to the Senate, it is read, debated and amended by members of the entire assembly and voted. If a majority of the Senate, a two-thirds majority, but there should the majority approve it is declared to the Senate, to the House of Representatives. The total for this session is $1.8 billion for the war on poverty, and just as seen by some of its...
that Vietnam money requirements had gone up something like $6 billion beyond what had been estimated. So there is the need for the supplemental next year.

In addition, Chairman George Mahon of the Ways and Means Committee has indicated that it is correct; that additional funds will be needed, and that is the man who should know.

Thank you.

Mr. McCURCHEN. If the subject of Vietnam overshadowed all other foreign policy problems this past year, that was the result of the strain that has occurred in our domestic life. The President was unable to get his program through the Congress. He was just not able to get his program through. 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 crisis of the past six years, I think, impressed upon everyone, including a good many Congressmen, just 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 difficulties. Perhaps even more important, Mr. Foote. Mr. Foote. Yes, Dick, the seriousness of the crisis of the past six years, I think, impressed upon everyone, including a good many Congressmen, just 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 difficulties. Perhaps even more important, 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 restate the $44 million program.

Crimes was a big issue, one I am sure will be discussed at some length in the next session. The crime bill this session was aimed at people who were making an income-to-support ratio of less than $2,000. It is designed to help low-income families—not welfare families, but people who were making an income—to obtain better housing. The President got only 66 votes in the House.

In the poverty program he did far better than anyone expected, really. He won passage of his tax 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 restate the $44 million program.

Crime was a big issue, one I am sure will be discussed at some length in the next session. The crime bill this session was aimed at people who were making an income-to-support ratio of less than $2,000. It is designed to help low-income families—not welfare families, but people who were making an income—to obtain better housing. The President got only 66 votes in the House.

In the poverty program he did far better than anyone expected, really. He won passage of his tax 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 restate the $44 million program.

Crime was a big issue, one I am sure will be discussed at some length in the next session. The crime bill this session was aimed at people who were making an income-to-support ratio of less than $2,000. It is designed to help low-income families—not welfare families, but people who were making an income—to obtain better housing. The President got only 66 votes in the House.

In the poverty program he did far better than anyone expected, really. He won passage of his tax 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 restate the $44 million program.

Crime was a big issue, one I am sure will be discussed at some length in the next session. The crime bill this session was aimed at people who were making an income-to-support ratio of less than $2,000. It is designed to help low-income families—not welfare families, but people who were making an income—to obtain better housing. The President got only 66 votes in the House.

In the poverty program he did far better than anyone expected, really. He won passage of his tax 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 restate the $44 million program.

Crime was a big issue, one I am sure will be discussed at some length in the next session. The crime bill this session was aimed at people who were making an income-to-support ratio of less than $2,000. It is designed to help low-income families—not welfare families, but people who were making an income—to obtain better housing. The President got only 66 votes in the House.

In the poverty program he did far better than anyone expected, really. He won passage of his tax 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 restate the $44 million program.
an important breakthrough because many experts believe that unless there is some kind of public disclosure of outside income and activity by members of Congress, this ethic problem will always be a very troublesome one. In September, as a matter of fact, I introduced a bill in the Senate which would require, in disclosure in which disclosure only four votes short of passage indicating that the idea which would be the forerunner of any legislation which would have a chance in the future. Also in September, the Senate did pass a comprehensive campaign spending reform law, the most far-reaching such law ever to pass in Congress or ever to be approved by one of the chambers of Congress. This bill would tighten up the Federal Election Campaign Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the Consumer Credit Law. That bill passed with a bipartisan vote, and I think it is a milestone, a breakthrough in the way we deal with public issues. I think this is the product of the strong power that we have in Congress and the Senate.

Mr. McCREECHE. Neal, thank you and gentlemen, thank you all for those reports on what Congress did and failed to do in 1967.

Let's switch now to our four guests from the Congress with Paul Niven at the Capitol. Mr. Niven, Senators Morton and Muskie, Congressman Boggs and Laird. I would like to ask each of you in turn to give your personal verdict on the work of the Congress in the last year or two, specifically, 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, but we didn't do a lot of things that we should have done, so that is the way I look at it. I think the achievements are real and meaningful.

Let me turn today's session over to you. We completed action on the biggest social program of the year. We completed action on the poverty program which the Senate did pass in a very votes short of passage. We completed action on the biggest social program of the year. We completed action on the poverty program which the Senate did pass in a very votes short of passage. We completed action on the biggest social program of the year. We completed action on the poverty program which the Senate did pass in a very votes short of passage.

Mr. Niven. Senator Morton, first, let me say that I am younger than any of my colleagues who are here but I take junior to my friend, Congressman Boggs, in service in the Congress. This to me has been the most frustrating year from a personal standpoint. I have been a member of 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.

Second, I think that the breakdown of communications between the Administration and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is a tragedy.
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vote. It is my job as the Democratic whip to put these votes together.

Mr. Niven. You now—excuse me. Rep. Robert Peabody of Johns Hopkins University was talking when I was interrupted. I think we have done it is quite remarkable really, and I can understand the frustration Senator Morton expressed because there are frustrations all over the country. It is my opinion that these frustrations should be attributed to Congress. The frustrations come from Vietnam. They come from the cities, from each other, from poor people. They come from a change in the population pattern. I don't think 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 that view?

Representative Lamm. 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. It has made possible the greatest deficit that this country has ever experienced at any time since World War II and this deficit is going to have its effect. The distribution of the population is going to be felt upon all our people. The housewife in the home, the worker in the factory, those in the city, those in the farm are all feeling the effects of deficit financing to the extent that we have embarked upon in this first session of the 90th Congress. We have had no new ideas coming from the Executive Branch of the government. True, the poverty program was re-enacted, but there was no new aid programs were asked for by the President.

Grant-in-aid programs using the old model of the 1930's. Instead of moving into a new model, we have been giving aid to publicans 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 tax effort, 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 problems solvers in our cities and in our states and we believe that the creativity of the American people can be brought to its fullest effect by returning the resources to the local communities instead of setting up this new committee or this new grant and the billions 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 to 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, this is a problem.

Mr. Niven. Thank you, Gentlemen. It is clear that we have four rather distinct views—political parties, 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 panel of government experts 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 had our first session of the 90th Congress; four out of the most able and distinguished members of Congress have given us four quite distinct views of which four, I hope the 90th Congress, 1st Session, was all about.

I had an unusual opportunity to watch the 1st Session of the 90th Congress, 1965, at firsthand. Democrats called that one a great Congress. It certainly passed a large number of laws. Congress is the legislative branch of the government. 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 Congress? Is it in terms of the numbers of bills passed? Clearly not. Is it the kind of bill that is passed, what the Nixon Administration, that the President wants is probably more important. I happen to have heard the Senate minority leader Dirksen and Senator Johnsen 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 do is to evaluate the output of Congress. How do you determine whether it is truly representative of the needs of the 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, from Mr. DeGrazia, Professor of New York University.

Mr. DeGrazia. I guess Professor Peabody and myself are thinking along the same lines. I meant to make several comments about the output of the Congress, not only for this past year but in terms of the past and of the future, because I think when you evaluate and measure what Congress has done, 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 roll of the voting pretty much up to the experts who are bored already and who have preceded me.

I think that one might find good and bad things. I think that I also mentioned a lot of bad legislation has been screened out. Some of it has—some good legislation has gone out as well. The tax cut, for example, the middle class people, I think that was an honest one. The tax reform, middle class people, I think that was an honest one. I think that was an honest one.

Mr. Niven. Thank you, Gentlemen. I am not sure that I have heard about the middle class people, I think that was an honest one. I think that was an honest one.
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tion and from the military commanders in Vietnam, well, from my own state the 101st Airborne just went over there and they are the greatest outfit in the world, I think, the greatest fighting men in the world, and every Republican, every Republican in the House and Senate has supported the troops in Vietnam and continuing to fight this war. 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 the 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 do any way solve the problem that exists there.

Professor PeaRDy. Can I break in here, Paul?

Senator Morton. Yes, sir.

Professor PeaRDy. 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 PeaRDy. Professor PeaRDy. No question about—

Mr. NIVEN. Excuse me just a moment—

Representative Laid. The Vietnam situation, as I remember the discussion last week about the whole question of Congressional oversight can be brought into focus. I don't believe that you can look at the Vietnam appropriations here and a responsibility here where we don't always respond to, Sure, all of us can raise questions as to how we happened to get these policies. But surely we can ask questions, and legitimate ones, about whether or not we are hitting the proper targets, all of our taxes, and so on.

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 along the line. So, we don't have to worry about the war, but at some point we have learned the lesson in 180 years that after you ask all the questions, after you ask all the questions that naturally arise and the options, you exercise a little self-restraint and a little steadfastness to suppress. You don't just go ahead.

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 improper to do this, so I think your question doesn't carry any 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 many of you desire to cross that at some point we ought to exercise not restraint imposed.

Mr. PeaRDy. 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. PeaRDy. 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 Boogs. In Vietnam is a good thing to talk about in connection with this Congress because it is the overriding thing.

Mr. PeaRDy. But we could stay here with Vietnam for another half-hour.

Representative Laid. 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 Boogs. I think it has to do with both. I think you can't separate the spending policies. Somebody should mention that. But go ahead, Professor. He was about to ask a new question.

Mr. PeaRDy. We ought to move on to domestic problems and especially the problems of the cities.

Representative Boogs. What is the question? Go ahead, Professor.

Mr. PeaRDy. This one is on tax policy. You are a member of the Ways and Means Committee, a very important member of that committee.

Representative Boogs. Thank you.

Mr. PeaRDy. How come it is when the Administration, the President, the House leaders, the Senate leaders, and the Congress to put it in plainer terms, can't they get Congress to do what the President wants them to do? Well, it can't get out of the Ways and Means Committee?

Representative Boogs. Well, I would suggest that you direct that question to Congressmen Mills, the chairman of the committee. He would be better able to answer the question. I can only speak for myself and say to you that any time that I am given an opportunity to vote for a tax bill, Congress to support the Administration, I will vote for it. But the fact that it 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—

Representative Boogs. Excuse me. Let me go ahead.

In addition, 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 builders, 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 interest rates are just one of the items in this bill that is going to affect the economy than other sectors of the economy.

Mr. NIVEn. I can only say when the President comes out and tells us in February what he felt and said on the floor of the House, we have to—

Mr. PeaRDy. I wonder—

As we have in previous wars—and this is the point that many of you desire to cross that at some point we ought to exercise not restraint imposed.

Mr. NIVEn. Excuse me just a moment—

Representative Boogs. Already, I would just—

Mr. PeaRDy. So Mr. Boggs. I think that, especially in the light of what has happened to the pound, that we are going to have to do something about the secondary reserve currency as we call it, 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 think that the American people are not 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, Congress Mills, and me. All the rest of them, they had more fun voting against taxes but every now and then you have to vote for them. We had to vote on the Atwater-Kent in World War II, and we are going to have to vote for them now.

Representative Boogs. Already. As a member of the Financial Institutions Subcommittee, I know that the President comes out and tells us in February it is an $8 billion deficit and I'm terrible things are going to happen. Well, I don't think that is going to happen. We won't have one is something that I think that the American people are not 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, Congress Mills, and me. All the rest of them, they had more fun voting against taxes but every now and then you have to vote for them. We had to vote on the Atwater-Kent in World War II, and we are going to have to vote for them now.
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history here. Senator, I was on the committee and was a member of the House back in the beginning of the war in Korea.

Senator MORRISON. Yes.

Representative BOOCS. 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, but it wasn't passed. It wasn't at all.

II tax schedule and the House had actually passed a tax reduction bill, both in individual income and corporation 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.

Senator MORRISON. And that changed the whole picture.

Representative BOOCS. 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 was 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.

Senator MORRISON. I would like to pose a question which is really more about the more that prevail in this building than it is about the way we do things. The Secretary of the Treasury 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 Congress, one of the 15 members on the Ways and Means Committee vote out a tax bill. We had taken a look at the World War II tax schedule and the House had actually passed a tax bill. We had a lot of fun and some grief among the House, were against putting it over in the Senate, were against raising the debt ceiling and raising the excise taxes. Between the time that 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 tremendous.

Senator MORRISON. But they were against setting up a new categorical aid program.

Representative BOOCS. Sorry, Mel, I won't—

Senator MORRISON. But they were against setting up a new categorical aid program.

Representative BOOCS. Sorry, Senator Morton. The Department of Housing and Home Finance under the Public Health Service in HEW. We wanted to use—

Representative BOOCS. You know, it really makes me laugh to say that the Republicans are never for anything the first time.

Representative BOOCS. Well, we are not for the categorical aid approach on any of these programs today.

Senator MORRISON. Mr. de Grajia, Senator Morton—I would like to pose this question to each of you. He certainly did mention that there was no agonizing reappraisal of the poverty program.

Senator MORRISON. No.

Mr. de Grajia. Senator Morton, and I wonder whether the Congress actually has the machinery for making such an appraisal.

Senator MORRISON. Yes, I think Congress definitely has.

Mr. de Grajia. 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 Senator Muskie went back to the 1st Session, beginning of this long debate. The Secretary of Housing and I had high hopes—I personally think that our whole welfare programs, all of them, need reevaluation. I must 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 those who are productive members of society. Many of us had very serious misgivings about the social security bill, the housing program, the rural housing program 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, that we are going at this thing the wrong way, and the next Congress, whether they are—next session of this Congress or the next Congress, whether things are going to be any better. It 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 our country.

Senator MUSKIN. I would like to make a comment.

Representative BOOCS. I would like to make one too, when you get through.

Senator MUSKIN. 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 under consideration, is the wrong way to do it and until we find the right way to do it we are not going to get support.

Mr. de Grajia. Yet they don't come up with the means for finding the right way. Is that right, Senator?

Senator MUSKIN. Well, they offer suggestion from time to time, but that, as Congressman Laird distinctly said tonight, not being in the majority, he disclaims responsibility for getting the votes necessary to carry any legislation through. If you do not have responsible action and I am all for getting the best idea that we can, but when you deal with problems of this magnitude, such as cities and the like, 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 Boos. 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 take them seriously?

Representative Boos. Let's go on a little further there, Senator. The Education bill which we passed today, which we find today, represents our educational education for all practical purposes is a new program. For the first time we passed this program a joint of 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 doing.

Senator Muskie. And pollution.

Representative Boos. And pollution—to the problems of the cities. I want to go on one program, the Security thing.

Representative Lamm. Then I would like to break in.

Representative Boos. 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 100,000 people now on welfare will be trained for gainful employment within the next two years.

Senator Morton. Mothers of one or two-year-olds.

Professor Peabody. Can I break in here a minute?

Representative Lamm. I would like to rebut sometimes these four categorical aid programs that were brought up because we have a better way.

