20, 1906, and the District of Columbia election law to provide for the election of members of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, April 3, 1968, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 2, 1968:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

George C. McGhee, of Texas, to be Ambassador at Large.

Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 2, 1968:

HEMISFAIR 1968

Edward Clark, of Texas, to be commissioner for the Federal exhibit at HemisFair 1968.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, April 2, 1968*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Unto Thee, O Lord, do I lift up my soul.—Psalm 25: 1.

O God, our Father, to whom we belong and with whom we live, we come to Thee in this our morning prayer seeking a fresh consciousness of the reality of Thy presence. Help us to know that Thou art with us and that Thou art always with us seeking to guide us along the ways of righteousness, justice, and peace. If some of us have been disturbed by doubt, hurt by hate, or maligned by malice until life has been drained of its worth—restore to us such a vision of Thee and of the truth about life that we may believe triumphantly once again.

For our Nation we pray that it may not miss the true and right path amid the world's confusion. Bless all efforts to create and maintain an ordered and a peaceful human family on this planet. Particularly do Thou bless the effort now put forth to bring peace in Vietnam. We pray for our President, our Speaker, and the Members of this House of Representatives. In all truth and in all good will steady Thou their faith that life for them may not be a drifting raft but a ship with a course.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7325. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain Federal lands for certain lands owned by Mr. Robert S. Latham, Albany, Oreg.;

H.R. 10599. An act relating to the Tiwa Indians of Texas;

H.R. 11254. An act for the relief of Jack L. Good;

H. Con. Res. 657. Concurrent resolution providing for ceremonies in the rotunda of the Capitol in connection with the unveiling of the bust of Constantino Brumidi; and

H. Con. Res. 658. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of the proceedings in connection with the unveiling of the bust of Constantino Brumidi.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1000. An act for the relief of Jack Nam Yee;

S. 1069. An act for the relief of Dr. Chung Chick Nahm;

S. 1749. An act for the relief of Dr. Enrique Jose Catasus Soto;

S. 1960. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Aucar;

S. 2165. An act for the relief of Rene E. Montero;

S. 2250. An act for the relief of Dr. Hugo Vicente Cartaya;

S. 2311. An act for the relief of Dr. Evelio Francisco Diaz;

S. 2371. An act for the relief of Dr. Herman J. Lohmann;

S. 2378. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio P. Amable;

S. 2383. An act for the relief of Dr. Francisco J. Menedez;

S. 2469. An act for the relief of Dr. Carlos Hernandez;

S. 2491. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio Pinera;

S. 2501. An act for the relief of Dr. Fernando Rafael Boudet-Esteban;

S. 2504. An act for the relief of Dr. Martiniano L. Orta;

S. 2506. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Epifanio Morera;

S. 2581. An act for the relief of Dr. Edmee Serantes;

S. 2585. An act for the relief of Kap Rai Kim and Young Nam Kim;

S. 2720. An act for the relief of Heng Liong Thung;

S. 2745. An act to provide for the observance of the centennial of the signing of the 1868 Treaty of Peace between the Navajo Indian Tribe and the United States;

S. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution to designate May 20, 1968, as "Charlotte, N.C., Day";

S. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

S.J. Res. 143. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Caryl P. Haskins as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

S.J. Res. 144. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. William A. M. Burden as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

S. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings on the establishment of a Commission on Balanced Economic Development and the creation of a Northwest Regional Services Corporation;

S. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution to print, for the use of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, additional copies of its hearings on long-range program and research needs in aging; and

S. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to take action to insure the United States will derive maximum benefits from an expanded and intensified effort to increase the accuracy and extend the time range of weather predictions.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 109. An act to control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate for the Disposition of Executive Papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 68–11.

APPOINTMENT AS ADVISORY MEMBERS OF NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 202(b), Public Law 90–259, the Chair appoints as advisory members of the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. PETTIS of California.

THE LATE HONORABLE D. LANE POWERS

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce the death of the Honorable D. Lane Powers, who represented the Fourth District of New Jersey in this House. Those who served with Lane Powers in the 73d and the six succeeding Congresses will recall him as a dedicated Member who worked tirelessly for his constituents. I came to know him as a warm friend who, although not of my party, was always generous with his counsel.

Lane came to our city of Trenton in 1919 fresh upon his discharge from the U.S. Army. He had compiled a distinguished record in World War I, enlist-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ing as a private in the ranks. Later, he was commissioned a second lieutenant and was elevated to the rank of first lieutenant. Lane served as battalion adjutant in the 807th Pioneer Infantry both here and abroad. Lane entered the business world in Trenton and prospered. He made a host of friends and, as might be expected, was soon proposed for public office. Prior to his election to the Congress, he served three terms in our State legislature as a member of the general assembly. Possibly the best gage of his popularity as an officeholder was the retention of his seat in the Congress during the Roosevelt administrations.

For the last 22 years of his life, Lane served as a member of our State board of public utility commissioners, a position in which he served with honor. Although not trained in the law—he held a degree in civil engineering from the Pennsylvania Military College—Lane presided over utility commission hearings with great skill and scrupulous fairness. We shall miss Lane Powers in New Jersey. He was a distinguished public servant and a truly fine human being.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with others among my colleagues who were privileged to serve with David Lane Powers in paying my respects to his memory.

Although it has been a number of years since he resigned from this body to return to the service of his State, I remember him well as an able, fine person who was held in highest regard by Members on both sides of the aisle.

Certainly he was always my good friend, as I would hope I was his.

To the bereaved members of David Lane Powers' family I offer my deepest sympathy.

AWARD OF DEFENSE CONTRACTS TO CANADIAN CONCERNS

Mr. VANIK. 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. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, I learned through Cleveland labor officials that two defense contracts for the production of 81 millimeter mortar shell cases currently being produced by the Weatherhead Co., in Cleveland, were recently awarded to Canadian concerns. The termination of this work at Weatherhead could also terminate jobs for over 400 workers who are currently involved in this production.

Today the Department of the Army advised me that the production contracts were awarded to the Prestolite Co., of Sarnia, Canada, the Ingersoll Machine & Tool Co., Ingersoll, Ontario, and the Hayes International Co., of Birmingham, Ala.

The Department of the Army advised me today:

> It is Department of Defense policy to seek the best possible coordination of the materiel programs of Canada and the United States to assure Canada a fair opportunity to share in the production of military equipment and materiel involving programs of mutual interest to both. Under this criteria, privately owned Canadian firms are considered on the same basis as United States firms when evaluating bids prior to award, pursuant to current procurement regulations.

Under these rules, the Department of Defense completely overlooks the lower wage differential prevailing in Canada which favors Canadian industry. Furthermore, American defense production in Canada is exempt from the Renegotiation Act and excess profits claims which can be made against an American producer.

It is ridiculous to expect the taxpayers of America to support American defense production in Canada under rules which discriminate against American labor and industry and compound the balance-of-payments problem with defense dollars.

WITHDRAWING TROOPS FROM EUROPE FOR ASSIGNMENT TO VIETNAM

Mr. HENDERSON. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today written Defense Secretary Clifford to urge that he give strong consideration to the immediate withdrawal of at least one full Army division from Western Europe for assignment to Vietnam.

This would serve the dual purpose of providing needed manpower for our effort in Vietnam without increasing the draft of Reserve callup, while simultaneously reducing our balance-of-payments deficit and gold outflow. With the assignment of this division to Vietnam and the return to this country of their dependents and associated civilians, the American dollars now being spent in Europe would be significantly cut.

No doubt our NATO allies would protest such a move. However, it is only fair to point out that we are the only nation which has ever met its full commitment in men and materials to NATO and that that NATO nations have just as vital a stake as we have in Southeast Asia. Since they are not supporting the allied effort there, they should at least be willing to take up any slack which might be left in Europe by such a withdrawal.