Mr. Niven. Professor Peabody tries to set you up for that.

Professor Peabody. Just a minute. Professor, I think we will be pretty hard when professors and politicians are on the same program.

Professor Peabody. Equal time.

Mr. Lamm. The question I have is this. It seems to me that 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 grant, and I wonder 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 don't think that question very much because that really is the alternative. That is a better way to do things than the way of categorical aid approach.

Senator Muskie. May I say that we authorized $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 I am not going to discuss it.

Mr. Laird. It is $100 million and the President asked for that. There is $5 billion—

Senator Muskie. We gave every penny that the President asked for.

Mr. Laird. The Rent program. Which was $203 million.

Mr. Laird. Senat­

Senator Muskie. We gave you a chance to go up another twenty-three and you didn't.

Mr. Laird. Forty.

Senator Muskie. 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—

Professor Peabody. Please.

Mr. Laird. That is why we need another approach of a massive nature.

Mr. Niven. I would like to listen to—

Mr. Laird. The trouble here is—

Mr. Niven. We are in our last five minutes and I would like to move along to a last question. That 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. That, to me, seems very much like the image that you all appear to be trying to sell in your districts but collectively Congress is kind of a whipping boy. It is, you know, mis­

Mr. Niven. Gentlemen, particularly, but not too many of them seem to understand what goes on in the House.

Mr. Peabody. Let me just read this quote:—

"It is Representative Johnson's statement 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, a proposal of the next session. The device which will probably cost $20,000 to install is intended to apply to only two roll calls of the House."

This is John Matthews, the News and Notes in the New York, Professor Peabody. It is very important, really. It seems to me that the Senate, Paul Niven particularly, but not too many of them seem to understand what goes on in the House.
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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 Eden you will 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 to continue and aggravate 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 8 of the 10 free world flag ships arriving in North Vietnam this past month were flying the British flag. When related to events recently transpiring in both South Vietnam and Korea it appears to me that the time has come to urge the British with greater force to stop renting their flag in support of those too few the British flag. Just this morning I received a letter his widow wrote.

In this, and an identical resolution, 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.

Because of this dangerous situation—the President has suggested a number of means—both legislative and voluntary—for diminishing the flow of dollars abroad—and thus materially reverse the present trend. All Americans should be concerned about our worsening balance-of-payments situation and seek to find ways and means of correcting it.

In this vein, on January 19, I wrote to the Secretary of Commerce pointing out that an important factor in the outflow of American dollars since World War II has been the foreign construction of land and water vessels and the related purchase 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 ocean-going vessels have been built 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 accounts 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. Indeed, as 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 question we are today is intended to emphasize that a nation's shipping services is an export commodity—and thus American patronage of American ships for travel and the transportation of goods can make a significant contribution to the reduction of our balance-of-payments deficit. The American merchant marine we have today is capable of carrying enough goods and people to eliminate the balance-of-payments problem singlehanded. To do that we must rebuild and expand our operating fleet.

But if all who travel or ship will bear in mind the contribution they can make in the national welfare by patronizing ships flying the U.S. flag to the fullest extent possible, I believe major improvements can be made in this serious problem affecting our national economy will be felt immediately.

I hope that early action can be taken on this concurrent resolution and that, when, as I have reported to the floor, I will have overwhelming support from the Congress.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

Mr. Speaker, is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress should vote for this all-party, non-controversial 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 93 percent 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 can be doubled. Think of how that payments scale would begin to balance if we tripled or quadrupled that carriage figure. American ships should be carrying at least 50 percent of our import-export trade today to keep in step with the fleets of other nations.

The 100-percent subsidized Russian merchant fleet is being used to preserve 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 fastest, safest, most luxurious liners afloat? To aid our balance-of-payments dilemma, Americans should patronize our passenger ships that visit port cities around the globe. America has the world's safest, fastest, and most luxurious passenger ships. A number of our 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.

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 by day.

Only trained expert economists have the knowledge and understanding to analyze this problem in its entirety and make appropriate recommendations. The questions posed 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, in a November 29, 1959, article not only laid out that current proposals and efforts to solve the international payments problem cannot succeed until the Federal budget deficit is reduced. Both these distinguished gentlemen, who are experts in their fields, have said, in effect, what some of us have said here, and I quote: If the financial house is not put in order by cutting down excessive monetary growth and by reducing 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 observe.

They believe that "higher taxes could not be avoided now, even if Government expenditures were cut to the maximum extent politically feasible."

They are also of the opinion that it is no longer possible to provide guns and butter at the rate of which expenditures for both have been rising, and that checking inflation is the 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. These learned gentlemen suggest, the benefits from restricting direct foreign investment can only be temporary, no matter how long the controls are maintained.

Since the investment controls fall on every foreign nation, 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 conditions 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
some times have in the past, in releasing deflationary forces in the economy.

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 matters, and to include extraneous matters, and to include extraneous matters, and to include extraneous matters, and to include extraneous matters, and to include extraneous matters.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial of February 6 entitled "Problems for Travelers," the Cleveland 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 hardworking American's drain of U.S. dollars to countries outside the western hemisphere. To this end, Secretary of the Treasury Henry Fowler proposes to levy a 5% tax on all purchases abroad, a tax which is 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 5% tax on purchases. He proposes to reduce the duty-free limit on foreign purchases from $100 to $10 and to eliminate the duty exception 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 $18 a day.
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Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I have an article that appeared in the February 5, 1968, issue of the Washington Evening Star, an account by Mr. Robert Walters, Star staff writer, about the efforts of the Office of Economic Opportunity to draft guidelines to put to effect the so-called Green amendments to the recent new authorization of the Economic Opportunity Act.

This article suggests that the Green amendments to the authorization were designed to appease the Administration, 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 citizens.

The Federal effort would be negated. This is an affront to the intelligence of all of us. It 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 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 confronting them in their respective cities and counties. They are honorable people; they are compassionate people; and they welcome the opportunity to have the legal weapons available to them to meet some of the problems confronting them in their official capacities.

Let us stop this business of always doubting the motive of one who comes from a particular section of the country. It is not too soon to recognize that theills we are seeking to treat with the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act afflict all sections of America and that it is the responsibility of all Americans from every section to join hands and do what can be done to eliminate the causes of these troubles.

CONGRESSIONAL LLOYD MEED'S 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 gas, tear gas, tear gas launchers, chemical fire extinguishers and a siren so loud its wail can stun rioters.

Purse is one answer to controlling riots. Unfortunately, what 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 country 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," "White power" and "White power" rabblerousers can only inflame passions at the expense of cool-headed and creative action.

Congressman Lloyd Meeds has few or no Negro constituents. His is hardly the kind of situation that would result in low-quality education in ghetto schools.

Mr. Speaker, 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 the clock." We are not talking about the kind of situation that would result in low-quality education in ghetto schools.

Inequality of opportunity hits the Negro child early and dogs him for a lifetime. It shouldn't be surprising that he rarely gets that base.

We must understand these basic differences 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 predominantly white schools than in predominately Negro schools. These students are segregated and the result is a reading level that is far below the grade for which results in low-quality education in ghetto schools.

Mr. 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 the clock." We are not talking about the kind of situation that would result in low-quality education in ghetto schools.

Inequality of opportunity hits the Negro child early and dogs him for a lifetime. His very home is a reminder of that inequality. Over 30% of the Negroes in this country live in substandard housing, and evict any tenant who dares to complain. The responsibility is 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 ghettoes must be willing to try the new approaches developed and implemented.

Jobs

The number one priority is Jobs. A Community of breadwinners earning decent wages is not a community likely to explode. For the ghettoes can be turned into the cornerstone of a new way of life.

Manpower development and training.—This is one of the most successful of all the manpower programs. It must be expanded and strengthened.

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.

Teacher Corps.—A promising program that provides technical training teams into the ghettoes and enables schools to supplement both faculty and program, has been badly mauled by Congress. It needs to be augmented and fully funded.

On-the-job training.—This is one of the most successful of all the manpower programs. It must be expanded and strengthened.

Massive rebuilding programs must be undertaken to replace, repair or rehabilitate great rotting sections of our cities.

Housing

The core cities and ghettos of this nation are clogged with smoke, soot, garbage and great rotting sections of our cities, the crowded tenements are shameful as is the blight of our cities and the educational background that qualifies him for a good job, is one less person who will go into the labor market with trainable skills. Tax credits and other incentives may be necessary to stimulate greater business involvement.

Eliminate racial barriers.—If a man can’t find a job, the greatest problem he faces is the racism that is insidious, and can well be expected to hold him down. The Negro must pull himself up by his bootstraps. The Negro must prove himself. He must be willing to make his own way. He must participate if he is to make his way. He must participate in the plan whereupon, said Chandler:

The TRANSIENTS (Mr. NEMO) 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 of this 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 committee to investigate the action. The resolution was taken on the resolution for the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee. Mr. EMANUEL CELLES, 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—of a series of resolutions and letters 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.

Candlier's testimony was given before the Judicial Council of the 10th Circuit Court, sitting in Wichita, Kans., on April 23, 1962, after Chandler had been disbarred by the Kansas Bar Association and had been for nearly 4 years—ignored and gathering dust in the files of the U.S. Supreme Court—of a series of resolutions and letters of the allegations in this sordid case.

The SPEAKER (Mr. NEMO). 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 of this 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 committee to investigate the action. The resolution was taken on the resolution for the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee. Mr. EMANUEL CELLES, 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—of a series of resolutions and letters 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.

Candlier's testimony was given before the Judicial Council of the 10th Circuit Court, sitting in Wichita, Kans., on April 23, 1962, after Chandler had been disbarred by the Kansas Bar Association and had been for nearly 4 years—ignored and gathering dust in the files of the U.S. Supreme Court—of a series of resolutions and letters of the allegations in this sordid case.
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 act aside an order of the Court. The refused, Murrath then said, according to Chandler:

Well every other judge of the circuit does what I tell them to, do I 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, who disqualified Chandler as 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 delinquency that was assumed for 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. Baskin) 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, Murrath, and Bohanon. In these remarks, Mr. Brooks said, and I quote him in part:

"The problems before the subcommittee were brought to the floor of Congress as a result of a case 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 been disqualified from office, or has this 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." 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 Supreme Court, Mr. Brooks quotes the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. Cellar, 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 the 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 v. 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?
3. What was the 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. J. GROSS.

Member of Congress, Washington, D.G.

My Dear Congressman Gross: Sometimes 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 in such a manner as to make it impossible 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, and he was personally demeaned. It must have been very frustrating to find that, as 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 respect 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 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 these charges—that it is a travesty in the name of the courts and justice in this country.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to yield to my friend from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from Iowa yielding, I certainly appreciate him bringing this sad story of our judiciary 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 tendency to the separation of the powers.

As the gentleman from Iowa will recall, on February 1, I inserted an article on page 1863 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the 1-minute rule, entitled "The Privilege of Congress to Remap the Political Districts of the State of Missouri," and captioned it, "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 "Reprieve 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 other things to show you that I have pointed 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
ruler 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 of the equal and coequal branches of Government. There is no question about the authority of the State legislature to redress the wrongs done and the duties required, but there is no question about rule XI of our own House of Representatives which says:

All proposed legislation, messages, petitions, and other matters relative to the subject listed under the standing committees named below shall be referred to such committees respectively—(12) the Committee on the Judiciary, subheading h, 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 Legislature, and this House of Representatives so easily and arbitrarily on the one hand, yet avers it will respect the congressional legislation precluding elections at large in the 91st and 92d Congress.

I do not ask 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. However, the report is the latter if the special session of the Missouri General Assembly does not act in time for filing or under a stay which once 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 peacemaking, 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 Stewart, and the jobs were filled by the Governor, and the people were satisfied and the candidates were filing, when this issue 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 Governor, 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 case of these Federal judges, and who apparently hesitate 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 judges—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 fact that such a number of judges to be appointed by a Democratic President. Similarly, during the past two Congresses, we Democrats, then in power in the Legislative branch, did not like creating judgeships to be filled by a Republican President.

On one occasion I said, rather facetiously, that the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary—we Democrats do not like putting Democratic eggs under a 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 find the phrase under the heading of "Essential Conduct":

A judge should be temperate, attentive, patient, impartial, and since he is to address himself 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, communications, or solicitation of payments 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 politics, he will not be 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 promoter or opponent 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, through, courteous, patient, just, and the performance of his judicial office, regardless of public praise, indifferent to private political or partisan influences; he should not allow other affairs or his private interests to interfere with the prompt and proper performance of judicial duties. He should 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 oversight against the legislative process and branch that we know to be a coequal branch of the Government. In fact, we are asked to give direction and, perhaps, in many cases find and establish the principles of the separation of powers, but beyond all of the urgency of the judicial image which we have been told from childhood at home we should respect, and the lack of surveillance in the review of duly constituted authority, it is my opinion that a very sorry state of affairs has developed in view of all of the foregoing. I think the U.S. citizens are fed up with it and blame political bureaucracy for failure of our courts to back up our constitutional rights.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Iowa for bringing up this timely and erstwhile matter. Some of us are here to influence and in the 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 judicial image was probably the most important that he has made, and that is the growing lack of respect for the courts of this country, a thing that we badly need. The case that I have spoken of is one, but it seems to me a very sad and sordid case, but only one of a half dozen others that cry for attention in this country, cases that involve the Federal judiciary.

Mr. HALL. I certainly agree with the gentleman, if he would yield further, but I want to make it crystal clear and reemphasize the fact that we are defending 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 and certainly agree with the gentleman, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution.
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 had seen many changes in the Army—from Indian fighting on the western plains to jungle warfare in the Philippines and later to the bloody battles for trenches in France. Just before America entered World War I in April 1917, he was promoted to second lieutenant and assigned to the 26th Infantry, then a regiment of light infantry fighting in rapid order. Hines became a company commander, then a battalion commander, and later a regimental commander.

When the United States entered the war, Pershing, as commander of the American Expeditionary Forces, began a campaign in the West, with the 16th Infantry, located west of Soissons, when liaison had been established between the 16th Infantry and 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 commands in the United States, including the command of the Philippine Department. 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 was used to the rigors of active service and was not in harmony with 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 life of the army, so when war broke out, he was called back 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 efficiency were so marked that loyally 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, the 16th Infantry, under the command of General Hines, joined in the 1st Division, rose, continuously, to the further battle command of brigade, division, and corps, displaying and directing. America—Hines—"He is able, efficient, conscientious, and loyal, all to a superlative degree. Command in battle from regiment to corps in World War I 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, one of the 1 on list of general officers known to me."