WITHDRAWAL OF U.S. TROOPS FROM EUROPE FOR ASSIGNMENT TO VIETNAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a little bit of irony that I seem to follow the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina. I hate to admit the possibility that what he suggested might have to take place. However, Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed by the military situation in Europe and the attitudes of our allies.

This morning we received testimony from Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, the supreme allied commander in Europe.

His testimony was given in an executive session and I cannot discuss details of it until the record of this morning's hearings will be released by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I can say this, however. There was nothing in General Lemnitzer's testimony which gave me reason to feel cheerful or reassured.

Two facts stand out. During the past 12 months, the military strength of the Warsaw Pact countries has continued to increase.

They have improved their land forces.

They have increased their naval capability.

And the Soviets have moved into the eastern Mediterranean in considerable strength.

The second fact is that our NATO allies, by and large, have not responded to this increased threat.

This is extremely disappointing.

I have said for some time that the day is at hand when the United States—pressed by demands at home and abroad—has to reduce at least the level of our conventional commitment in Western Europe.

We simply cannot continue shouldering all of those burdens.

We either have to cut our forces in Europe, or get more substantial help from our allies in paying for the cost of those troops.

And here, credit alone is not enough. Our allies have to face the facts and either determine to pay their fair share of our common security, or accept the consequences.

I hope that as we move to review the world situation—and our ability to deal with it—that new approaches will be made to our allies in Europe.

They have to fish—or cut bait.

MY CANDIDACY FOR PRESIDENT

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, a couple of weeks ago I said if the President did not run for reelection, I would be a candidate for that office. However, I never thought I would be called upon, as the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] said, to fish or cut bait. But in the interval, the last 24 hours, it seems to me that the Democrats who are not yippies or hippies or cop-outs or dropouts do not have any candidate left unless I stay in the race. So it looks like I am going to stay in.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have any money with which to buy delegates or even to pay the expense of their hotel rooms. I am going to truly be the poor man's candidate. I at one time thought that Senator MCCARTHY was a poor man's

candidate, but he does not have a chance against me on that score.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to say that I talked to a reporter today, a reporter not from Washington, D.C., but a reporter from outside this area who has covered the States of Kansas and Wisconsin in the last few days, and he said that the only time audiences responded to either of the candidates and to the statements which they made, and the only time during which they had any rapport with the audiences, was when they said either directly or indirectly that they were going to do away with the draft.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, a lot of these young folk who are now out working for the candidacies of these candidates will not fight for their own country if they can help it. They have used the war in Vietnam as their excuse. But, I do not need their help because it is my opinion that 95 percent of the Democratic Party is made up of other kind of people.

SOME PARALLELS OF THE PAST WHICH MIGHT APPLY TO THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON NOT TO RUN FOR RE-ELECTION

Mr. HANNA. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, it is remarkable how the pattern of men's thoughts weave a web to trap and hold a singular approach to certain aspects of life. The President in a single and uncomplicated sentence sacrificed for a cause he felt was worth it all—the future his political career might yet have held. With crystal clarity, classic simplicity, and utter sincerity he said:

> I will not seek nor will I accept the nomination.

Although no further explanation should have been required, when pursued by the press following his pronouncement he said the decision was "irrevocable."

In spite of all this, no sooner had the event become public when Johnson detractors and those political pundits with psychological hangups were seeing all kinds of innuendo, subtle overtones, and dark intrigues. One is reminded of the curious politics involved during the era when France was being threatened by a militaristic Prussia. Talleyrand of France was viewing with alarm and reacting with suspicion to the menace of every Prussian move. So engrossed and totally involved did that great politician become in reading menace into each Prussian report that when his lieutenants brought him news of the death of the Prussian Prince, Talleyrand was said to have exclaimed:

> Now, what could be his motive in that?

That mentality is very alive in many of the detractors reacting today to the announced political retirement of the President.

PERMISSION FOR THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works may sit this afternoon during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

COL. FRANCIS J. KELLY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, recently, because of my position as commander of the Congressional Squadron of the Civil Air Patrol, I had the opportunity to meet Col. Francis J. Kelly, USA, Armor. Subsequently, I was able to introduce Colonel Kelly to Speaker McCORMACK, and because of the colonel's special service to his country and his experience in Vietnam the Speaker suggested that Colonel Kelly be asked to speak to the Members.

I am pleased that Colonel Kelly, former commander of the 5th Special Forces Group, Airborne, in Vietnam, will be here today and that he will speak to the Members at 3 p.m. in the Speaker's dining room. We have a unique opportunity to learn from an experienced and able gentleman certain of the conditions regarding our struggle for freedom in Vietnam.

Colonel Kelly is present today with the kind and thoughtful consent of his commanding officer, Lt. Gen. Harry W. O. Kinnard. The colonel is currently commander of the Special Welfare Agency, Combat Developments Command, at Fort Bragg, N.C. Assisting in making it possible for the colonel to be with us was Maj. Raymond Frankenberg, USAF. I have the privilege of knowing the very capable Major Frankenberg, and wish to thank him for his assistance.

So that the Members will know of the colonel's excellent qualifications I should like to include some of his biographical background:

Colonel Kelly entered the service as an enlisted man in 1941. After attaining officer status he served in the European Theater during World War II. He then held a series of important posts in Korea, at the Pentagon, and on Okinawa before taking command of the 5th Special Forces Group, Abn, in Vietnam in 1966. In Vietnam he distinguished himself on both the military and civilian aspects of the battle. Colonel Kelly is responsible for protecting scores of American and Vietnamese lives and he recognizes the need for civil action as a necessary complement to our military action.

Colonel Kelly's decorations include the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit with oak leaf cluster, the Bronze Star for Valor with oak leaf cluster, the Air Medal with four oak leaf clusters, the Purple Heart, and Army Commendation Medal. His foreign decorations include the Republic of Vietnam's Cross of Gallantry With Palm, and the Medal of Honor, and the Republic of Korea's Order of Military Merit.

With these decorations I imagine the day is not far away when Colonel Kelly will take off his present insignia and don a star.

THE PRESIDENT'S SINCERE DESIRE FOR PEACE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has taken bold and courageous steps to deescalate a war that nobody wants but the leaders in Hanoi. He has made an unprecedented personal sacrifice to prove his sincerity.

The President's announcement that the United States will halt the bombing of North Vietnam is a clear indication of our willingness to do everything possible to prove America's sincere desire for peace.

The President could do no more than what he has done. The American people will support him completely. The onus for peace now rests squarely in Hanoi. It is up to the leaders there to take steps of their own to move still further toward a major deescalation of the conflict.

President Johnson has acted with a generosity and compassion that all Americans will applaud. He has borne the brunt of this war for nearly 4½ years. It was the understatement of the year when he said:

> I have lived—daily—with the cost of this war. I know the pain it has inflicted and the misgivings it has aroused.

History will show that President Johnson has never been found wanting for either courage or wisdom. I am proud to stand with him in his efforts to bring an honorable peace to the people of South Vietnam.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader.

I want to add, Mr. Speaker, that I feel in the excitement of the past 36 hours, one vital element of President Johnson's speech of Sunday evening has received less attention than it really deserves.

I refer, of course, to President Johnson's announcement that he has ordered a stop to the bombing of most of North Vietnam, reiterated our willingness to negotiate in good faith, and appointed Ambassador Harriman to act as his personal representative in the discussions which we hope will commence soon with Hanoi.

All of these steps are fully consistent with President Johnson's earlier efforts to achieve peace in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the offer to sheath the

swords and to commence negotiations has been made once more.

The bombs are not falling on the vast areas of North Vietnam in which 90 percent of the population of that country lives.

The next step is up to Hanoi.

President Johnson, speaking on behalf of the American Nation, has done all he can. The responsibility for what happens next rests squarely with those who have started the conflict in Vietnam.