In 1924 General Hines succeeded General Pershing, on his recommendations, as Chief of Staff, a position he served as from 1924 until his retirement in 1932, at the age of 64. Hines then traveled extensively and later settled in Washington, D.C. He served his country in the post-mid nineteenth century American Expeditionary Forces. A five-month period of this service, during which he was promoted again, was spent in Co-
General Hines’ desired way of life. Basically a field soldier, a troop commander, an out- door man, a man 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 in the ways of Washington. It was the political overtones at the seat of government. So, when his years on the War Department came to an end, 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, for in the year of his retirement was spent in his boyhood home of White Sulphur Springs.


The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLINT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, February 7, 1968, an occurrence took place in the board of education in the county of Fayette, Georgia. It is a case concerning possibly the appropriateness 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, some addresses, and some dates in this context, in order to make 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 7–5, 1967, when on December 13, 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. Martin 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 Bowser, the superintendent of schools of Fayette County, Ga.

On December 29, 1967, Mr. A. Eugene Bowser addressed a letter to Mrs. Ruby G. Martin outlining apparent conflicts between the plan written on successive days by Mrs. Martin and by Mr. Henderson. This letter from Mr. Bowser 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. Bowser’s letter dated December 29, 1967.

January 26, 1968, Mrs. Ruby G. Martin addressed a letter to Mr. Bowser stating that in her opinion an impasse had been reached and that it would be necessary to issue a notice of deferral. Mrs. Martin attached to her letter—a January 31, 1968—addressed to me, as follows:

Upon receipt of the letter of January 26, 1968, Mr. Bowser 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 at 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 the 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, Mr. Martin addressed a letter to 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. Martin was that Mrs. Martin had accepted such extension, and that she replied that she would be glad to grant an extension until February 15. Whereupon I asked her to notify Mr. Bowers immediately and she did. The letter from Mr. Bowers to Mrs. Martin dated January 31, 1968, and Mrs. Martin’s reply dated February 2, 1968, are as follows:

Mrs. Ruby G. Martin, Director, Operations Division, Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 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, February 15. The Board approves the plan we will forward same to you by February 15, 1968.

We hereby request delay in any further action. Mr. Bowser has granted the extension requested, and at which time we would have the opportunity to review the plan submitted for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A. Eugene Bowser, Superintendent, Fayette County Schools.
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. We were told 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 hereofore granted based upon "concrete" evidence which they had received. The 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 February 15, 1968 in initiation of Title VI enforcement action by this Department was not made in good faith.

Therefore, we have asked our general counsel to initiate enforcement action against Fayette County Schools 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.

Sincerely, A. Eugene Bowens, 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 $12,000.00 and for additional allocations in Title I funds for this term of approximately $5,000.

Sincerely, A. Eugene Bowens, Superintendent, Fayette County Schools.

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 meet his obligations to the universe and the 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 funds are to be used.

The application 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 since his statements 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.

We had a further conversation and I discussed this in my office on yesterday, February 7, 1968, for approximately 2 hours.

Upon my arrival in my office on yester-
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Wrapped up in the six-foot frame of John Cardinal Krol, 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 am not here to shrug my responsibility," the 57-year-old cardinal told me recently during a day I spent with him in his appointed rounds in his adopted city.

The former Cleveland priest and auxiliary bishop believes not all he does for the 1.3 million Catholics in Cleveland is popular. Nothing a leader does meets with unanimous consent and Cardinal Krol is as human as any 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. But he has been revered by thousands 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 U.S.

Because of this concern, the National Conference of Christians and Jews will honor the cardinal next Sunday night with its 1968 National Award for Goodwill toward the Jew. In the Ecumenical movement both nationally and internationally; his efforts in the Ecumenical movement both nationally and internationally; his efforts in Africa, Latin America; the rights of labor; his work in bettering race relations in America; his labors on behalf of nationality groups, his missionary endeavors among American Indians, his work with 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 is to receive next Thursday, Feb. 14, is but the latest in a long roll of awards which have been presented to the cardinal from the Catholic and non-Catholic worlds. He has been presented with nine awards by the National Catholic Churches, seven awards by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, one award by the United Nations, the Order of Francis of Assisi of the Philippines, the Order of the Lily of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Order of the Holy Cross of the Austrian government, the Order of the Holy Sepulchre of the Polish government, the Golden Key of the Institute of Mass Communication and the Order of St. Nutzsche of the United States, Archbishop Amleto Cicognani, now the Vatican's secretary of state, told me recently during a day in downtown Philadelphia.

His spirits were buoyed by the news that the Vatican had recently told him that he would be implicated in the development of the new church for Philadelphia. The old Cathedral Basilica was burned in the 1967 riots in the city, and it is now being rebuilt.

"I wish I could spare the time for slow travel, it's always meetings, meetings, meetings. My life is a series of meetings," Cardinal Krol said.

"That's all I can do. It's a busy man indeed."

When he entered the seminary he carried a machinist.

"The far-reaching consequences of Vatican II are still being felt in all areas of church life. Shape those programs that will yield a church for the future. I sometimes tell people that although I have no choice in it, I don't have to do it; if I don't like it, I don't have to do it."

Cardinal Krol is a man of his word. He doesn't have to get up in front of us and ask us. He could have sent those plans to the cardinal from the Catholic and non-Catholic worlds. He has been presented with nine awards by the National Catholic Churches, seven awards by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, one award by the United Nations, the Order of Francis of Assisi of the Philippines, the Order of the Holy Cross of the Austrian government, the Order of the Holy Sepulchre of the Polish government, the Golden Key of the Institute of Mass Communication and the Order of St. Nutzsche of the United States, Archbishop Amleto Cicognani, now the Vatican's secretary of state, told me recently during a day in downtown Philadelphia.

A spokesman for the cardinal's office said: "I wish I could spare the time for slow travel, it's always meetings, meetings, meetings. My life is a series of meetings."

"The cardinal's office is in one of the high-ceiling rooms in the house. He runs 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. My life is a series of meetings."

Cardinal Krol thrives on those meetings. It gives him a chance to meet more people and to explain his church to them.}

When he entered the seminary he carried a machinist.

"The far-reaching consequences of Vatican II are still being felt in all areas of church life. Shape those programs that will yield a church for the future. I sometimes tell people that although I have no choice in it, I don't have to do it; if I don't like it, I don't have to do it."

Cardinal Krol is a man of his word. He doesn't have to get up in front of us and ask us. He could have sent those plans to the cardinal from the Catholic and non-Catholic worlds. He has been presented with nine awards by the National Catholic Churches, seven awards by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, one award by the United Nations, the Order of Francis of Assisi of the Philippines, the Order of the Holy Cross of the Austrian government, the Order of the Holy Sepulchre of the Polish government, the Golden Key of the Institute of Mass Communication and the Order of St. Nutzsche of the United States, Archbishop Amleto Cicognani, now the Vatican's secretary of state, told me recently during a day in downtown Philadelphia.

A spokesman for the cardinal's office said: "I wish I could spare the time for slow travel. It's always meetings, meetings, meetings. My life is a series of meetings."

"The cardinal's office is in one of the high-ceiling rooms in the house. He runs 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. My life is a series of meetings."

Cardinal Krol thrives on those meetings. It gives him a chance to meet more people and to explain his church to them.
call the Vietnam war immoral, because they lack a Roman Catholic who doesn't know all the facts that are involved although I have been to briefings with Secretary of State Kiss and have direct information from Vietnam. Bishop Corson is a Roman Catholic Relief Services there for 17 years. You have 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 to see the hierarchy as a sort of cloistered set."

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Halfpern] 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 proposed in the Senate by Senator 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 particular plan for many years does not have to forfeit his pension rights because of some "small print" in the contract; that is recognized for 15 minutes.

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 portability fund, providing a central clearinghouse of pension credits for persons transferring from one employer to another.

Fourth, establish a special trust 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 the same Justice Department approval.

Seventh, consolidate in the Commission most existing Federal regulatory standards relating to pension and welfare plans, thereby relieving employers, labor 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 that 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, now is the time that this bill is the answer to that need. 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 adoption of a universal clearinghouse 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."

Mr. 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. HICKS. 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 by 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 of our country. Government agencies 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 ineffective.

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 our Nation's security.

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 their resources and channel their concern into constructive action.

One of the Johnson administration's failures to provide Americans with this much-needed leadership. No program can fill a leadership gap.

Republicans welcome the President's pledge taken by the government 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 the need to deal with the challenge. His proposed program is much like a prize fighter with dazzling foot work, but no punch.

I am concerned that an analysis will show that the President has given the Nation a political document and not a much-needed plan for national action. The President must first recognize the facts, and substantially reduced. The Republican Party is committed to solving this problem which each year grows as a deepening crisis. While the Johnson administration is to be commended, 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 in the last Congress, 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 antiriot legislation in this and previous Congresses.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday he repeated to me that the President's 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.

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 was passed, was opposed by the other body where it died that year. I think the date upon which the bill was debated is significant. That date was July 10, 1967. And, in order to demonstrate that the President's 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, July 19, 1967, page 4332.

The distinguished Attorney General on "Mr. Speaker, yesterday," said, "Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I had an opportunity to read the President's message and I have such a Republican orientation. The immunity legislation which the President recommended is not the 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 Governor 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 prisons. It is that legislation.

And, as all will recall the legislation, after it was passed, was opposed by the other body where it died that year. I think the date upon which the bill was debated is significant. That date was July 10, 1967. And, in order to demonstrate that the President's 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, July 19, 1967, page 4332.

The distinguished Attorney General on "Mr. Speaker, yesterday," said, "Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I had an opportunity to read the President's message and I have such a Republican orientation. The immunity legislation which the President recommended is not the 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 Governor 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 prisons. It is that legislation.
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Mr. Speaker, if I may continue for just a moment, while I say it might be pre­
ma tious to make an analysis of certain proposals in the President's message, it would be appropriate to take note of some of the omissions in the President's message.

I fear the Republican task force on crime proposed a series of bills and endor­
sed other bills in the general law en­forcement area to most of which the President made no reference. I ask imman­
cise -a bill which makes it a federal crime to invest money which has been earned from illegal racket activities in legitimate business.

This is the Criminal Activities Profits Act (H.R. 11266, co-sponsored by the Task Force), and principally aimed at organized crime.

8. Joint Congressional Committee on Or­
organized Crime—a bill creating a permanent bi-partisan Committee of both Houses of Congress to combat organized crime and report its extent, impact and effect to the American public. This is H.R. 6054, first pro­

II. INVESTIGATION AND PRELIMINARY PROCEDURES

1. Motion to suppress—a bill creating in the Government a limited right to appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States

2. Witness immunity—a bill to expand the power of the Government to compel the testi­mony of witnesses. It is contained in Title II of the Criminal Procedures Revision Act (H.R. 11267, co-sponsored by the Task Force).

II. THE POLICE

1. Survivorship and disability benefits—a proposal to provide Federal survivorship and disability benefits for local police and non­
federal agents who either die in the line of duty or are killed or injured while assisting federal of­
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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 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. Popoff. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGregor. Mr. Speaker. I would like to subscribe to and endorse the most excellent summary made by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, regarding the law enforcement and criminal justice assistance act passed by the House of Representatives in August of last year. I am sure the gentleman joins 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 institutionalities.

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 $800 million will be asked to commence a sweeping action program.

It was with great disappointment that I found the President in his state of the Union message, and again in his crime message, reiterating from $300 million to $100 million in his recommended support of the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act for its second year. 

Mr. Popoff. I thank the gentleman for his most meaningful contribution.

Mr. Gerald R. Ford. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Gerald R. Ford. Let me say 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 that crime bill. This endorsement by 49 out of our 50 Governors should insure the support of the administration for this legislation.

Mr. Popoff. The gentleman has anticipated my speech and it is infinitely more eloquently than I could.

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

Mr. Popoff. 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 Bister of Pennsylvania, Republican Congressman Hans B. Basker, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McClosky), 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. Popoff. 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, 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 out there, something which the President’s task force has been working hard on, 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, 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 of 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. Popoff. 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 made loan sharking a Federal crime was added to the truth-in-lending bill.

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. Popoff. 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. Popoff. 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 and 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 all, regardless of party, regardless of our particular concerns in this field.

I yield to the gentleman'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 pressure on us and that we should address this 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, 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, if the Senate will cooperate.

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 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 so that it's not a nefarious concern.

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 parts of our Government.

I know the Republican task force on crime will indicate its efforts and its best determination, and it has to be fought by all sides of our political system, by all political parties.

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 House, the Senate, 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 we do not have more time to do the work that should be done 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 the 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 function 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.

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 inaction 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. We would like 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 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 great, the urgency imposed by the delay 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 millions of dollars of 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 part of the bill. I am encouraged to hope that 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.

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. Simil­larly, the Administration's proposed formula would impose criminal penalties upon persons traveling in, or using the facilities of, interstate commerce with the intent to incite a riot, was also passed by the House.

Unfortunately, this essential legislation was not adopted by the Senate during the first session. We are hopeful that, with the new-found interest and support of the President, this legislation will be enacted into law without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record at this point the House Republican policy committee statements of July 12, 1967, and August 2, 1967, that deal with this important legislation. As chairman of the policy committee, I believe that these statements carefully set forth the need for this legislation and the reasons we urge its early enactment. The statements referred to follow:

HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON THE ANTIRiot LEGISLATION, H.R. 421, JULY 12, 1967

The House Republican Policy Committee urges the immediate 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 a Federal criminal antiriot law and order in the streets and urban centers of our land, Republican antiriot legislation was adopted in the House of Representatives as an amendment to the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966, by a vote of 389 to 25. That legislation was permitted to die in the Senate. Now, as a result of continuing pressure and leadership by Republican Members, this vital legislation is being brought to the House Republican floor for enactment.

The proposed legislation represents the legitimate exercise of Federal criminal power under authority based on the commerce clause. Of course, certain types of conduct have been prohibited by Federal Statute when the facilities of interstate commerce are used. For example, there is a statute which prohibits 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 participate in public gatherings or other lawful uses of facilities can be assisted in keeping the peace and protecting the public safety.

This bill would supplement, not supersedee local law enforcement. Certainly by now we have demonstrated the effective means of riot control rests with the State and local police. However, by assuring Federal jurisdiction over "out-of-State" incidents, State, Sub-State, and local agencies will be substantially assisted in keeping the peace and protecting the public safety.

H.R. 421 provides 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 trace to troublemakers who travel about this Nation inciting riots. It is imperative that we rid interstate commerce of these aggressors and riot-mongers. The law-abiding citizens in the area where the riots occur may suffer grievous personal injury and un­told damage when the rioters overreach this additional protection is afforded them.

The House Republican Policy Committee urges the immediate enactment of H.R. 5037, August 2, 1967.

The events of recent weeks have starkly driven home the need for effective law enforcement in this country. The very ability of government to maintain law and order and to provide personal safety has been challenged. Local police programs and criminal justice techniques of correction and rehabilitation must be updated and improved.