I hope and pray that our offer will result in positive steps toward peace. But I also think we ought to state clearly, here and now, that we cannot wait forever while the other side continues to fight.

It takes two to make peace.

We are waiting for Hanoi's move.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday night President Johnson spoke for all Americans in expressing the prayerful hope that America's deescalation of the Vietnam war will be followed by a similar gesture by Hanoi. And by his selfless actions he has given the Presidency one of its finest hours.

I think the Nation will strongly support these efforts toward peace made by President Johnson. For all of us share a common hope that a terrible and costly war can end quickly and honorably at the negotiating table.

I commend the President. I strongly support his efforts to encourage negotiation by placing on standby alert two of this country's most distinguished diplomats—Ambassadors Harriman and Thompson.

We know that unilateral deescalation is no substitute for mutual deescalation. But the world knows that it was the United States that demonstrated its commitment for peace in Vietnam. And all Americans will join with President Johnson in the prayerful hope that Hanoi will not reject America's generous and sincere desire for peace.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] has expired.

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY DESERVES A FAIR SHAKE IN THE PRESIDENTIAL "SPECULATION SWEEPSTAKES"

Mr. PUCINSKI. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, political pundits all over America are engaged in a huge debate as to who is going to be the successor to President Johnson as the Democratic candidate.

I would suggest that they not omit from their speculation the very active and highly respected Vice President of the United States, HUBERT HUMPHREY.

HUBERT HUMPHREY was a liberal long before many Johnny-come-lately's got into the picture. He has been more closely associated with the spectacular program of achievement on which the Democratic Party will run in 1968 than any man in Congress, and certainly he is one who has to be reckoned with and has to be recognized.

I would suggest to those who would like to write him off because of the quiet dignity with which he has conducted himself in office and the silence that he has assumed at this particularly critical time not be misinterpreted as any lack of qualification for consideration by the Democratic Convention.

In my judgment, as we look over the impressive field of potential candidates that the Democratic Party has to consider, certainly you cannot omit or ignore the spectacular record of achievement of Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY. His conduct as Vice President has been beyond reproach.

He is among those that all of America could rally around if the Democratic Convention decides to give him the nomination.

HUBERT HUMPHREY cannot be omitted from the current Presidential "speculation sweepstakes." I have no idea whom the convention will nominate and I intend to support whomever the convention selects. All I suggest here today is that Vice President HUMPHREY be given a fair shake in the "speculation sweepstakes."

It appears to me that many of the pundits would write him off before the Vice President even has had a chance to say whether or not he wants to run. I would suggest to the pundits that on the basis of their tremendously bad record of predictions to date, they cannot afford to omit HUBERT HUMPHREY from their speculations.

THE PRESIDENT SEEKS NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the President's decision not to accept his party's nomination for the Presidency was an act of patriotism and statesmanship unequaled in our Nation's history. It was made with the realization that the problems facing this Nation are too grave to be tossed about in the stormy seas of 1968 partisan politics—that they will only be solved through the actions of a nation united in a common purpose. The President's decision has given strength and leadership to this common purpose.

There is little question that many problems divide this Nation; in spite of partisan attacks, however, these problems are neither Democratic nor Republican, but American. The Nation is divided by racial strife, and yet the President has done more to alleviate the causes of that strife than any American in history. The Nation is divided by war, and yet the President has done more to seek an honorable peace than any other world leader.

By placing national duty above partisan politics the President has taken a strong step toward achieving the national unity so necessary to solve this Nation's problems, and he deserves the praise and support of all Americans. To paraphrase another great American President, Mr. Johnson asked not what his country could do for him, but what he could do for his country.

All Americans should ask themselves this same question. In spite of our many differences, the large majority of Americans desire peace in Vietnam and racial justice here at home. We should stress our similarities rather than our differences on these important national issues, because as a nation united we have the power to solve any problem. President Johnson has shown us the way; let us now follow his leadership.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

VISITACION ENRIQUEZ MAYPA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4386) for the relief of Visitacion Enriquez Maypa.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ARTHUR JEROME OLINGER, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 155) for the relief of Arthur Jerome Olinger, a minor, by his next friend, his father, George Henry Olinger, and George Henry Olinger, individually.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CHESTER E. DAVIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 233) for the relief of Chester E. Davis.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JOHN W. ROGERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1580) for the relief of John W. Rogers.

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

S. 1580

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That John W. Rogers, of Louisville, Kentucky, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the

United States of the sum of $700.80, representing overpayments of salary which he received as an employee of the Department of Labor (1) for the period from November 24, 1963, through January 20, 1964, incident to his erroneous within grade step-increase from grade GS–14, step 6 to GS–14, step 7, and (2) for the period from January 21, 1964, through December 19, 1964, incident to the erroneous determination of his salary rate when he was changed from grade GS–14 to grade GS–12, due to a reorganization downgrading his position, such overpayments having occurred as a result of administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said John W. Rogers the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

DWAYNE C. COX AND WILLIAM D. MARTIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2281) for the relief of Dwayne C. Cox and William D. Martin.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

E. L. TOWNLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11381) for the relief of E. L. Townley.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JOSEPH M. HEPWORTH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12119) for the relief of Joseph M. Hepworth.

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

H.R. 12119

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Joseph M. Hepworth, Chief Personnel Man, United States Navy (retired), of La Mesa, California, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $1,823.45, representing overpayments of disability retired pay made to him by the United States through administrative error from February 1, 1954, through June 30, 1964. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Joseph M. Hepworth, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delievered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, lines 8 and 9, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

JE–IL BRICK CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4058) for the relief of the JE–IL Brick Co.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1040) for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JOSEPH W. HARRIS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 991) to refer the bill (H.R. 14109) entitled "A bill for the relief of Joseph W. Harris," to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, as amended.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER, CONCORD, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2282) for the relief of certain employees of the Naval Weapons Center, Concord, Calif.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

INDIVIDUALS EMPLOYED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AT FORT SAM HOUSTON, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10327) for the relief of Louis J. Falardeau, Irva G. Franger, Betty Klemcke, Wineta L. Welburn, and Emma L. McNeil, all individuals employed by the Department of the Army at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

PEDRO ANTONIO JULIO SANCHEZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 126) for the relief of Pedro Antonio Julio Sanchez.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pre tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PAUL L., MARGARET, AND JOSEPHINE KIRSTEATTER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 909) for the relief of Paul L., Margaret, and Josephine Kirsteatter.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. DAISY G. MERRITT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 172) for the relief of Mrs. Daisy G. Merritt.

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

S. 172

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Mrs. Daisy G. Merritt, of Rockledge, Florida, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $552.90, representing overpayments of salary which she received as an employee of the United States Army Engineer District, Cape Canaveral, Florida, for the period from May 26, 1963, through July 16, 1966, incident to the erroneous determination of her salary rate upon her promotion from grade GS–5 to grade GS–6, effective May 26, 1963, the said Mrs. Daisy G. Merritt having been promoted to step 6 of grade GS–6, instead of step 5 of such grade, as a result of administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any

money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Mrs. Daisy G. Merritt the sum of any amounts received or withheld from her on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further call of the Private Calendar.

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

There was no objection.

PFC. JOHN PATRICK COLLOPY, [redacted]

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Private Calendar No. 381, the bill (H.R. 15591) for the relief of Pfc. John Patrick Collopy, [redacted].

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

H.R. 15591

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Private First Class John Patrick Collopy, a native of Ireland, who served honorably in the United States Army from April 25, 1966, until his death on July 15, 1967, shall be held and considered to have been a citizen of the United States at the time of his death.

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MILLS. 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. 80]

Abbitt	Gurney	Nichols
Ashley	Hardy	Nix
Brock	Hawkins	Pucinski
Button	Herlong	Resnick
Conyers	Karsten	Roth
Corman	King, Calif.	Selden
Dent	Lukens	Teague, Calif.
Dowdy	Matsunaga	Teague, Tex.
Gardner	Mize	Whalley
Gibbons	Morris, N. Mex.	Zablocki
Green, Pa.		

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 401 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 21, 1968:

H.R. 2901. An act to designate the Oahe Reservoir on the Missouri River in the States of North Dakota and South Dakota as Lake Oahe.

On March 28, 1968:

H.R. 12555. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize the provisions relating to payment of pension, and for other purposes.

On March 30, 1968:

H.R. 536. An act to convey certain Chilocco Indian School lands at Chilocco, Okla., to the Cherokee Nation.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTED BOARD OF EDUCATION ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 13042) to amend the act of June 20, 1906, and the District of Columbia election law to provide for the election of members of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1232)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13042) to amend the act of June 20, 1906, and the District of Columbia election law to provide for the election of members of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'District of Columbia Elected Board of Education Act.'

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the school is a focal point of neighborhood and community activity; that the merit of its schools and educational system is a primary index to the merit of the community; and that the education of their children is a municipal matter of primary and personal concern to the citizens of a community. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to give the citizens of the Nation's Capital a direct voice in the development and conduct of the public educational system of the District of Columbia; to provide organizational arrangements whereby educational programs may be improved and coordinated with other municipal programs; and to make District schools centers of neighborhood and community life.

"AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BOARD OF EDUCATION LAW

"SEC. 3. (a) Section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the board of education of the District of Columbia', approved June 20, 1906 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–101), is amended by striking out the first paragraph of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" 'SEC. 2. (a) The control of the public schools of the District of Columbia is vested in a Board of Education to consist of eleven elected members, three of whom are to be elected at large, and one to be elected from each of the eight school election wards established under the District of Columbia Election Act. The election of the members of the Board of Education shall be conducted on a nonpartisan basis and in accordance with such Act.

" '(b)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection and section 10(e) of the District of Columbia Election Act, the term of office of a member of the Board of Education shall be four years.

" '(2) Of the members of the Board of Education first elected after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, three members elected from wards and two members elected at large shall serve for terms ending January 26, 1970, and the other six members shall serve for terms ending January 24, 1972. The members who shall serve for terms ending January 26, 1970, shall be determined by lots cast before the Board of Elections of the District of Columbia upon a date set and pursuant to regulation issued by the Board of Elections.

" '(3) The term of office of a member of the Board of Education elected at a general election shall begin at noon on the fourth Monday in January next following such election. A member may serve more than one term.

" '(4) The members may receive compensation at a rate fixed by the District of Columbia Council, which shall not exceed $1,200 per annum.

" '(c)(1) Each member of the Board of Education elected from a ward shall at the time of his nomination (A) be a qualified elector (as that term is defined in section 2 of the District of Columbia Election Act) in the school election ward from which he seeks election, (B) have, for the one-year period immediately preceding his nomination, resided in the school election ward from which he is nominated, (C) have, during the three years next preceding his nomination, been an actual resident of the District of Columbia and have during such period claimed residence nowhere else, and (D) hold no elective office other than delegate or alternate delegate to a convention of a political party nominating candidates for President and Vice President of the United States. A member shall forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualifications required by this paragraph.

" '(2) Each member of the Board of Education elected at large shall at the time of his nomination (A) be a qualified elector (as that term is defined in section 2 of the District of Columbia Election Act) in the District of Columbia, (B) have, during the three-year period next preceding his nomination, been an actual resident of the District of Columbia and have during such period claimed residence nowhere else, and (C) hold no elective office other than delegate or alternate delegate to a convention of a political party nominating candidates for President and Vice President of the United States. A member shall forfeit his office upon

failure to maintain the qualifications required by this paragraph.

"'(3) No individual may hold the office of member of the Board of Education and also be an officer or employee of the District of Columbia government or of the Board of Education. A member will forfeit his office upon failure to maintain the qualification required by this paragraph.

"'(d) Whenever, before the end of his term, a member of the Board of Education dies, resigns, or becomes unable to serve or a member-elect of the Board of Education fails to take office, such vacancy shall be filled as provided in section 10(e) of the District of Columbia Election Act.

"'(e) The Board of Education shall select a President from among its members at the first meeting of the Board of Education held on or after the date (prescribed in paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of this section) on which members are to take office after each general election. The Board of Education may appoint a secretary, who shall not be a member of the Board of Education. The Board of Education shall hold stated meetings at least once a month during the school year and such additional meetings as it may from time to time provide for. Meetings of the Board of Education shall be open to the public; except that the Board of Education (1) may close to the public any meeting (or part thereof) dealing with the appointment, promotion, transfer, or termination of employment of, or any other related matter involving, any employee of the Board of Education, and (2) may close to the public any meeting (or part thereof) dealing with any other matter but no final policy decision on such other matter may be made by the Board of Education in a meeting (or part thereof) closed to the public.'

"(b) The second, third, fourth, and fifth paragraphs of such section 2(a) are redesignated as subsection (f), (g), (h), and (i), respectively.

"(c) Subsection (b) of such section 2 is repealed.

"(d)(1) The provisions of the Act of June 20, 1906, listed in paragraph (2) of this subsection, are amended by striking out the terms 'board of education' and 'board' each place they appear in such provisions and inserting in lieu thereof 'Board of Education' and 'Board', respectively.

"(2) The provisions of the Act of June 20, 1906, amended by paragraph (1) of this subsection are as follows:

"(A) Subsections (f), (g), (h), and (i) of section 2 of such Act (as so redesignated by subsection (b) of this section) (D.C. Code, secs. 31–102, 31–103, 31–104, 31–101).

"(B) Section 3 of such Act (D.C. Code, secs. 31–105, 31–108, 31–110, 31–111).

"(C) The first paragraph of section 5 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 31–112).

"(D) Section 12 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 31–117).

"AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTION LAW

"SEC. 4. The Act entitled 'An Act to regulate the election in the District of Columbia of electors of President and Vice President of the United States and of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes', approved August 12, 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1101 et seq.), is amended as follows:

"(1) The first section of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1101) is amended by inserting immediately after 'Vice President of the United States' the following: ', the members of the Board of Education,'.

"(2) Section 2 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1102) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"'(4) The term "ward" means a school election ward established by the Board under section 5(a)(4) of this Act.

"'(5) The term "Board of Education" means the Board of Education of the District.'

"(3) Paragraph (4) of section 5(a) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1105(a)(4)) is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon the following: '; divide the District into eight compact and contiguous school election wards which shall include such numbers of precincts as will provide approximately equal population within each ward; and reapportion the wards accordingly after each decennial census'.

"(4) Section 7 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1107) is amended—

"(A) by striking out in subsection (a) 'he registers in the District during the year in which such election is to be held.' and inserting in lieu thereof 'he is duly registered in the District on the date of such election. A person shall be considered duly registered in the District if he registers under this Act after January 1, 1968, and if after the date he registers no four-year period elapses during which he fails to vote in an election held under this Act.';

"(B) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

"'(d)(1) The registry shall be open during reasonable hours, except that the registry shall not be open (A) during the thirty-day period ending on the first Tuesday following the first Monday in November of each odd-numbered calendar year and of each presidential election year, (B) during the thirty-day period ending on the first Tuesday in May in each presidential election year, and (C) during such other period as the Board may provide in the case of a special election.

"'(2) The Board may close the registry on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. While the registry is open, any person may apply for registration or change his registration.'; and

"(C) by striking out in subsection (e) 'Municipal Court for the District of Columbia' and inserting in lieu thereof 'District of Columbia Court of General Sessions'.

"(5) Section 8 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1108) is amended—(A) by striking out in subsection (a)(1) 'thirty days' and inserting in lieu thereof 'forty-five days'; and

"(B) by adding the following new subsections at the end thereof:

"'(h)(1) Except in the case of the three members of the Board of Education elected at large, the members of the Board of Education shall be elected by the qualified electors of the respective wards of the District from which the members have been nominated.