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 is true many suggestions have been made so that a state has a plan for an appropriately balanced distribution of aid funds. The Attorney General should have the final power and responsibility for coordinating the Federal and state programs. Certainly, experience under the poverty program has demonstrated that failure to coordinate Federal actions 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 is true many suggestions have been made so that a state has a plan for an appropriately balanced distribution of aid funds. The Attorney General should have the final power and responsibility for coordinating the Federal and state programs. Certainly, experience under the poverty program has demonstrated that failure to coordinate Federal actions with state activities creates serious financial and administrative problems."

We support an amendment of this type. We believe it will provide the 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 the exercise of his discretion to determine the population size that would be most appropriate for participation in the light of all considerations relevant to the programs." We believe that an appropriate allocation formula should be adopted. In the present bill, 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
The President desires controls on the hallucinatory drug LSD—a measure first suggested by my Republican colleague from Nebraska [Mr. Connelly].

The President also asks for riot control legislation—legislation which my Republican colleague from Florida [Mr. Ciccolini] 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 the same 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 record.

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 in 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 are a rehash of the administration's past proposals. Careful scrutiny of the President's February 7 message reveals the full texts of the messages between the Pueblo and higher U.S. authority? A very small part of Pueblo's misfortunes, 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 been an exercise in self-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 South China Sea; flight 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 were the case?
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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 rest 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 thrift institutions, 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 relationship and compatibility 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”, which I directed to be placed in the Record, by order of the House on February 8, 1968.

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, do incorporate in their organizational 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 supervision, and fingerprinting, and other 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 the report, which, on the part of the supervisory agencies, be submitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for further examination.

4. That the supervisory agencies consider making it a requirement that the institutions they supervise that fingerprints of prospective officers, directors, and employees of such institutions be submitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for clearance.

5. That the supervisory agencies establish an interagency committee for the purpose of making a coordinated effort to lessen bank crimes through the collection and analysis of bank crime statistics and the study and development of methods of preventing such crimes; and to assist banking institutions toward greater security against such crimes by undertaking national crime prevention projects as may be deemed advisable, including the requirements, from the security standpoint, of a model institution, and the testing and evaluation of such models.

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, de novo insurance, branch offices, or any other application requiring an investigation.

7. That the supervisory agencies impress on the directors of the institutions they supervise the collective responsibility of the board of directors and the 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 are providing to guard against robberies and burglaries. In many instances they 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 all-time high of 1,871. Figures recently made available by the Federal Bureau of Investigation indicate that the total reached 2,551 in 1967—reflecting approximately a 30-percent increase.

The dollar amounts stolen from victimized banks are staggering. Data compiled by the American Bankers Association show that losses to federally insured banks, alone, resulting from robberies committed from January through June 1967, totaled $3.3 million, compared with $1.3 million in the same 6-month period of 1966. Additionally, losses were suffered due to burglaries.

These statistics do not reflect the cost of investigating these crimes by law enforcement agencies.

As our report pointed out, of even greater concern are the dollar losses, the peril to human lives that armed world elements from taking over the banking institutions.

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, do incorporate in their organizational 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 supervision, and fingerprinting, and other 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 the report, which, on the part of the supervisory agencies, be submitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for further examination.

4. That the supervisory agencies consider making it a requirement that the institutions they supervise that fingerprints of prospective officers, directors, and employees of such institutions be submitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for clearance.

5. That the supervisory agencies establish an interagency committee for the purpose of making a coordinated effort to lessen bank crimes through the collection and analysis of bank crime statistics and the study and development of methods of preventing such crimes; and to assist banking institutions toward greater security against such crimes by undertaking national crime prevention projects as may be deemed advisable, including the requirements, from the security standpoint, of a model institution, and the testing and evaluation of such models.

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, de novo insurance, branch offices, or any other application requiring an investigation.

7. That the supervisory agencies impress on the directors of the institutions they supervise the collective responsibility of the board of directors and the 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 are providing to guard against robberies and burglaries. In many instances they 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 all-time high of 1,871. Figures recently made available by the Federal Bureau of Investigation indicate that the total reached 2,551 in 1967—reflecting approximately a 30-percent increase.

The dollar amounts stolen from victimized banks are staggering. Data compiled by the American Bankers Association show that losses to federally insured banks, alone, resulting from robberies committed from January through June 1967, totaled $3.3 million, compared with $1.3 million in the same 6-month period of 1966. Additionally, losses were suffered due to burglaries.

These statistics do not reflect the cost of investigating these crimes by law enforcement agencies.

As our report pointed out, of even greater concern are the dollar losses, the peril to human lives that armed world elements from taking over the banking institutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the rest of the gentleman from Florida?
Although size and air pollution do not necessarily coincide, New York City has the most powerful concentration of major cities 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 happen.

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 grants.

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 an end to sulfur fumes. It scoffed at the city's laws 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 Federal Government has confirmed the facts of my testimony before the Conference about its failures.

A new city law, local law 14, had required upgrading of incinerators in large apartment buildings by May 20, 1967. In testimony on February 1, 1968, the New York City commissioner of air pollution control, Austin N. Heiber, confirmed that the administration's own ruling that buildings constructed before 1951 would not have to upgrade incinerators "was the final 'cop de grace' to the law.

Although city law required an end to open burning by May 20, 1967, Commissioner Heiber admitted 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 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 particular polluters in the area. On February 1, 1968, the Conference released a list of 144 point sources emitting more than 100 tons of particulate matter per year. The point source report reveals that New York City's municipal incinerators produce 17,223 tons per year of particulate matter. On the basis of a 6-day week this is 83.6 tons per day. The figure used in my testimony, which was obtained from the New York City Department of Air Pollution Control, was 15,000 tons per year. This is probably worse than the city's own estimate.

I asked the Conference to require that New York City-

- Immediately develop a workable automatic emergency plan to prevent the next pollution disaster.

Comply immediately with the 1967 Conference recommendations for the sulfur content of fuels.

Set requirements that those who burn coal and fuel oil use fuel which generates less particulate matter or install adequate control and collection equipment.

Enforce the ban on open burning.

Immediately enforce upgrading or shut down 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.

Immediately make actual use of granted Federal funds.

I urged the Conference to require New Jersey to comply immediately with last year's Conference recommendations for the sulfur content of coal.

I pointed out that the use of coal should be reduced because of its particulate-producing effects.

I called upon the Conference to make specific recommendations to deal with the dangerous problem of particles which are smaller than 5 microns.

I urged the Conference to prepare a comprehensive legislative 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 preceding 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 ALUMNIT HALL, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 30, 1968

This Second Session of the Interstate Air Pollution Abatement Conference is investigating particular 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 sulfur dioxide pollution was an old one. We know its costs and its damage to health and property. We have the power, the funds and the knowledge to better deal with it.

"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 for strict controls in only a few cases, frequently 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 iniquitous, broken promises, and shocking failures. Over the past 10 years the Administration has given a demonstration of the worst administration of air pollution control efforts of any major city in America. Air pollution in New York City has been uncontrolled by the Public Service Commission, the Mayor, the 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 on 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. The Administration has played a comedy on enforcing the law governing apartment building incinerators 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 law.

In the remainder of the New York City area, we are paying $8 billion a dollar a year for pollution damage.

New York City itself estimates each person spends $65 extra per year because of air pollution. According to the City, polluted air is costing the families in Manhattan $650 a year, a family in Brooklyn and Queens $730 and the families in Staten Island $350 a year.

In air pollution we are now paying many millions of dollars extra per year because of air pollution. One estimate puts the cost at $80 per person or from $11 to $12 billion a year. Yet for around $3 billion we could stop most of these disasters.

To put it another way, in New York City we face atmospheric disasters more than we would have to pay for the clean air we want.

In air pollution needs no description. It kills us slowly. Air pollution in its effects on health... sets up pathological conditions--the xenodermic diseases--arouses untold numbers of cases of 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 1948 the death rates of emphysema have increased 100 per cent.

Air pollution also contributes to lung cancer, which now taxes 50,000 lives a year. Despite plans and promises, it has taken very few steps to demand clean air. And to tell you there's no excuse. Clean air is achievable. Air pollution control is a major power plant fuel and continues to contribute to the sulfur dioxide pollution. Through power-plant use, sulfur-rich fuels are burned by power plants to generate electricity and by domestic and commercial purposes. They are burned by power plants to generate electricity and by domestic and commercial purposes. They are burned by power plants to generate electricity and by domestic and commercial purposes. They are burned by power plants to generate electricity and by domestic and commercial purposes. They are burned by power plants to generate electricity and by domestic and commercial purposes. They are burned by power plants to generate electricity and by domestic and commercial purposes.

We are all familiar with the historic air pollution disasters--the Meuse River Valley (0.85) and the Donora, Pennsylvania, disaster of 1948; and disasters in New York City in 1953, 1955, and 1966, which killed hundreds and at times murder thousands.

As I have warned many times in the past, in New York City we face atmospheric invasions which will concentrate the slowly accumulating sulfur pollution in a few hours or days, and murder hundreds or even thousands.

As well as injuring our health, air pollution contributes to bronchitis and emphysema, which now take 50,000 lives a year. The Conference found that our air is continuously more polluted by sulfur dioxide pollution. The Conference found that our air is continuously more polluted by sulfur dioxide pollution. The Conference found that our air is continuously more polluted by sulfur dioxide pollution. They are burned by power plants to generate electricity and by domestic and commercial purposes. They are burned by power plants to generate electricity and by domestic and commercial purposes.

As a result of the Conference recommendations, the Administration has formally and publicly made the following declaration to all of us. I quote to you a part of it: "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 'nothing to it'... 'I know, but it's cheaper than dirty air.'"

You know, the major heel-dragging polluters who pull a price tag on clean air are the Consolidated Edison, the New York City Administration. In their own words, they must be told there is no excuse. Clean air is a cheap price to pay. No one need sacrifice anything to have clean air.

Conference Recommendations

On January 19, 1967, the first session of this Conference, as provided by law, made seven major recommendations. These recommendations are related to rule 200.

The Conference recommendation 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 bravest of all air pollution depicted in Hell.
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The Conference recommendation 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 bravest of all air pollution depicted in Hell.
declared its intention to "cooperate with Federal, State, and local officials in every way to attain the goal of clean air for New York." Chairman Charles F. Luce formally supported the move.

By last December, Con Edison had switched to fuel oil of one percent sulfur. By April, 1968, it was operating on fuel oil containing one-quarter percent sulfur. It was expected to meet the one percent standard.

As a past critic of Con Edison's failures in air pollution control, it is a pleasure to comment on its progress, but it is also a warning to everyone that it is not a significant accomplishment. Con Edison's actions alone prove the soundness of the Conference approach.

However, in the fight against sulfur oxides in New York City, the Public Service Commission has taken its stand with the polluters and against clean air.

Neither New York's Local Law 14 nor proposed addenda 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 2.3 percent sulfur. On May 20, 1967, it was limited to 2 percent and on May 20, 1971, to 1 percent. Under the proposed amendment to Local Law 14, oil would be limited to one-half percent and Number 4 oil to 1.75 percent sulfur. On May 20, 1969, Number 4 oil would be limited to 1.6 percent and on May 20, 1972, Number 4 oil would be limited to 1 percent.)

Studies have shown that the worst reduced concentrations of sulfur oxides in the heart of Manhattan, around the 121st Street air pollution sampling station. At the first session of this Conference, William H. Magee, Director of the National Center for Air Pollution Control, said that the maximum sulfur dioxide concentrations at the 121st Street station were used, which experts have stated would not necessitate a mandatory 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 its network of air pollution monitoring stations to report on rising pollution.

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 disaster.

The Federal Weather Bureau warns localities of inversions and the threat of air pollution disasters. New York City has publicized its 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 against 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 disasters in New York. It may threaten the lives of hundreds or thousands. We will be warned of its approach. Yet New York City has neither an automatic warning system nor a workable emergency plan that would stave off the disaster—no workable plan to stop polluters before pollution reaches the danger and death-dealing densities.

This is worse than shocking. This is criminal.

For the sake of the health and life of the citizens of New York City, the Conference must require that the metropolitan area, and particularly New York City, immediately develop a workable warning system and an emergency plan to prevent the next pollution disaster.

New York State has moved to comply with Conference recommendations. Con Edison 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.

NO WORKABLE EMERGENCY PLAN

With present levels of sulfur dioxide, carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide and particulate pollution, New York City still faces the threat of an air pollution disaster. New York has not held 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 now has sulfur dioxide episodes greater than 802 ppm. In one-half of the years an episode will occur in September or October and one-third of the episodes will persist through January. The increased 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, 1965. I pointed out that the inversion was substantially the same as that which we have faced. As 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 disaster."

The Federal Weather Bureau warns localities of inversions and the threat of air pollution disasters. New York City has publicized its 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 against 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 disasters in New York. It may threaten the lives of hundreds or thousands. We will be warned of its approach. Yet New York City has neither an automatic warning system nor a workable emergency plan that would stave off the disaster—no workable plan to stop polluters before pollution reaches the danger and death-dealing densities.

This is worse than shocking. This is criminal.

For the sake of the health and life of the citizens of New York City, the Conference must require that the metropolitan area, and particularly New York City, immediately develop a workable warning system and an emergency plan to prevent the next pollution disaster.

New York State has moved to comply with Conference recommendations. Con Edison 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.
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17-county metropolitan area, for air pollution damage. Much of this expenditure is for the removal of settled particles from buildings (commercial and residential), clothing, household effects and 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 90,000 tons more than the amount reported in 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 percent. Motor vehicles contribute 14 percent, per cent, industrial processes 10 percent, and aircraft and shipping less than one percent.

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 month, 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 from the Service's report that has pinpointed some 137 major sources of particulate pollution, each of which generates more than one percent of the total.

These sources include 26 steam-electric power plants, 73 industrial sites (fuel, process, incineration combined), 21 municipal incinerators, and 7 miscellaneous coal-burning operations.

These 137 point sources contribute 49 percent of the total particulate emissions in the area. Industrial point sources generate 38,800 tons of particulate pollution, or one third of the area total.

Power plant point sources contribute 17 percent of the total particulate (38,900 tons), and the 31 point source municipal incinerators emit 18,000 tons of particulate, or 3.2 percent of the total.

I ask that this Conference make public a list of those point sources of sulfur dioxide 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 percent of our heat, but more than twice as much of our ash. Coal burning contributes about 10 percent of the particulate pollution. Fuel oil contributes something like 21 percent of the particulate matter; natural gas less than 3 percent.

In stationary combustion, power plants and industrial sources are major sources.

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 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, the New York Telephone Company last April asked the California Water Pollution Control Board for a pre-emptor automatic solid mass spectrometer to be used at the New Haven's Greenhouse Plant.