"'(2) In the case of the three members of the Board of Education elected at large, each such member shall be elected by the qualified electors of the District.

"'(i) Each candidate in a general election for member of the Board of Education shall be nominated for such office by a petition (A) filed with the Board not later than forty-five days before the date of such general election; (B) signed by at least two hundred and fifty persons who are duly registered under section 7 in the ward from which the candidate seeks election, or in the case of a candidate running at large, signed by at least one hundred and twenty-five persons in each ward of the District who are duly registered in such ward; and (C) accompanied by a filing fee of $100. Such fee may be refunded only in the event that the candidate withdraws his nomination by writing received by the Board not later than three days after the date on which nominations are closed. A nominating petition for a candidate in a general election for member of the Board of Education may not be circulated for signatures before the ninety-ninth day preceding the date of such election and may not be filed with the Board before the seventieth day preceding such date. The Board may prescribe rules with respect to the preparation and presentation of nominating petitions and the posting and disposition of filing fees. In a general election for members of the Board of Education, the Board shall arrange the ballots in each ward to enable a voter registered in that ward to vote for any one candidate duly nominated to be elected to such office from such ward, and to vote for as many candidates duly nominated for election at large to such office as there are Board of Education members to be elected at large in such election.

"'(j)(1) The Board is authorized to accept any nominating petition for a candidate for any office as bona fide with respect to the qualifications of the signatories thereto if the original or fascimile thereof has been posted in a suitable public place for the ten-day period beginning on the forty-second day before the date of the election for such office. Any qualified elector may within such ten-day period challenge the validity of any petition by a written statement duly signed by the challenger and filed with the Board and specifying concisely the alleged defects in such petition. Copy of such challenge shall be sent by the Board promptly to the person designated for the purpose in the nominating petition.

"'(2) The Board shall receive evidence in support of and in opposition to the challenge and shall determine the validity of the challenged nominating petition not more than eight days after the challenge has been filed. Within three days after announcement of the determination of the Board with respect to the validity of the nominating petition, either the challenger or any person named in the challenged petition as a nominee may apply to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals for a review of the reasonableness of such determination. The court shall expedite consideration of the matter and the decision of such court shall be final and not appealable.

"'(k) In any election, the order in which the names of the candidates for office appear on the ballot shall be determined by lot, upon a date or dates and under regulations prescribed by the Board.'

"(6) Section 9 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1109) is amended—

"(A) by striking out 'for electors of President and Vice President' in the second sentence of subsection (b); and

"(B) by striking out 'Municipal Court for the District of Columbia' in subsection (e) and inserting 'District of Columbia Court of General Sessions'.

"(7) Section 10 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1110) is amended—

"(A) by striking out the second and third sentences of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) and the second sentence of paragraph (2) of such subsection;

"(B) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following new paragraphs:

"'(3) The first general election for members of the Board of Education shall be held on November 5, 1968, and thereafter on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of each odd-numbered calendar year.

"'(4)(A) If in a general election for members of the Board of Education no candidate for the office of member from a ward, or no candidate for the office of member elected at large (where only one at-large position is being filled at such election), receives a majority of the votes validly cast for such office, a runoff election shall be held on the twenty-first day next following such election. The candidate receiving the highest number of votes in such runoff election shall be declared elected.

"'(B) When more than one office of member elected at large is being filled at such a general election, the candidates for such offices who receive the highest number of votes shall be declared elected, except that no candidate shall be declared elected who does not receive a majority of the number of all

votes cast for candidates for election at large in such election divided by the number of at-large offices to be filled in such election. Where one or more of the at-large positions remains unfilled, a runoff election shall be held as provided in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, and the candidate or candidates receiving the highest number of votes in such runoff election shall be declared elected.

"'(C) Where a vacancy in an unexpired term for an at-large position is being filled at the same general election as one or more full term at-large positions, the successful candidate or candidates with the highest number of votes in the general election, or in the runoff election if a runoff election is necessary, shall be declared elected to the full term position or positions, provided that any candidate declared elected at the general election shall for this purpose be deemed to have received a higher number of votes than any candidate elected in the runoff election.

"'(D) The Board may resolve any tie vote occurring in an election governed by this paragraph by requiring the candidates receiving the tie vote to cast lots at such time and in such manner as the Board may prescribe.

"'(5) In the case of a runoff election for the office of member of the Board of Education elected at large, the candidates in such runoff election shall be those unsuccessful candidates, in number not more than one more than the number of such offices to be filled, who in the general election next preceding such runoff election received the highest number of votes less than a majority. In the case of a runoff election for the office of member of the Board of Education from a ward, the runoff election shall be held in such ward, and the two candidates who in the general election next preceding such runoff election received respectively the highest number and the second highest number of votes validly cast in such ward or who tied in receiving the highest number of such votes shall run in such runoff election. If in any case (other than the one described in the preceding sentence) a tie vote must be resolved to determine the candidates to run in any runoff election, the Board may resolve such tie vote by requiring the candidates receiving the tie vote to cast lots at such time and in such manner as the Board may prescribe.

"'(6) If any candidate withdraws (in accordance with such rules and time limits as the Board shall prescribe) from a runoff election held to select a member of the Board of Education or dies before the date of such election, the candidate who received the same number of votes in the general election next preceding such runoff election as a candidate in such runoff election or who received a number of votes in such general election, which is next highest to the number of votes in such general election received by a candidate in the runoff election and who is not a candidate in such runoff election shall be a candidate in such runoff election. The resolution of any tie necessary to determine the candidate to fill the vacancy caused by such withdrawal or death shall be resolved by the Board in the same manner as ties are resolved under paragraph (5).'

"(C) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

"'(b) All elections prescribed by this Act shall be conducted by the Board in conformity with the provisions of this Act. In all elections held pursuant to this Act the polls shall be open from 8 o'clock antemeridan to 8 o'clock postmeridian. Candidates receiving the highest number of votes in elections held pursuant to this Act, other than general elections for members of the Board of Education, shall be declared the winners.';

"'(D) by inserting after 'In the case of a tie' in subsection (c) the following: 'vote in any election other than an election for members of the Board of Education,';

"(E) by inserting after 'official' in subsection (d) the following: ', other than a member of the Board of Education,'; and

"(F) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) Whenever a vacancy occurs in the office of member of the Board of Education, such vacancy shall be filled at the next general election for members of the Board of Education which occurs more than ninety-nine days after such vacancy occurs. However, the Board of Education shall appoint a person to fill such vacancy until the unexpired term of the vacant office ends or until the fourth Monday in January next following the date of the election of a person to serve the remainder of such unexpired term, whichever occurs first. A person elected to fill a vacancy shall hold office for the duration of the unexpired term of office to which he was elected. Any person appointed under this subsection shall have the same qualifications for holding such office as were required of his immediate predecessor.'

"(8) The first sentence of section 11(b) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1111(b)) is amended by striking out 'the United States District Court for the District of Columbia' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the District of Columbia Court of Appeals'.

"(9) The following new sections shall be added at the end of such Act:

"'SEC. 15. No person shall be a candidate for more than one office on the Board of Education in any election for members of the Board of Education. If a person is nominated for more than one such office, he shall, within three days after the Board has sent him notice that he has been so nominated, designate in writing the office for which he wishes to run, in which case he will be deemed to have withdrawn all other nominations. In the event that such person fails within such three-day period to file such a designation with the Board, all such nominations of such person shall be deemed withdrawn.

"'SEC. 16. This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Election Act".'

"COORDINATION WITH THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

"SEC. 5. (a) The Board of Education and the Commissioner of the District of Columbia shall jointly develop procedures to assure the maximum coordination of educational and other municipal programs and services in achieving the most effective educational system and utilization of educational facilities and services to serve broad community needs. Such procedures shall cover such matters as—

"(1) design and construction of educational facilities to accommodate civic and community activities such as recreation, adult and vocational education and training, and other community purposes;

"(2) full utilization of educational facilities during nonschool hours for community purposes;

"(3) utilization of municipal services such as police, sanitation, recreational, maintenance services to enhance the effectiveness and stature of the school in the community;

"(4) arrangements for cost-sharing and reimbursements on school and community programs involving utilization of educational facilities and services; and

"(5) other matters of mutual interest and concern.

"(b) The Board of Education may invite the Commissioner of the District of Columbia or his designee to attend and participate in meetings of the Board on matters pertaining to coordination of educational and other municipal programs and services and on such other matters as may be of mutual interest.

"EFFECTIVE DATE AND TERMINATION OF OFFICE

"SEC. 6. (a) The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on May 15, 1968, except that—

"(1) the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, appointed under the Act of June 20, 1906 (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act), shall continue to exercise the powers, functions, duties vested in it under such Act (as in effect on such date);

"(2) vacancies in such Board shall be filled by appointment in accordance with such Act (as in effect on such date); and

"(3) the members of such Board appointed under such Act (as in effect on such date) shall continue in office; until such time as at least six of the members first elected to the Board of Education (under such Act as amended by this Act) take office."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
JOHN DOWDY,
DONALD FRASER,
BERNIE SISK,
ANCHER NELSEN,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
JOHN M. ZWACH,
SAM STEIGER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WAYNE MORSE,
ROBERT KENNEDY,
WINSTON PROUTY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13042) to amend the act of June 20, 1906, and the District of Columbia election law to provide for the election of members of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate struck out all the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference has agreed to a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. Except for technical, clarifying, and conforming changes, the following statement explains the differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference.

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

The conference substitute contains a provision, not in the House bill, stating certain findings relating to the function of schools in a community and declaring as the purpose of the Act to facilitate the participation of the citizens of the District of Columbia in the development and conduct of their schools through the election of a Board of Education, and to provide for the coordination of educational and other municipal programs.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Under the House bill members of the Board of Education could be reimbursed for expenses actually incurred in the performance of services as members of the Board. Reimbursement was not to exceed $100 in any month. The conference substitute provides that members of the Board will be compensated at a rate, not to exceed $1,200 per annum, set by the District of Columbia Council.

BOARD MEETINGS

The Board of Education law relating to the holding of meetings was not changed in the House bill. The conference substitute provides with certain exceptions that all meetings of the Board shall be open to the public. The Board is given authority to close to the public any meeting (or part thereof) which relates to matters involving employees of the Board. The Board is also given the authority to discuss any other matter in a closed session, but it is required to make its final policy decision on such other matter in an open session.

ELECTIONS

Date of first election.—The House bill provided that the first election for the members

of the Board of Education would take place on April 16, 1968. The conference substitute provides that such first election shall take place on Tuesday, November 5, 1968.

Date of succeeding election.—The conference substitute provides that suceeding elections shall be held in November of each odd-numbered calendar year.

Qualifications for Office.—Under the House bill an individual could not qualify to run for or hold the office of member of the Board of Education if he held any other elected office. The conference substitute permits individuals who have been elected to serve as delegates or alternate delegates to Presidential nominating conventions to be nominated for and hold the office of member of the Board of Education.

Hours Registry to be Open.—Under the House bill the registry was to be open during normal business hours. The conference substitute provides that the registry shall be open during reasonable hours.

Nominating Petitions: Filing Date.—The House bill amended the District of Columbia Election Act to require that nominating petitions for any election be filed no later than 56 days prior to the date of election. The conference substitute provides that such petitions shall be filed no later than 45 days prior to the date of election.

Nominating Petitions: Number of Signatures Required.—In the case of ward candidates, the House bill required in the first election that the ward candidate's nominating petition be signed by 50 voters registered in his ward; and required in each election thereafter that such petition be signed by at least 250 voters registered in his ward. The conference substitute requires the signatures of 250 registered voters in each election.

In the case of elections for candidates for election at large, the House bill required in the first election that such candidates' petitions be signed by at least 50 registered voters in each of the eight wards (for a total of 400 signatures); and required in each election thereafter that such petitions be signed by at least 200 registered voters in each of the eight wards plus an additional 400 registered voters (for a total of 2,000 signatures). The conference substitute requires that in each election petitions for candidates for election at large be signed by at least 125 registered voters in each of the eight wards (for a total of 1,000 signatures).

Election of At-Large Candidates.—Under the House bill a candidate for an at-large office had to receive at least a majority of the votes validly cast for such office before being elected.

Under the conference substitute, the majority vote requirement for election to an at-large office was clarified. When only one at-large office is to be filled in an election, the candidate for such office receiving the highest number of votes in excess of a majority of the votes validly cast for such office shall be elected. When more than one at-large office is being filled at a general election, the candidates for such offices who receive the highest number of votes shall be elected if they receive at least a majority of the number of all votes cast for candidates for election at large in such election divided by the number of at-large offices to be filled in such election.

Election of members to fill a vacancy in an at-large office.—The conference substitute contains a provision, not in the House bill, which provides that if a vacancy in an at-large office is to be filled at an election in which the full term of another at-large office is to be filled, the successful candidate who receives the lowest number of votes shall be elected to the vacant at-large office.

Restriction on running for more than one office.—The House bill amended the District of Columbia Election Act to provide that no person could be a candidate for more than one office in any election held under that Act and that if a person were nominated for more than one office he had to designate the office for which he would run. The conference substitute provides that no person may be a candidate for more than one office of member of the Board of Education and contains a provision identical to the House bill requiring persons nominated for more than one office of member of the Board of Education to designate the office for which they will run.

COORDINATING OF ACTIVITIES OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

The conference substitute contains a provision, not in the House bill, which requires the Board of Education and the District of Columbia Commissioner to develop procedures to assure maximum coordination of educational and other municipal services. The procedures shall cover such matters as design, construction, and utilization of educational facilities to accommodate community activities and utilization of municipal services to enhance the effectiveness and stature of the school in the community.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The House bill provides that the terms of office of members of the Board of Education appointed under the Act of June 20, 1906, before the date of enactment of the bill, will terminate when a majority of the members first elected to such Board take office. The conference substitute provides that the amendments made to the Board of Education law and the District of Columbia Election Act will take effect on May 15, 1968. However, it is further provided that, until such time as a majority of the elected Board take office, the appointed Board of Education will continue to exercise all of its powers, functions, and duties and vacancies in the appointed Board will continue to be filled by appointment. It is also specified that the terms of office of the appointed members of the Board of Education would terminate when a majority of the elected Board first takes office. Thus, only those provisions of the Board of Education law which are required for the election of members of the Board of Education will take effect on May 15, 1968. Accordingly, such new provisions of such law as those relating to the size of the Board, compensation, and meetings will not take effect until a majority of the members first elected to the Board take office.

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
JOHN DOWDY,
DONALD FRASER,
BERNIE SISK,
ANCHER NELSEN,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
JOHN M. ZWACH,
SAM STEIGER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GROSS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 1101—TO DISAPPROVE REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1

Mr. BLATNIK. 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 House Resolution 1101, to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the resolution may continue not to exceed 4 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLENBORN] and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

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 House Resolution 1101, with Mr. HUNGATE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] will be recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLENBORN] will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, my initial statement will be essentially a summary review or summary presentation of what is before us in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1968, and the resolution (H. Res. 1101) filed by three of our colleagues to disapprove of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1.

In essence, Reorganization Plan No. 1 would combine or bring together the Bureau of Narcotics, which now and for over 30 years has been in the Treasury Department, and the relatively new Bureau of Drug Abuse Control now in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These two combined would form a new bureau entitled the "Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs," with a Director at its head, and this new Bureau would be moved over and placed in the Justice Department.