In stationary combustion, however, the largest source of particulates is the burning of coal and fuel oil for residential heating. This burning contributes 22.5 percent of the total particulates generated in New York City.

The term 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 that leaves particulate matter or install adequate control and collection equipment. These requirements may cover both power plants and heating units.

Inclusion

In New York City, incineration continues to be a major source of particulate pollution. 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 a major source of particulates. New York City is moving to install scrubbers and retrofits to reduce incineration emissions, and none of the municipal incinerators are up to the current state-of-the-art emission standards.

The Conference released a list showing who is poisoning us and how much.

Not only is the Administration not enforcing its own law, it is itself violating the law and in some instances even encouraging landlords to violate the law.

In 1966, the Housing Authority issued 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, 1969.

Upgrading of the incinerators would require two types of proven, available equipment--combustion chambers to raise burning temperatures to at least 1,400 degrees for minimal efficient burning and a scrubber to trap solid particles before they pour into the atmosphere.

Commissioner Heller estimated the average cost of the upgrading would be $7,000 per incinerator.

The Administration has gone through a series of contradictory statements, retractions, and inter-Administration arguments.

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 2,600 incinerators by May 20, 1967.

On May 21, 1967, Commissioner Heller made a public tour of the Authority's Robert Fulton Houses, which had been using upgraded incinerators for three years.

Then apparently the Housing Authority had second thoughts--upgraded. Although the City had estimated it would cost $7,000 to upgrade each incinerator, the Authority said it would cost $19,000 per incinerator or a total of $23 million.

As of yesterday, the New York City Housing Authority had completed only 158 installations. It has worked on combustion devices for less than ½ (or only 305) of the 1,169 incinerators. It has one third (or 343) scrubbers, on test, one third (or 343) scrubbers. Thus, the Housing Authority incinerators continue in violation of the Air Pollution Code and Local Law 14.

Apparently, it has done nothing about the 1,407 incinerators that must be upgraded by May 20, 1967.

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 who 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 laze and delay in the upgrading of the incinerators, both from the financial ability and all the information they need to meet this deadline."

And he added: "Every incinerator that does not have a valid certificate of operation will be served a notice that within five days the incinerator will be shut." But on May 20th, when the law went into effect, the Administration jumped several days, and failed to do anything.

Up until 1961 some apartments constructed in New York City were built with incinerators and some without incinerators. In 1951 the City passed Local Law 14 prohibiting new apartment houses to be built with incinerators. This fact gave the Administration its loophole.

When the new law took effect, Commissioner Heller ruled that owners of large buildings built with incinerators before 1961 would not necessarily have to abide by the law. They could choose whether to upgrade their incinerators or to shut them down. The Administration said yes--and I quote the New York Times of August 5, 1967--"to make them even with pre-1961 owners who had selected garbage removal in their buildings."

But on May 21, after the law went into effect, Commissioner Heller permitted them to remain. He said the law was the law, but had not considered the fact that closing incinerators would mean more garbage on the street and more work for the Sanitation Department.

At the same time, however, the Commissioner said 75 inspectors would check more than 17,000 buildings for violations within five days, inspectors would seal incinerators. Landlords would be fined $25 and billed for additional garbage collection.

This Administration, whatever the 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 incinicators be installed in apartment houses. Theoretically, that Code was to take effect after all incinicators had been upgraded.

The Commissioner had assured the Housing Authority that the same Administration as the Air Pollution Control and Sanitation Commissioners, promptly ruled that because of the new Code none could be inspected.

Then the Sanitation Department jumped in and pointed out that, if all incinerators were upgraded, they 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 disposing of garbage by burning.

The Sanitation Commissioner pointed out that all this was predicated on his getting 800 new collection trucks to haul away the garbage. He said that 400 trucks were contracted for at $11.6 million for 800 new trucks.

The New York City Administration and others have introduced amendments to Local Law 14 on incinerators. The Administration proposes three alternatives: upgrading, burning all gas, and to follow a Federal Government规定.

Robert Low introduced an amendment which would require all landors by May 20, 1968, to either upgrade or to install compaction 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 proceeded with burning of timbers from pier and other projects.

Staten Island threatened to sue to enforce the law, but 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 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 18,000 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 ever since. Bag filters were invented in 1938 and have been used. Precipitators and bag filters can handle the additional refuse. 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 spokesman for the present Administration pledged immediate action to bring municipal incineration within the law. On June 23, 1965, John V. Lindsay, Candidate for Mayor, said, "The City should put its own house in order the first day it sits down to operate." Early in 1965, 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 control pollution if it acts today, and promptly to reduce the film, smoke and poisons produced by the incinerators in its own backyard." The Task Force reported the City must, "First, install effective air-pollution equipment on its incinerators or it must find other methods for disposal of garbage and refuse." 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. 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 Administration failed to produce a prototype on schedule. And finally 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. But on January 1, 1967, the Federal government had granted the full amount requested, $218,400 in Federal funds to be matched by $272,900 of city funds. Under the grant the first year funded was scheduled for completion December 31, 1967. The Federal government scheduled a second year of support for $140,750.

Leisurely, the Administration went out looking for a contractor, hired Arthur D. Little Company, then apparently found Little was not interested. In New York City the hook-up with another engineering firm which was licensed, and the whole year was gone.

On December 26, 1967, the City Administration spent $72,900 out of the amount 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-1968, but, for the present, may go right on burning. A Federal grant, a pilot model will be in operation at one city incinerator within six months. The information derived from this pilot study will provide a firm basis for the selection of an efficient and economical device to control all particulate emissions for 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 normally happens in the Department. It may also be subject to 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 placed on order 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 a new type of scrubber device in its East 73rd Street bunker."

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 measurement of modern standards. Precipitators, for example, were invented in 1912, have proven themselves. Everything that is in place of the City is obsolete by any standard. And it's going to be that way for another eight years."

In 1965 the Sanitation Department reported the South Bronx Plant was scheduled for completion in 1968. The Sanitation Department estimated the plant will be in operation 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 take immediate action 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, coal is not a problem. For the citizen, clean air is cheaper. It will cost less than dirty air.

CONCLUSION

I ask this Conference to require immediate action by the New York Administration, including the actual use of granted Federal funds; immediate initiation of a workable plan of action for emergencies; upgrading or closing all apartment incinerators; and immediate compliance with last year's Conference recommendations for the sulfur content of fuels.

In addition, the Conference should require New York to comply immediately with last year's Conference recommendations for the sulfur content of coal. Moreover, the use of coal should be reduced because of its particulate-producing effect.

This Conference should require the City Administration to 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 pollution rises.

Finally, the Conference should remain in continuous session, and regular reports should be submitted. The Conference proved during the past year that it is a crucial vehicle for air pollution abatement in the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area. If it is kept open, and if it is not 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:

PARTICULATE EMISSIONS INVENTORY

(By Robert T. Walsh)

My name is Robert T. Walsh. I am a chemical engineer. My position with the Public Health Service is Project Director of the New York-New Jersey Abatement Activity. I will discuss the particulate emissions inventory.

During our recent study, sources of particulate matter air pollution in the 17 counties were located and quantified using the best available information. Personnel of state and local agencies as well as the Public Health Service were involved in the investigation. Much of the information was supplied by industrial and commercial establishments and by governmental agencies.

The 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 access to these data, I want to limit 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 plane. 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 processors, smelters, and other equipment emitting particulate matter.

These visible particulates include some smoke and soot from the incomplete combustion of fuels and solid waste. The smoke resulting from the burning of coal or oil is not combustible — coal ash, metallic foundry fume, rock dust, sulfuric acid mist and petroleum catalyst dust to name a few. These particulates are inventoried and confirmed by aerial observations. Black smoke — indicating carbonaceous particulates — is observed in the outer counties but relatively minor in the inner counties. Some 47,000 tons of particulate pollution are generated in each area, the four major sources of particulate pollution in each area, outer New York counties, Rockland, Nassau, Westchester, and in New Jersey. Most of the particulate pollution is about half of the quantity attributed to bituminous coal.

The rest 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, utilities 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 emergencies, 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 particulate discharges from power plants during 1967 which is not reflected in the 1966 inventory.

Most of the bituminous coal not consumed as fuel is burned in boilers by farmers in New York 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 the same grade of boilers burning oil. Oil-fired boilers discharge about five times more particulate per ton of coal than do power plants.

When burning fuel oil, boilers are some four times greater than natural gas. Fuel oil burning is responsible for about 95,000 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 efficiencies 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 this. The key factor is technology.

Industrial processes account for approximately 16% of the particulate matter discharged by the area. Many of these processes are point sources, especially in the Hudson River, Arthur Kill, and the Arthur Kill. Many of the isolated point sources in New York State are municipal incinerators and small power plants in heavily populated areas of New York. The New Jersey, the sources tend to be industrial processes and coal burning boilers.

For purposes of the emissions inventory, the area was divided into 97 zones based on census tract boundaries and other grid systems. Aggregate emissions of point sources and area sources were calculated for each of the 97 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 per day.

In this map, we see that point sources are generally limited to areas having high population concentrations in New York City, Newark, and Hudson County. Also, we can see a clustering along major waterways; the Hudson River, Arthur Kill, Raritan Bay and the Arthur Kill. Many of the isolated point sources in New York State are municipal incinerators. In heavily populated areas of New York, the New Jersey, the sources tend to be industrial processes and coal burning boilers.

For purposes of the emissions inventory, the area was divided into 97 zones based on census tract boundaries and other grid systems. Aggregate emissions of point sources and area sources were calculated for each of the 97 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 per day.

In this map, we see that point sources are generally limited to areas having high population concentrations in New York City, Newark, and Hudson County. Also, we can see a clustering along major waterways; the Hudson River, Arthur Kill, Raritan Bay and the Arthur Kill. Many of the isolated point sources in New York State are municipal incinerators. In heavily populated areas of New York, the New Jersey, the sources tend to be industrial processes and coal burning boilers.
is required, almost twice the average quantity of particulate is dumped into our atmosphere. All particulate matter pollution is not the same either in human interest or the ability to remain airborne. For this reason, we find that particulate is greater than 44 microns in diameter. The rest is smaller than 44 microns, in which case generally termed "suspended." Much of the latter eventually settles to the ground but its settling velocity is quite low. Much of the latter eventually settles to the ground but its settling velocity is quite low. 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 compiled 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 suburban areas. 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 8, 1968.**

**New York-New Jersey Air Pollution Abatement**

**Concentrating Sources Emission More Than 100 Tons/Year of Particulate Matter—1966 Estimate**

The 144 point sources tabulated in the attached table are estimated to emit at least 100 tons of particulate matter pollution per year. They are located throughout the 17 county area encompassed by the air pollution abatement activity. Together, they discharge over 119,000 tons of particulate annually.

![Table of estimated particulate emissions](image)

![Table of estimated particulate emissions](image)

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.
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Estimated particulate emissions (tons per year)—Continued

RICHMOND COUNTY (STATEN ISLAND) (5)—Contd.

Nassau Smelting & Refining Co. 110
Sea View Hospital 651
U.S. Gypsum Co. 684

Richmond County total 2,783

NEW YORK COUNTY (MANHATTAN) (12)—Contd.

Bellevue Hospital 628
Consolidated Edison Co., 69th Street plant 1,051
Consolidated Edison Co., 74th Street plant 1,105
Consolidated Edison Co., Con Ed River plant 3,211
Consolidated Edison Co., Kips Bay plant 435
Consolidated Edison Co., Co., 70th Street plant 1,106
Consolidated Edison Co., Waterside plant 2,771
Incinerator, East 73rd Street 1,239
Incinerator, Gansevoort Street 1,666
Incinerator, West 56th Street plant 1,578
Incinerator, West 216th Street 1,629
New York City asphalt batch plant 214

New York County total 16,653

QUEENS COUNTY (6)—Contd.

Consolidated Edison Co., Astoria 3,988
Consolidated Edison Co., Raritan wood 1,881
Incinerator, Betsu Avenue 1,542
Incinerator, Freshing 909
Long Island Lighting Co., Far Rockaway 151
Phelps-Dodge Refining Corp. 140
Queens County total 8,609

NASSAU COUNTY (14)—Contd.

Gunnman Aircraft Engineering Corp., Bethpage 968
Incinerator, city of Glen Cove 146
Incinerator, city of Long Beach 117
Incinerator, Garden City 960
Incinerator, Merrick 960
Incinerator, New Hyde Park 360
Incinerator, Oceanside 750
Incinerator, Hicksville 948
Incinerator, town of Oyster Bay, plant No. 1 800
Incinerator, village of Hempstead 232
Incinerator, village of Hempstead 131
Incinerator, valley of Valley Stream 112
Long Island Lighting Co., Baytown 1,220
Long Island Lighting Co., Glenwood 304
Nassau County total 6,515

ROCKLAND COUNTY (9)—Contd.

Incinerator, town of Ramapo 144
Lediees Laboratories, Pearl River 597
Letchworth Village, Haverstraw 208
New York Trap Rock Corp., West Nyack 165
Orange and Rockland Utilities, Inc., Loomis Plant 3,543
Orangeburg Manufacturing Co., Orangeburg 371
Rock Industries, Tomkins Cove 1,146
Rock Industries, Tomkins Cove 1,133
Rockland Material Corp., Suffern 699
U.S. Gypsum Co., Stony Point 258

Rockland County total 9,266

WESTCHESTER COUNTY (12)—Contd.

Consolidated Edison Co., Indian Point 103
FDR Veterans Administration Hospital, Indian Point Annex 129
Incinerator, city of White Plains 238
Incinerator, Mount Vernon 150

Fuel change will result in 1968 emissions below 100 T.T.P.

*Emissions total being reviewed.

A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Racocon 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 privilege to visit with a colleague from the State of Michigan Congressman MARVIN L. ESCR. We were comparing notes as to the citizen reaction concerning the Pueblo incident and recognize that we both have been in our districts recently.

At that time, Congressman Escr 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 be interested in the opportunity to see it. I am certain that we will hold even greater interest in the reply that Congressman Escr receives in response to his 14 key questions on what he has called "a crisis of confidence in the administration's handling of foreign policy."

Congressman Escr's complete letter to the President follows:

The President,

Mr. Speaker: 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 citizens 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 contemporaneous 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 broadly reflecting the gravity of the activity and strength of the widespread enemy attacks in South Vietnam. To this date, neither the Defense Department nor the State Department 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 delineated 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 Administration's secret information, not possible that you present your answers to Members of the appropriate committees in this Congress.

1. Was the Pueblo in international waters when she was seized? Had she previously intruded into territorial waters? There was direct conflict in the U.S. position between the first statement by Ambassador Goldber and the United Nations that she had been "intercepted" on Korean territorial waters and the subsequent doubts raised by Mr. Rus, and Mr. McNamaru on August 4th. If the Pueblo was relicted 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. Have been 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 the incident? Did contingency plans made to handle a renewal of hostilities in Korea?