Under the rule, both the plan and the disapproval resolution were referred to our Committee on Government Operations for study. The Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, which is our subcommittee, reviewed this plan in depth. We held 3 days of hearings, and I think the feeling in the committee was unanimous that ample opportunity was given for all points of view to be expressed by opponents, proponents, and others, plus other aspects that should be called to the attention of the Congress.

Our conclusion is that the reorganization plan is a good one. It will promote, within the limitations of authority already vested in these two bureaus by acts of Congress, more effective administration and more effective and efficient enforcement. The subcommittee and the full committee felt that this reorganiza-

tion plan should be permitted to go into effect, and therefore we recommend that the resolution of disapproval be defeated.

Now for a short discussion of the background. The Bureau of Narcotics in the Treasury Department has for many years—perhaps for over a third of a century—enforced the narcotics laws which relate to hard addictive drugs, such as heroin, opium, cocaine and, more recently, marihuana.

Our drug abuse laws more recently enacted in 1965 deal with the hallucinogens, such as LSD, and other stimulants, depressants, and other drugs that, when taken in sufficient dosage, result in abnormal mental, emotional, and physiological responses. While these drugs are designated as dangerous, they are generally considered to be nonaddictive.

I am not going into detail on this, which is simple in one sense but complicated in another, for while it may be nonaddictive in terms of physical symptoms, withdrawal symptoms, it can be addictive in the sense that there is a psychological addiction or psychological need for the supporting mechanism which this drug induces. At any rate, I am sure we all can see a rather close relationship between dangerous drugs and narcotics, the laws that Congress has enacted to control their use, and the governmental agencies that have been created to carry out these policies. There is widespread agreement that these agencies should be combined.

The areas of disagreement seem to be on where the new agency should be put and the emphasis that such location may place on the overall governmental attack on the narcotic and drug abuse problems.

We are faced with a most serious condition in our country today. Tremendous social distress and criminal consequences have resulted from the increasing use of narcotics and dangerous drugs. More and more people and, particularly, our youth in schools and colleges and on the streets, are being caught up by the attractiveness of the escape these drugs appear to provide—little realizing, of course, the price that must be paid and what must be done to meet the price. Many of these drugs are described as psychotoxic; that is, they poison the mind—inevitably leading to abnormal behavior and often to crime and delinquency.

In spite of the programs now being carried on, the problem is expanding. The number of narcotic addicts has increased 15,000 in the past 7 years and a large percentage of the new addicts are youths. The quantities of marihuana seized annually by the authorities have increased seven or eightfold in the past 4 years, suggesting how wide is its illegal use. As reported in our hearings Federal agents, in the past 18 months, "have seized over 600 million dosage units of controlled depressant and stimulant drugs, including over 2½ million dosage units of LSD and other hallucinogens."

In the 2 years of operation of the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control, 2,200 criminal investigations and 1,100 accountability investigations were made. Over 1,300 persons were arrested and out of 464 defendants, 458 or 98.7 percent were convicted and sentenced.

During 1966, 680 narcotics violators and 243 marihuana violators were convicted in the Federal courts. During the same year, 279 narcotic violators and 138 marihuana violators were convicted in State courts.

It is obvious from these figures that our enforcement program has produced results in terms of convictions. But looking at the increase in the use and abuse of drugs and narcotics—and our common knowledge confirms this even though statistics may be lacking—we certainly cannot say that our overall governmental effort has been a success. Improvement on a variety of fronts is called for. We need to know a great deal more about the sociological and psychological forces which make people prone to the use of these drugs. How can the weakness of body and will which produces abusers and addicts be avoided? What are the deeper motivations involved here and can they be controlled? The scientists and medical authorities in the Public Health Service and its Institute of Mental Health and in the Food and Drug Administration are all searching for answers to these vexing problems—through research being conducted in their own facilities and by research grants and contracts to our great universities, hospitals, and other institutions. This vital work, which will not be affected by this reorganization, will continue and we hope be productive of solutions.

These same divisions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare also have in being extensive public education and preventive programs which are essential to any successful attack on the abuse of dangerous drugs and narcotics. They provide materials and scientific information to schools and colleges and other institutions and organizations through which young people can be reached. This, too, will continue and not be affected by the reorganization plan.

Possibly, one of the most frustrating factors in this equation is finding an effective treatment and possible cure for those who get "hooked" on the hard narcotics and for those others who step on the dangerous drug escalator and move from one "thrill" to another more intense excitement until they lose touch with reality. Our success in this field has been extremely limited. Work is going on, of course, at the treatment centers at Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Tex. We are well aware that much more needs to be done—possibly a crash program such as has been effective in some other diseases. The reorganization will have little effect on what is being done except, we hope, give a greater sense of urgency to finding some remedy for the thousands of tragedies that move before our eyes but seem to be hopeless cases.

Now let us examine a bit closer the reorganization plan itself:

First. The plan transfers from the Treasury Department to Justice all functions of the Secretary of the Treasury now carried out by the Bureau of Narcotics. Other functions and duties of the Secretary with respect to the narcotics laws such as those of collecting taxes and duties will remain in Treasury and be carried out by the Customs Bureau and the Internal Revenue Service as at present. Justice, therefore, will not get in the tax collecting business through this plan. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, the entire Bureau of Narcotics and its personnel will be shifted to Justice. Appeals from decisions of the Bureau of Narcotics and the approval of narcotics regulations will likewise shift from the Secretary of the Treasury to the Attorney General. Laboratory services now performed by the Treasury Department with respect to the enforcement of the narcotics laws will go over to Justice. This is important because instant laboratory service must be available for the analysis of suspected narcotic substances. I think it is fair to say that with respect to the enforcement of the narcotics laws—except for tax and duty collection—the transfer is complete.

Second. The plan transfers from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare all functions under the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965, except the regulation of the counterfeiting of noncontrolled drugs. The Bureau of Drug Abuse Control and all of its agents and personnel will be transferred. Other incidental functions of the Secretary necessary to the administration of the Bureau such as approval of its regulations, and so forth, will be given to the Attorney General. BDAC does not have its own laboratories and uses those of the Food and Drug Administration for its analyses. This service will be continued under a firm agreement between the two departments until the new Bureau has sufficient laboratory service of its own. The text of a draft agreement relating to all services to be rendered the new Bureau by HEW is contained in our report.

Third. A new Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs will be established in Justice which will absorb and carry out the duties of both the Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Dangerous Drugs. This new Bureau will be on a level with other similar bureaus in Justice and will have a status commensurate with its important responsibilities. The Director of the new Bureau will report directly to the Attorney General.

Fourth. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget will administer the transfer of the property and funds to Justice.

Why should this plan be adopted?

First of all, because it makes a great deal of sense to put these two agencies together. When an agent looking for narcotics also finds illegal drugs he should be in a position to act against them. Today, he cannot. Our hearings showed that where illegal drugs are found, narcotics are often there and vice versa. This broadened authority for the agents will be bad news for the dopesters. The merger of these two bureaus will produce a better organization to carry out our Government's responsibility.

Organized crime is heavily involved in both narcotic and illicit drugs. The Justice Department is the major crime-fighting agency of the Government. The emphasis in enforcement will be against

the pusher, the big-timer, the syndicate, the large illegal manufacturers. The Attorney General told us this:

Drugs and narcotics are a very major part of crime in the United States. Organized crime handles billions, illegally, annually. One of the chief sources of its income, one of the major three, is trafficking in drugs and narcotics. Of the people arrested not only by the Federal agencies, but by State and local agencies in narcotics activities, a very substantial proportion are involved in lives of crime. They are criminals. Crime control requires the control of drugs and narcotics. It is a major national problem. And the responsibility for control of narcotics and dangerous drugs should be vested in the official in government who has the greatest concern with the control of crime. Not the person that is involved in education, or in welfare and health. Not the person that is involved in financing, in balance of payments, in taxes and in fiscal matters. Illegal drug traffic is a crime problem. It is a major crime problem. It cries for control. And I think the Department of Justice provides the best opportunities for the full realization of the Federal potential in that area.