3. There have been seemingly contradictory statements by Ambassador Goldber and Secretary Rus regarding the nature and frequency of communications between the Pueblo and American sources and during the capture. What was the exact nature of those communications from the first approach of the North Korean vessels until the docking at Wonsan Harbor?

4. It has also been charged that high government officials with decision making power have not been informed until the capture was a fait 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. Would provisions made to destroy sensitive equipment? Have any efforts been made to prevent the North Korean government from salvaging operations at the site of the seizure or have we attempted to salvage the equipment ourselves—both to protect the secrecy it may contain and to prove the location of the seizure?

6. Is there any concrete evidence to connect the Pueblo incident with the greatest Vietnamese 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. Do you envision any changes in policy regarding the protection and armaments and deployment of other intelligence ships?

8. There are also important questions regarding the stepped up Communist activity in South Vietnam, the Viet-Cong capture of a number of provincial capitals, and the apparent escalation of the Phase III process to maintain the stability of South Vietnam.

9. To what degree does this current crisis in both Vietnam and 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 Vietnamese are skilled and accurate?
men in Vietnam who have consistently maintained that the casualty figures were actual.  

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 proved an indecent and American conscience. In what way are we working with the South Vietnamese government to demand that the Geneva Convention articles 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 Vietnam.  

13. Reports of widespread corruption, extensive blackmarket dealings and failure of the people to declare income are needed to be rectified. There is also deep concern about the failure of the Thieu government to consider both the economic situation and the extensive practice of South Vietnamese young men avoiding military duty by bribing their way out of their obligations. Have we given our assistance 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 of 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 is not brought about the beginning of the end of the 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 freedom to spell out their own destiny, then sure Nationalism, surely our defense of that independence is in vain. If our government cannot communicate to the rest of the world and its people, then surely our troops serve in vain. Such a crisis demands an answer. I await your answer.  

Respectfully, 

MARVIN L. EICHEN, Member of Congress.  

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES  

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks made in the Record of February 8, 1968, in the Record of February 8, 1968, in the Record of February 8, 1968, in the Record of February 8, 1968, in the Record of February 8, 1968.

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 asked the Congress to consider his proposals for Federal expenditures for the coming year. As has been the case in the past few years, the proposed expenditures of the national defense and for the war in Vietnam are the largest category. Forty-three cents out of every dollar proposed to be spent in the coming fiscal year are to 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.  

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that 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 individuals and taxable taxpayers in that 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 must never overwhelm and enthusiastically 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 cost of living. 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 stimulates continues even today, and it is expected that this prosperity alone, with no increases in tax rates, will produce an additional $1.11 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.  

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 realize 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 may fall behind, or well ahead of, the amount of money being spent in succeeding years. In regular appropriation bills for this fiscal year, Congress reduced appropriations below the President's budget by $8.5 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 an average of $58 billion in proposed expenditures for the current fiscal year.  

It must, of necessity, follow that reductions and postponements in Federal expenditures will be made at 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 $30,000. This program was designed to help states and communities 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 reduced, postponed, or perhaps even eliminated.  

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has suggested that Congress consider a Government Program Evaluation Commission, 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 has the responsibility to develop effective, intelligent, and expensive guidelines for expenditure control. I think that the work of a Government Program Evaluation Commission as a result of the resolutions and I have cosponsored legislation 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.  

Mr. Speaker, 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 waste of the largest portion of 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. GIBSONs. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 1, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Gibbons), was honored at a civic dinner in Tampa. The House, of course, knows that Sam Gibbons is just 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 sequel to the gentleman to share extraneous matter.

I believe the House will be interested in the Secretary's remarks on this occasion and I include the text thereof:

REMARKS ST JOHN W. GARDNER, SECRETARY OF
EDUCATION AND LABOR, introcuced at a civic dinner
February 8, 1968

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 for us. I have seen the dedication of his soul and affection of his fellow Members of Congress and of the Executive Branch.

So I am honored 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 was evil, cruel, lazy or corrupt, the consequences were inevitably bad.

In free societies we don't have kings. We have representatives of the people. But the consequences of bad governing are unchanged. If the American people refuse to face the problems of the age and if they neglect their responsibility, 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 it is the crucial way that the people must exhibit wisdom in selecting their representatives.

Mr. GIBSONs 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 be the leaders. You have the problems confronting the nation today.

My present job has given me a close-up view of the domestic issues facing this Nation. And I think of these issues, and about some of the things we're doing, in and out of government, to cope with these.

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 competence 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 victory for those who have fought?

It doesn't require the instincts of a reformer or the eye of a muckraker to detect social ills. 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 manifestations of conflict. All it requires is to observe the bitterness of racial conflict, to sense the mood of the people.

Despite our knowledge, these 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 some­ one 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 that we cannot escape them. The second step is to recognize that the problems are exceedingly complex. Anyone who tells you that there are simple answers to them is lying. There are no simple answers.

There are no easy victories.

Having admitted that the problems are real, and complicated, and complex, we must then face the fact that they cannot be solved by hatred or rage or cynicism or by any of us. They will yield only to unceasing effort by people who have the stability and steadfastness of purpose to tackle our toughest social problems head-on.

Millions of Americans are engaged in that work today—and the man we are honoring tonight is one of those so engaged. The din of controversy has all but obscured the constructive efforts of such people, and I want to say a word about those efforts.

My job has enabled me to see a side of our national life that gives one hope for the future. That is the innate human desire to do things for others.

Some time ago, when I was manager of the Education Board of Greenwich, Connecticut, I had a patient who was suffering from a variety of ailments. He was a small boy who had a bad foot injury. When the wound did not heal properly, amputation of the foot was recommended. The boy, with great courage, decided that he would have his foot amputated above the knee. When the wound was healed he was fitted with his first artificial leg. The doctor walked 15 feet with him in the room and said "Now, walk!" The boy hesitated and then came forward. With each step he gained new confidence. As he returned to his seat the doctor said "Boy, you 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 a tragic accident. This boy's leg was amputated above the knee. When the wound was healed he was fitted with his first artificial limb. The doctor walked 15 feet with him in the room and said "Now, walk!" The boy hesitated and then came forward. With each step he gained new confidence. As he returned to his seat the doctor said "Boy, you 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 a tragic accident. This boy's leg was amputated above the knee. When the wound was healed he was fitted with his first artificial limb. The doctor walked 15 feet with him in the room and said "Now, walk!" The boy hesitated and then came forward. With each step he gained new confidence. As he returned to his seat the doctor said "Boy, you 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.
CONTROVERSY IN DISTRICT OF CO-
LUMBIA POLICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. NELSEN. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently a good deal of attention has been given to what ap-
peared to be a controversy within the Police Department of the District of Co-
lorbia. This has disturbed many Mem-
bers of Congress. It is of grave concern now that we cannot overlook. The Federal
City law-enforcement officials should be of best and in all cases harmony should prevail in order that the Federal Inter-
est 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 in-
sert these 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 De-
partment's job of combating the District's appallaihing crime rate.

The city's need for help has been rea-
sured 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 Murray, Chief Layton and Assistant Chief Jerry V. Wilson, in his new role as head of Field Operations.

Our three top public safety officials are to-
tgether 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 by the Public Safety, Patrick V. Murphy, and Chief of Police John B. Layton.

The appointment of Jerry V. Wilson as As-
Assistant Chief for Field Operations in no man-
ner diminishes the authority and functions
of the Chief of Police, John B. Layton. Chief Layton continues as the operating head of the Metropolitan Police Department.

Assistant Chief of Police Howard V. Covell continues in his present position in the Department, Executive Officer.

Assistant Chief Wilson has filled one of the four Assistant Chief positions and will be responsible for the four major func-
tions of the Department.

The Director of Public Safety, Patrick V. Murphy, is responsible for policy formulation and program development in the Police De-
artment, as well as in the Fire Department and Office of Civil Defense, the three agen-
cies which comprise the Public Safety De-
partment. The selection of the position of Director of Public Safety has strengthened and facilitated police planning and operations in 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 ap-
pointment. I would not have accepted this position if I did not consider Chief Layton an able, experienced and capable police chief. He has been of great assistance in familiarizing me with the operations of the Police Department. We have worked closely together in the development of the Department for the future. I look for-
ward to a continuing fruitful working rela-
tionship between myself and the Mayor's
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 Metropo-
litan Police Department and the accom-
dishments 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 reor-
organize and retool our City Government.

In this connection, my role as operating head of the Department was made clear by Mayor Washington on the appointment of Public Safety Commissioner W. A. Boyle of the Mine Workers of America made an important and chal-
genous speech in which he said:

"The government-subsidized atomic power program is a threat to the survival 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 Continentals from West Vir-

Michael H. 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, W. A. Boyle of the United Mine Workers of America made an important and chal-
genous speech in which he said:

"The government-subsidized atomic power program is a threat to the survival and the health of all Americans. It should be stopped.
of dangerous, poisonous, radioactive civilian atomic powerplants.

Mr. Speaker, along with some 25 other Members, I have joined the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] in introducing a joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 889, to create a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the Government's civilian nuclear program. I have also called 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 23, plus 13 more in the planning stage. In the light of these figures there is an urgent need, Mr. Speaker, for an early review of this program as provided in the joint resolution.

EXCISE TAX ON ELECTRIC ENERGY PRODUCED WITH NUCLEAR POWER

Mr. Saylor. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks 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 [Mr. Saylor]?

MR. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on page 81 of Mr. Speaker's white paper entitled "Fuel Policy" published last November is this paragraph:

As regards the Atomic Energy Authority's required fixed capital expenditure, the royalty at the rate of 0.14d. per kwh to be paid by the generating Boards to the Atomic Energy Authority under present nuclear power programmes has rested primarily on the assumption that they will show a cost advantage over alternative methods of generation. This royalty will not recover any part of the cost of the development of the Magnum and AOS systems, but it is expected to cover, in all, all forward available 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 gone 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 electrical energy produced in this country's nuclear powerplants.

The tax rate of 0.14d 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 householder using power from nuclear reactors would be less than 76 cents a year. Actually, with the Federal Government subsidizing a high percentage of the limited liability insurance coverage on atomic plants, the utility companies themselves should absorb the tax at no additional charge whatsoever to home owners.

By contributing less than one and one-half tenths of a mill per kilowatt-hour on electric power that comes from atom plants, the private utilities enjoying the consequences of research subsidized by the Federal Government will still be far in arrears with the advent of the 21st century, particularly if an additional $2 billion is to be taken from the U.S. Treasury for development of a breeder reactor as envisioned by the AEC. Nevertheless, the British tax plan is a step in the right direction and should be welcome here in an era of dangerously unbalanced budgets.

H.R. 15199 reads as follows:

H.R. 15199

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 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 in respect of any electrical energy produced in nuclear powerplants and sold by the producer thereof for domestic or commercial consumption a tax equivalent to 0.14d. 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. Does the gentleman from Florida object 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 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 and Senate representatives and the situation is changed. Congress, in short got some balance has been restored in the American party in both the Senate and the House, I viewed it and give you my assessment of it.

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 spending and the dis­astrous effects of inflation which massive Federal spending and huge red ink de­icits 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 request 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 Demo­crats in the House 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 the record will be accurate and true.

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 power from the Federal Government to 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 define one main object and our accomplishment. But some of our failures may have been as important to the country as our successes. For, although on occasion we may have been voted down, we have pointed out why. We have shown what our party stands for and what we believe and must be done.

In many respects, this year has been a year of education for the American people. We have tried to make it clear what we believe 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 out why. We have shown what our party stands for and what we believe and must be done.

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 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 on forms for the 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 existing foreign aid programs; their relationship to 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 those 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 would be limited to the ongoing activities of the Agency for International Development. Further, the committee would be directed to consider the extent of its assignment.

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 really all about. It is premature to state that the goal of mankind has been achieved. It is premature to say that the world's problems are simply problems of population control. It is premature to say that the world's woes have been solved. It is premature to say that the world's mists are settled. 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 really all about. It is premature to state that the goal of mankind has been achieved. It is premature to say that the world's problems are simply problems of population control. It is premature to say that the world's woes have been solved. It is premature to say that the world's mists are settled. 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 are probably in as much need of anything we can do for them as they were in the mid-1940's. In other words, the world's needs have not been met and the world's problems have not been met. What is needed now is a major rethinking about the whole aid effort.

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. Scozz) in the other body, on January 25, 1968. The resolution authorizes 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 revaluation of foreign aid with a view toward 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 existing foreign aid programs; their relationship to 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 those 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 would be limited to the ongoing activities of the Agency for International Development. Further, the committee would be directed to consider such basic and important factors as: the nature and objectives of existing foreign aid programs; their relationship to 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 those by which existing foreign aid programs might be improved to insure their efficient, economical, and effective administration and operation.

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. What is popular support there is 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 support can only 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 popularly delineated are vague 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; and to reduce interest rates to the world's miseries. What is needed now is a major rethinking about the whole aid effort.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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 beginning, but 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.

Mr. Speaker, this 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 beginning, but 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.

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 the meaningful and productive 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.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

Mr. Speaker, I urge full and careful consideration of each of these points with a view to waywardness and providing incentive to those who have given such service to their country.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT

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 implementation of reforms which it would enact, will go a long way toward the rebuilding of that respect and confidence.

Mr. Speaker, I submit here an informal comparison of section 1103 and 164 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, S. 355, and other similar bills. This
material contains a careful explanation of what is involved in the relevant sections of the bill and I think it merits our careful attention.

SECTION 103 (A) "a", PUBLIC NOTICE OF OPEN HEARINGS; BROADCASTING OF HEARINGS

S. 355—Requires each standing committee (except Appropriations) to give public notice of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing 5 days in advance of the day of the hearing, and S. 355 begins unless the committee determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing at an earlier date.

Bolling—Provision deleted. Reid—Same as S. 355. Print No. 3—Same provision as S. 355. Original language of bill provided for two weeks' advance, but Senate amended original report (page 11): "2. 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. 55—See Congressional Record, volume 113, part 5, page 32924.

SECTION 103 (A) "b", OPEN HEARINGS; BROADCASTING OF HEARINGS

S. 355—Requires committees of hearings (except Appropriations) to open the public unless determined that, for any other urgent reason, such hearings should not be open to the public. Further, S. 355 also requires 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 explanation of bill. S. 355 makes an exception when the witness appears before the committee in the presence of national security, may tend to reflect adversely on the character or reputation of any witness appearing before the committee, by record vote of a majority of the members of the committee, or in the event that the committee finds good cause for the failure to file such a statement. The staff shall prepare digest of such statements for the use of committee members.

See Senate Amendment No. 54, Congressional Record, volume 113, part 5, pages 3224-3225.

SEC. 103 (A) "d", SUMMARIES OF DAILY TESTIMONY

S. 355—Provides that upon conclusion of a hearing, the chairman of the committee, staff shall prepare summary of that day's testimony for use by committee members. (Summaries may be printed in committee hearings as above.) S. 355 requires that open hearings may be broadcast and telecast. Original language conformed to mandatory language of Final Report recommendation (page 11), as follows: "11. Each committee shall require all witnesses appearing before it to file, at least 3 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. 55, Congressional Record, volume 113, part 5, pages 3224-3225.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraterritorial. 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 George 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 selective service commission has said, for example, that there has been no leveling off in the number of draft classifications for next year, for example, that the selective service commission, for example, 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 an occupational course 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 has been empowered by the President 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 call was made last year to 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 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 for all boards which 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.

Mr. Speaker: The Petition is in. 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 uncertainties of modern life call for more foreign travel, not less.

At the same time, however, the large U.S. payments deficit caused by foreign travel may compromise our international economic position. Because there were many public officials 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 in light of such 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 countries which depend on tourism from the United States for a substantial part of their income. The net result could be an even larger payments deficit than we now have.

In the hope of avoiding the necessity for restrictive legislation, I am introducing today a bill that would accomplish the same results by encouraging more Americans and 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 facilities 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 UST S Travel budget to $15 million, including $10 million to promote foreign travel to the 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 standards.”

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, since stranded 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. 15325

A bill to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote travel in the United States and for other purposes.

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 sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following sentence:

That it is the purpose of this Act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States and to promote the 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 foreign travel policy with respect to domestic travel;

(2) develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program designed to encourage travel to and within the United States for purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities associated with the diffusion of knowledge and understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and the United States;

(3) encourage the development of tourist facilities in, near, and around United States and other countries to meet the probable distribution of the benefits of travel at the cheapest rates between foreign countries and the United States, and in the United States consistent with sound economic principles;

(4) encourage the simplification, reduction, or elimination of barriers to travel, and the facilitation of travel to and within the United States generally;

(5) establish, publish, and provide for the exchange of statistics and technical information, including schedules of meetings, fairs, and other attractions, relating to travel and tourism; and

(7) establish an office to be known as the Office of Travel Program Coordination, which shall assist the Secretary in carrying out his responsibilities under this Act for the purpose of (A) achieving maximum coordination of the programs of the various departments and agencies of the United States Government to promote the purposes of this Act, (B) consulting with appropriate officers and agencies of the United States, and with private organizations and agencies, with respect to programs undertaken pursuant to this Act, and (C) achieving the effective coordination of Federal, State, and other governmental, 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 any agencies of the United States Government established or empowered to carry out the purposes of this Act”;

(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 shall appoint two assistant directors for the purpose of this Act. Such assistant directors shall be compensated at rates fixed 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 Commission on Domestic Tourism, which shall consist of fifteen members appointed by the Secretary from among persons who are sincerely concerned about the need to institute a number of urgent reforms in the operations of the Federal government and to promote, or planning, the Secretary shall appoint a chairman from among such members. The Commission shall meet at the call of the chairman, but shall not meet more than once in any year.

(b) The Commission shall make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of determining:

(1) 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) the travel resources of the Nation available to satisfy such needs now to the year 1980;

(3) the policies and programs which will insure that the domestic travel needs of the present and the future are adequately met;

(4) a program of Federal assistance to the States in promoting domestic tourism;

(5) whether a separate agency of the Government should be established to consolidate and coordinate tourism research, planning, and other activities currently 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.

(d) The Secretary is authorized to engage in 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.

(e) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $2,500,000 for the purpose of this section.

(f) by striking out "$4,700,000" in the section redesignated as section 7 and inserting in lieu thereof "$15,000,000";

and

(g) by striking out "International Travel Act of 1968" in the section redesignated as section 8 and inserting in lieu thereof "International and Domestic Travel Act of 1969".


To the House

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 meet the challenge of excessive outlays that 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 holies that it looks more like something hastily devised to help get the White House off the balance-of-payments hook than as legislation the Administration would 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 the 6 percent tax on postage to the United Kingdom, nominal $10, are reasonable and practical proposals. But the more important part of the legislation is the proposed tax 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 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 eva­marks at this point I lay the Rachel 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 Republi­cans for greater emphasis than it has yet been done on programs to attract foreign visitors to the United States. Here is a virtually un­tapped source of dollars, embodying the potential for in­creasing the dollar influence of the United States in the foreign market. Simply put, the Administration's proposal would be expensive and ineffective as well; it would almost surely result in retaliation by other nations, and the danger that Americans would be tempted to place funds abroad, adding to the outflow instead of reduc­ing it.

With the 5 percent transportation tax and the lowering of the duty-free limit are worth adopting, the Administration would be wise to give even greater emphasis than it has yet been done on programs to attract foreign visitors to the United States. Here is a virtually un­tapped source of dollars, embodying the potential for in­creasing the dollar influence of the United States in the foreign market. Simply put, the Administration's proposal would be expensive and ineffective as well; it would almost surely result in retaliation by other nations, and the danger that Americans would be tempted to place funds abroad, adding to the outflow instead of reduc­ing it.

1. (b) 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. (c) determining whether a separate agency of the Government should be established to consolidate and coordinate tourism research, planning, and other activities currently performed by different existing agencies of the Government;

3. (d) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive no compensation therefor by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving on business of the Commission, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 573b-2) for persons in Government services employed intermittently.

4. (e) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $2,500,000 for the purpose of this section.

5. (f) by striking out "$4,700,000" in the section redesignated as section 7 and inserting in lieu thereof "$15,000,000";

6. (g) by striking out "International Travel Act of 1968" in the section redesignated as section 8 and inserting in lieu thereof "International and Domestic Travel Act of 1969".

SEC. 235. ROLLCALL VOTES ON COMPENSATION OF SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 234. A roll call vote shall not be required on any "general appropriation 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. 5, pp. 4125-4127, accepted by voice vote.)

New provision—Reid bill.

New Sec. 335 of Reid bill provides for the establishment of a joint committee to make a study of "means of (1) giving recipients of Federal educational assistance programs assurance as to the amount of funds they will receive in a fiscal year under such programs far enough in advance of the beginning of such year to permit them effectively to plan their participation in such programs for such year, and (2) providing the funds necessary for such participation in a fiscal year early enough in the fiscal year to permit the recipients to use the funds effectively and economically."

The joint committee is to report no later than 3 months after its approval and to go out of business on submission of the report.

MAKING 18 YEARS THE ELIGIBLE VOTING AGE FOR FEDERAL ELECTIONS

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island.

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a House joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States making citizens who have attained 18 years of age eligible to vote in Federal elections.

As you know, this subject has been before Congress for many years, but for a number of reasons, no positive results have been forthcoming.

Most of the arguments for and against this proposal are well known to all of our colleagues. I shall not go into these longstanding opinions in depth. Instead, I will address myself to the logic, wisdom, and the practicality of the matter as I see it.

The 18-year-old citizen today is better educated and better equipped intellectually and morally than was his or her 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.

In the years to come, there are a number of 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 responsible 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 our 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 to us by the law, 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 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 quality of the next generation. The youth of a nation is increasingly dependent on the opportunities, capabilities, and vitality of those who are soon to bear its chief responsibilities." Professor Clinton Rossiter writes, "Goals for the American future rest rather on the quality of our votes—and of our participation of every kind—than it does on the quantity. What America needs is not more voters, but more informed and responsible men and women who are informed, understanding and responsible."

Mr. Speaker, we would do well to heed the advice of these two prominent Americans—to have faith in our young who are soon to bear the policies we have made and to involve them at a time when they are enthusiastic and interested in government and politics.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks a copy of the joint resolution I have introduced today, as follows:

H.J. Res. 1078

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States making citizens who have attained 18 years of age eligible to vote in Federal elections.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each)
February 8, 1968
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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 when 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—

"Sec. 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 in which the names of candidates for 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.

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 seized on as the only solution.

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 devastating to the building industry and the homebuying public.

The proposals that have been published 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 homeowner, the increased cost over the life of a 30-year mortgage would be between $4,500 and $5,600. Later I will detail all of the costs that would be imposed on the homeowner under these increased interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I urge those who are promoting this idea to slow down, to stop, and look at what 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 FHA rates will increase the flow of funds. 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. 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?

The history of the flow of new credit into the mortgage market shows conclusively that the flow of funds has often decreased following an increase in the interest rate. A study printed in hearings before the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on page 47:

The history of the flow of new credit into the mortgage market indicates that higher 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, may be hurting housing markets. During 1966, 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 starts. There is no evidence to suggest that a new round of FHA interest rate increases would bring any different results in 1968.

Mr. Speaker, all of this points to the fact that housing mortgage paper is in a competitive market, long term. If 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 FHA mortgage will lose out to Treasury bills in preference to housing mortgages.

Also, many lenders are reluctant, particularly in times of tight money, to tie up funds for longer terms. 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 National Mortgage Association—Fannie Mae—and the Federal Housing Administration are the result of specific policies based on the theory that a special stimulant was needed in the housing market.

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, particularly low and moderate income units.

Like Fannie Mae and FHLLB, the establishment of FHA was designed to stimulate 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.
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 sky rocket 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 an unfavorable 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 upward pressures on other municipal bonds and similar securities. Conventional mortgages likewise would keep pace in front of the FHA rate.

The Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I have heard no contention that these points would be eliminated by an increase in interest rates. There have only been remote reasons that the points would be reduced, possibly to 3 or 4.

In short, it is obvious that we would have FHA mortgages of 7 percent, with points.

In none of these proposals is there a plan to control points either by statute or administration action.

While points have gone down in the past, they have always reappeared in pe riods of tight money. Judging 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.

In proposing an increase in the FHA rate, many have argued that this would reduce the number of points or discounts that the borrower pays by past experience. It seems likely that points would be a loss in housing starts. For example, Federal Reserve Board Chairman Mr. Eccles, 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 rates

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 28 percent of the Nation's population now have 6 percent usury limits. A 10th State, North Carolina, has just raised its rates to 61/2 percent. States with 6 percent limit are: Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia. Six other States have 5 percent at 7 percent and 12 others at 8 percent.

States with 6-, 61/2-, 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 reciprocal rates that the States imposed on the homebuyer and the homebuilder.

In addition, it is my understanding that in some areas, existing mortgages have escrow 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.

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 89-957 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 89th Congress and renewed in the first session of the 90th Congress. This legislation which has been fully supported by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the affected Federal agencies. I know of no opposition.

Yet, the Federal Reserve System has failed to carry out this provision in any meaningful fashion. Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that the Federal Reserve System should carry out this Congressional mandate fully, before the Congress is asked to raise interest rates on consumers.

This is a mandate for the Federal Reserve System to support the housing market, and this, It has not done, in defiance of a law that has twice passed the Congress and twice been signed by the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we have the 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 any increase in interest rates. We cannot leave the consumer—the homebuyer—unprotected on all sides in the purchase of a house. If some people want higher interest rates, perhaps they will have to give up some other charge which they impose on the homebuyer and the 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.

Mr. Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. Speaker, in order to help clarify the situation, let us look at what congressional legislation has provided for us.

There are three provisions in the Truth in Lending Act which are pertinent to the problem of rate increases.

The first is a disclosure provision providing for the disclosure of the annual percentage cost of a transaction.

The annual percentage cost is calculated by taking the rate charged on a mortgage and adding an item for any points or other fees, and the costs involved in the closing. This number is then divided by the number of years involved in the mortgage, and is expressed as a percentage.

The law requires that the annual percentage cost be disclosed to the consumer in a readable format, along with the fixed rate.

The second provision is the rule of 500. This rule states that the annual percentage cost cannot exceed 500 percent of the fixed rate. If the annual percentage cost exceeds 500 percent, the lender must give the consumer the option of paying off the mortgage early without penalty.

The third provision is the usury limit. This law sets a maximum interest rate that the lender can charge on a mortgage. The usury limit is determined by the state in which the mortgage is made.

In summary, the Truth in Lending Act provides for the disclosure of the annual percentage cost and the option of paying off the mortgage early without penalty if the annual percentage cost exceeds 500 percent of the fixed rate. It also sets a maximum interest rate that the lender can charge on a mortgage.
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 interest on which I feel should be made before consideration by the House—Senate conference.

The first thing is to compliment my fellow Missourian, the gentlewoman from St. Louis, Lebanon, Miss 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. I have no better word for her work than 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 conference amendment. That is 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 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 1966, one year ago his pioneering bore fruit as the gentrality from Missouri so ably steered the bill to its passage by the unexpected and unanticipated final vote of 382 to 4. When the amendments before 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.

I am not so ready to pass judgment upon all those who grant credit and to whom the provisions of this bill apply, but with the passage of the conference bill, 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 should be afforded the protection of a greatly strengthened 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 helpless persons.

I became persuaded quite some time ago that the consumer all across our country needed the kind of protection this bill will afford from the unscrupulous practices of a few operators in the credit field.

We now have enactments on the statute books which call for the labeling of textiles, furs, and several other items. In our present economy which depends on 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 applied, will be apprised of 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 only be a half-truth because of the additional and concealed charges which are never stated in the advertising. Such a practice will now be a violation of law.

It was the Douglas amendment 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 and perhaps would in many instances 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 in the conference committee which, while desirable in one sense, 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 claims against personal credit. 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 Senate 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 it has become 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 opinion, the new Federal provision would affect our State statutes but very little. There would be no substantial change. Again I would be unobscuring and careless if I were to omit to point out it is quite open to question as to 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 preexisting Federal legislation in the field of bankruptcy.

The justification for Congress to legislate with respect to the garnishment of wages is placed under the commerce clause as reliance for constitutional authority. I voted for the Senate amendment to do not extend 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 or not the Court will 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 payments. The payee then, must write the note or bond or pledged the item as if the full price was paid. This bond is then assigned to a new creditor or 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 in their credit transactions there is a balloon payment. I would propose that such balloon payments be prohibited unless the consumer is advised separately in writing that he will be expected to make a greatly increased 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, most of our States—both large and small—have their own laws to define usury and to prohibit interest rates in excess of their definitions. The important point is that some of the States seem to believe these laws ineffective and 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 to offer any such loan or charge interest rates exceeding the maximum allowed under State law in the 43 States where State laws now 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 of the discussion I thought the arguments advanced by this side were so weak that argument against this proposal was being advanced by persons who were making this argument which is designed to remedy the deficiencies in our present national system of poultry inspection. 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 will attempt to argue that even now it may be argued that the truth will not be enough. Both opponents and I have tried to persuade the public and the consumer. The public will be greater and 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 of disclosure should apply.

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.

As one wag who was seeking to be fussy 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 concluded the debate on the amendment introducing H.R. 15146, Mr. Speaker, this week, the act which unwholesome poultry could reach the consumer. Make additional changes to the administration of law and strengthen the protection it gives to the public in the misleading nature of most credit and interest charges. Let me say 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 be given 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 of disclosure should apply. Whether it is a loan of money or credit extended by stores for an installment purchase, the principle of disclosure should apply.

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 extend the protection to all credit charges 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 as a "Truth in Lending Act," then it should be the truth. But if the amendment which excludes the low interest credit charges was passed, I would support it as a Truth in Lending Act, 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 credit transacts with and truthfully tell the borrower or purchaser the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

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 Tennessee?

There was no objection. Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, this week I had the distinct pleasure of joining with three of my colleagues—the gentleman 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 who are sponsoring this legislation.

This legislation represents an effort to achieve the first major overhaul of the Poultry Products Inspection Act since its enactment in August of 1906. 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 2-year period, the Federal Government would provide inspection in that State.

Provide USDA additional authority and control over marketing channels through which unwholesome poultry could reach the consumer.

Make additional changes to the administration of law and strengthen the protection it gives to the public against unwholesome, adulterated, mislabeled, or deceptively packaged poultry and poultry products.

Mr. Speaker, the need for this legislation is not just merely "evident." It demands our attention and our speedy consideration of the legislation just introduced.

Approximately 87 percent of U.S. poultry is 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—1.6 billion pounds—of the Nation's poultry supply is not slaughtered and is locally inspected and marketed in 75 States. The remaining 33 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 table shows 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 programs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

And what is the situation with regard to intrastate poultry inspection? Yesterday, the Department of Agriculture released findings of a survey of 97 poultry plants which indicated their inadequacy and 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 may be in a position 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. Mr. W. B. Conklin is the chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce and Foreign Commerce. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce into the Record a series of recommendations that I believe can be helpful in solving some of our balance-of-payments problems.

**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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate President Johnson for his great wisdom in sending us legislation for the prevention and treatment of narcotic addiction and alcoholism.

In 1968, alcoholism remains one of the most neglected health problems in America. The need for prompt action to encourage communities to establish comprehensive prevention and treatment facilities for alcoholics increases with the growing recognition that alcoholism is a disease to be treated in the community like other diseases.

The community mental health centers program has proved a concept of comprehensive community care; the Community Mental Health Centers Act provides a model for the administration of care to the alcoholic. This measure was carried in the Senate by Senator Thomas of Kansas and the House by Mr. Dingell of Michigan.

This program, which has coordinated mental health personnel, general hospitals, health and welfare agencies, and voluntary organizations, is the logical place for the development of comprehensive prevention and treatment programs for the alcoholic.

I support the proposed amendments to the Community Mental Health Centers Act. They will enable us to achieve maximum effectiveness in meeting the needs of alcoholics and narcotic addicts. I urge prompt and favorable consideration of this legislation.

**CongressionaL Reform**

Mr. MccLory. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record. 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, was designed to provide 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. Caveney], 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 of February 8, 1968 an extract from a paper comparing several sections of title II of S. 355 with the provisions of other congressional reform bills also pending before the Rules Committee. I note with satisfaction that some of the recommendations which I made in the task force—authorized book, "We propose: A Modern Congress" McGraw-Hill, 1968. These rec-
committees 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 jurisdiction.

PART 5—LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES
Sec. 251. Cost estimates by legislative committees.
Sec. 252. Appropriations on annual basis.
Sec. 253. Committee jurisdiction.
Sec. 254. Appropriations on annual basis.
Sec. 255. Committee jurisdiction.
Sec. 256. Appropriations on annual basis.

S. 355. 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 provisions of 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); the 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 loss in revenues for a period of 1 year.

If the report accompanying a bill or joint resolution is based on any program within its jurisdiction, it shall also be required by order of the House, a point of order may be made against it.

Bolling. Same. (Sec. 241 of Bolling bill.)
Reid. No provision.

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 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 committees... 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 CIG 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(a). GAO representatives shall be available to meet with Committees and legislative committees to discuss their reports as they may affect agency budget justifications or proposed legislation.

Sec. 243. Agency statements on GAO reports.

S. 355. Requires that whenever the GAO has issued a report containing recommenda-

tions to the head of any Federal agency, the agency shall, in connection with the first request for appropriations from the agency submitted to the Congress more than 60 days after the date of such report, submit a written statement to the Appropriations Committee expressing its views on the recommendations contained in the report and submitted by the agency with respect to the recommenda-

Bolling. Adds that copies of reports also go to other 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 jus-

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 provisions of 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); the 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 loss in revenues for a period of 1 year.

If the report accompanying a bill or joint resolution is based on any program within its jurisdiction, it shall also be required by order of the House, 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 proposed legislation, if less than 5 years; estimates shall include a comparison of the committee's cost estimate with that of the executive branch. Final consideration of new legislation shall include a point of order in the absence of this projection."

Section 251 was twice amended by the Senate. Additional starred sections above. See Congressional Record of Feb. 15, Amendments No. 79, pp. 2004-06, and No. 63, pp. 2006-08 respectively.

Sections 252 & 253. "Appropriations; grant-in-aid programs; miscellaneous."

S. 355. Sec. 252 directs each committee or joint committee which has legislative jurisdic-

... (b) Each legislative committee shall survey fixed obligation programs and report to the House, following the legislative program and any special orders

S. 355. Modifies all subsections of Sec. 252 to emphasize that the requirements are optional with the committees; other provi-

sions same as S. 356.

Note.—Section not amended by Senate. See Final Report page 35: "12 . . . (b) Each legislative committee shall survey fixed obligation programs and report to the House, following the legislative program and any special orders

(b) (c) Each legislative committee shall initiate a program for systematic review of grant-in-aid programs and report to the House, following the legislative program and any special orders

(b) Legislative committees shall authorize programs in such a manner that they will be subject to annual appropriations review."

(See paragraph 1 above; subsection a.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE
By unanimous consent, leave of ab-

sence was granted to Mr. MATMIS of California (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for February 7 and 8, on account of official business.

Mr. CROW (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 legisla-

tive program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SIMS, 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. CRAMPTON, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERRIV. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill designed to correct an inequity in the Internal Reve-

nue Code. At the present time any person who has had the misfortune of hav-

ing their home damaged or destroyed by fire, tornado, hurricane, or other means, and who must temporarily find another residence while his home is being re-

paired must declare any insurance payments covering the additional living expenses required by this situation as taxable income.

It is obvious that these insurance pay-
ments 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 Reve-

nue Service for comment, I have received positive 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 Kan-

sas is 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 pay-

ing income taxes on their additional liv-

ing expenses insurance payments. My bill will exclude from taxable income any insurance reimbursement for living expenses incurred in connection with a casualty loss.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following in the RECORD:

INEquality IN INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. SHERRIV. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks at this point in the Record and in-
clude extraneous matter.
Mr. BOLLING, Mr. WILLIAM D. Ford in two instances.
Mr. RODINO, Mr. COHEN in two instances.
Mr. FLOOD in two instances.
Mr. FEHRMAN in five instances.
Mr. RYAN in three instances.
Mr. WHITENER, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances.
Mr. BERING, Mr. SNYDFIT.
Mr. FREIDEL, Mr. ASHLEY in two instances.
Mr. ADARBO in four instances.
Mr. PICKLE, Mr. ST. ONGE in two instances.
Mr. BARRETT.
Mr. ROSENSHAL.
Mr. HÉBERT, Mr. RABICK 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. WHALEN.
Mr. EDWARDS of California.
Mr. KISICK.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred, as follows:
S. 2611. An act to maintain and improve the income of producers of crude pine gum, to stabilize production of crude pine gum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon 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. 19094. 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.
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. 12940. A bill to grant the masters of certain U.S. vessels a lien on those vessels for their wages (Rept. No. 1089). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXIII, 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 hallucinogenic drugs by unauthorized persons; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:
H.R. 15217. A bill to permit the release of certain veterans from liability to the United States for debts made, incurred, guaranteed, or insured under chapter 37 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 manufacture, advertisement for introduction, or introduction into interstate commerce of hallucinogenic drugs by unauthorized persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:
H.R. 15219. A bill to permit persons discharged from the uniformed services before October 1, 1961, to receive disability retirement pensions of 100 percent to apply for and, if qualified, be awarded retired pay under chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committees on Armed Services.

By Mr. COWGER:
H.R. 15220. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prescribe penalties for the possession of LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs by unauthorized persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT:
H.R. 15221. A bill to set forth a comprehensive 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 overseas quarters who is otherwise entitled to such separation allowance; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15223. A bill to provide for a coordinated national safety program to reduce boating accidents, and deaths and injuries resulting therefrom; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 15224. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRISON:
H.R. 15225. A bill to place in trust status certain lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming; 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 overflight permits for postal 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 conform to the primary authority and responsibility with respect to the management, regulation, and conservation of such fish and wildlife owned by the United States and to specify the exceptions applicable thereto, and to provide procedure under which Federal agencies may obtain regulation of such fish and wildlife on such lands; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LAMOUREUX:
H.R. 15229. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the Federal Government to bar the entrance of subversive aliens believed disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. BARICK:
H.R. 15230. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIVERS:
H.R. 15231. A bill to authorize the Committee of the United States General Staff College to award the degree of master of military art and science; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15232. A bill to authorize the U.S. Customs Court to maintain an office at the city of Los Angeles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15233. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SISK:
H.R. 15234. A bill to direct the Council of Environmental Quality to recommend regulations to control radiation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 15235. A bill to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote travel to the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. BOLTON:
H.R. 15236. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROWN of California:
H.R. 15237. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a comprehensive review of the medical, technical, educational, and institutional programs 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 by an amendment to the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of regional rehabilitation training 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. 15256. A bill providing for the additional article on the Distressed District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 15256. 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. MESKILL:
H.R. 15251. 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. OTTINGER:
H.R. 15253. A bill to amend title 26, United States Code, to provide for the elimination of the nominal corporate income tax for certain and postmasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OTTINGER:
H.R. 15255. A bill to provide for certain minimum payments to States from receipts derived from Federal 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.

By Mr. FUQUA:
H.R. 15252. 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. 15249. A bill to amend section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the withholding of visas to certain drug traffickers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIATT:
H.R. 15257. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide coverage 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. HAMMON:
H.R. 15246. 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 and profit-sharing plan program, to provide for portability of pension benefits, to provide for regulation of the administration of pension and other employee benefit plans, to establish a Pension and Benefit Plan Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMON:
H.R. 15245. A bill to establish the Blazing Foge 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. 15247. 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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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. MACHENER:
H.R. 15246. 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. MACHENER:
H.R. 15246. A bill to establish a Crime Compensation Commission to aid persons injured or the dependents of persons killed during the Korean War; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACHENER:
H.R. 15246. A bill to establish a Crime Compensation Commission to aid persons injured or the dependents of persons killed during the Korean War; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 15246. 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. OTTINGER:
H.R. 15246. A bill to establish a Crime Compensation Commission to aid persons injured or the dependents of persons killed during the Korean War; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MACHENER:
H.R. 15246. A bill to establish a Crime Compensation Commission to aid persons injured or the dependents of persons killed during the Korean War; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OTTINGER:
H.R. 15246. A bill to establish a Crime Compensation Commission to aid persons injured or the dependents of persons killed during the Korean War; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.
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By Mr. MINSKAI:

H. Res. 15278. A bill to provide for improved management of the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H. Res. 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. Res. 15330. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Act, as to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. STAUGERS:

H. Res. 15331. 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. Res. 15334. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LESTER:

H. J. Res. 1074. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HABSHA:

H. 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 in obtaining suitable employment in Vietnam and 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 authorizing the Congress to enact housing bills making citizens who have attained 18 years of age eligible to vote in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. J. Res. 1079. Joint resolution to direct the Federal Communications Commission to study the ways in which commercial broadcasters 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. GRETTS):

H. J. Res. 1081. Joint resolution providing, until October 1, 1969, for flexible interest rates for mortgage insurance programs and credit for low cost housing assistance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STUCKEY (for himself, Mr. CAYAT, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. DOWAY, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. FUGIYA, Mr. BARING, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. HOLLIDAY of North Carolina, Mrs. HECKER of Massachusetts, Mr. ORTEGA, Mrs. BOLTON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. RABICK, 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. REINCKE, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. ERLAM of Pennsylvania, and Mr. QUZE):

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. PULITON of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 637. Joint 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. 638. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to examine 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. 639. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to improving the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, with respect to the surveillance of the Soviet Union's East European satellites when there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Vietnam have been directed toward peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENEGEL:

H. Con. Res. 640. Concurrent resolution to urge the collection of the French World War I debt to the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMAN (for himself, Mr. MALILLIARD, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. PELLY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MOHIBER, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. GROVER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LEPORO, Mr. KEEFE, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. EDWARDS of Pennsylvania, Mr. BYRNE of New Jersey, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ROSES of Florida, Mr. REINICKE, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ST. OMER, and Mr. SAVAGE):

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. HATCHAW, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HERSTOSKI, Mr. GAIPTANIARKIS, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. KRYOS, Mr. HARDT, Mr. MACHESKEY, Mr. FALLON, Mr. GUDGE, 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. BRADEMAS:

H. Con. Res. 642. Concurrent resolution to urge the Congress to declare 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. 642. 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. 1086. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to U.S. ratification of the Conventions of 1866, 1874, 1876, and 1884, Abolition of Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, and Freedom of Association; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONYERS:


By Mr. COWGER:

H. Res. 1088. 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. Res. 15282. A bill for the relief of Rosario Pimentel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 15283. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Vitala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 15284. A bill for the relief of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. Res. 15285. A bill for the relief of Rose Wilfride Beauzile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 15286. A bill for the relief of Carmaida and Salvadore Levante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY (by request):

H. Res. 15287. A bill for the relief of Stefano Inzalaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 15288. A bill for the relief of Maria Rose Wilrde Beausiti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 15289. A bill for the relief of Carmela and Salvadore Levante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. Res. 15290. A bill for the relief of Antonio Corapi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 15291. A bill for the relief of Ciro Guastalla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS:

H. Res. 15292. A bill for the relief of Bernardo Calamba Sr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. Res. 15293. A bill for the relief of Frances Frod Artido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 15294. A bill for the relief of Habibollah Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Res. 15295. A bill for the relief of Michael Caraboski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 15296. A bill for the relief of Charles J. Culligan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H. Res. 15297. A bill for the relief of Mr. Pelacce DiCarrolls; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 15298. A bill for the relief of Polaccerio DeCaroals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. Res. 15299. A bill for the relief of Casimiro Grecco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H. Res. 15300. Resolution of the relief of Charles J. Culligan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.