There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Chairman, that the attack on organized crime can be more effectively pursued by the Department of Justice.

The soundness of placing this Bureau in Justice was foreseen by both the Hoover Commission many years ago and by the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse in its 1963 report. The Commission, headed by Chief Judge Barrett Prettyman, of the U.S. Court of Appeals, recommended—with the exception of regulatory functions—that the functions of the Bureau of Narcotics relating to the investigation of the illicit manufacture, sale, other distribution or possession of narcotic drugs and marihuana be transferred from the Department of the Treasury to the Department of Justice.

The Commission said:

Police work to stem the illicit traffic in drugs is a major criminal problem. And it requires a peculiar training and experience not normally possessed by officials chosen for expertise in the complexities of governmental finance, however earnest and dedicated they may be.

However, there is in the federal government a top line of command professionally chosen and trained for law enforcement. It is in the Department of Justice, whose principal concern is the investigation and prosecution of criminal violations of federal law.

This distinguished group made its recommendation before BDAC was set up but I believe its reasoning would inevitably have incorporated this agency in its proposal.

The adoption of this plan will eliminate a great deal of duplication in the work of these agencies and reduce the number of visits, audits, paperwork, and inspections that our pharmacies and other small businesses must contend with.

This plan is not being presented as an economy measure and there will not be a reduction of expenditures because the President has requested a substantial increase in the budgets of both bureaus for fiscal year 1969. Bringing together these related functions will produce greater efficiency of operations and substantial savings. For example, headquarters and field offices of the separate agencies will be brought together and administrative overhead will be cut down. Agents will be trained and made responsible for the control of both narcotics and dangerous drugs.

We listened carefully to the arguments of the opponents of this reorganization. They were not persuasive with us and I do not believe they will be persuasive with you. This is an important step in bringing our governmental mechanism in line with the requriements of an important social need.

I urge the Members to vote "nay" on the resolution.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is fair to say that nobody on the committee and probably nobody in this Chamber today is opposed to the merger of the law enforcement duties and responsibilities of the Bureau of Narcotics and of the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control. So let us make no mistake about it: our argument does not go to the question of merger. Our argument goes as to where that operation, once merged, should come to rest; and, second, how much of the present operations of the Bureau of Narcotics and of the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control should be transferred into a single agency, wherever it should be lodged?

Evidence was presented at the hearing, and it was a very complete hearing. I say here that the chairman and the majority were very generous and courteous as to the time they gave us in trying to get at the facts of this reorganization plan.

The evidence was clear that witness after witness who came before our committee was in favor of the merger, but when it came down to the question of "Why the Justice Department?" when it came down to the question of what the Justice Department would do that could not be done somewhere else or was not being done, then the witnesses got awfully vague. As a matter of fact, there is very little evidence in the record which supports the lodging of the merged entity in the Justice Department.

The report which has come to the floor with this bill is very short on supporting evidence as to "Why the Justice Department?"

Let us look at the plan for just a minute. The Bureau of Drug Abuse Control, which is commonly referred to as BDAC, is to be transferred to the Justice Department, except the function of regulating the counterfeiting of those drugs which are not controlled "depressant or stimulant" drugs. In other words, all the activities of BDAC, with this minor exception, are to be transferred into the Justice Department.

The Bureau of Narcotics is to be transferred into the Justice Department.

On its face we are told, then, that there will be a new Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs in the Justice Department. We do not know who will head it. We do not know what his philosophy will be. We do not know how the new agency will be controlled or handled.

One thing that is clear from the reorganization plan is this: There is given to the Attorney General of the United States, once this transfer is made, a blank check to do with the new agency as he will. There is nothing in the reorganization plan to prohibit the Attorney General if and when it suits his fancy to merge them in with the FBI, for example, so that the BDAC and BON conceivably could eventually come within the jurisdiction of the FBI.

We are told that the main reason for this proposal is that it will coordinate the activities of law enforcement in this field. The Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations has been holding hearings for almost a year now on the subject of coordination in the Federal Government in the field of organized crime. We have had witness after witness come to testify in these hearings that the coordination is good; that the Department of Justice with its Organized Crime Section has done an excellent job of coordinating the law enforcement activities of all of the Federal agencies involved with organized crime. It was likened to a wheel, with the Department of Justice sitting at the center and with the spokes going out to all of the other Federal agencies involved in the field of organized crime.

In my opinion, we found that there was good coordination, so the question naturally arises as to what better coordination will there be if this is put into the Department of Justice. Also the question comes to mind that if the transfer is made to the Department of Justice, then what will this do in effect to the coordination that presently exists within the other agencies? First, then, we might look at the Department of the Treasury where the Bureau of Narcotics is presently lodged. In the Treasury Department you will find the Bureau of Customs. The Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Customs have worked side by side for many years. They have had to work closely together. The Bureau of Narcotics is involved in the field of hard narcotics, such as heroin and others of that type. Most of these narcotics actually comes from overseas. Therefore, the BON and the Bureau of Customs have worked closely together so that foreign agents of the BON have tracked down suppliers in foreign countries. You have frequently read in the paper where the Bureau of Customs will stop somebody at the airport as they come in from some foreign country and take the narcotics from them. That has occurred for only one reason, namely, because the Bureau of Narcotics in some overseas country has followed this suspect for months and worked meticulously to track him down so that they can tell the Bureau of Customs, "Here is the man you want to catch when he gets off that plane at New York's International Airport." This is a very close relationship.

The Bureau of Narcotics also comes under the tax laws of the United States. Obviously, in the Department of the Treasury, where you have the Internal Revenue Service, there is a very close and delicate relationship between the Internal Revenue Service people and the Bureau of Narcotics as they proceed to

track down the criminals that deal in this field. The evidence has been clear that the Bureau of Narcotics and the Internal Revenue Service have one of the best records in the country of all Federal law agencies of convictions of criminals in the organized crime field when it comes to crime of a Federal nature. You also have in the Treasury Department the Secret Service and the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Unit, which deals with the criminal element which is closely ocordinated in the overall aspects of the work done in the Treasury Department, and the Bureau of Narcotics is a vital part of that department.

Now let us look over at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a moment where there is lodged the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control. BDAC is a part of the Food and Drug Administration. Of course, this is a part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I would just like to read briefly from the minority views in the committee report to point out to you very clearly how the coordination which presently exists within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been established.

Mr. Chairman, I am now quoting:

BDAC is located within the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) of HEW. As such it regularly draws upon the medical and scientific expertise of this agency. In fact BDAC presently assigns a number of its personnel to the Bureaus of Medicine and Science within FDA. BDAC also works closely with the Public Health Service and, especially, the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). Those within HEW, charged with the responsibility of alleviating the drug menace, are so cognizant of the need for effective coordination between BDAC and the scientific resources of the Public Health Service that they have created a Division of Drug Studies and Statistics within BDAC which is directed by an individual who holds a joint appointment between BDAC and NIMH. In addtion, HEW has only recently put through a reorganization which places one individual in supervision over the Public Health Service, NIMH, and FDA in order to improve the needed coordination that is so necessary between these agencies.

Coordination is also required and exists between BDAC and (1) the drug hospitals managed by the Public Health Service at Lexington and Fort Worth; (2) the Office of Education in youth and drug education programs; and (3) the Advisory Committee on Stimulant and Depressant Drugs which is charged with determining which drugs should be controlled under the law.

If BDAC were transferred to Justice, we are extremely doubtful that as effective coordination can be continued—thereby resulting in severely impeding effective drug enforcement.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is very close coordination presently existing within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, of which BDAC is a part. To remove this agency from that department obviously, then, is going to lessen the coordination within that particular agency.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are other procedures of coordination which presently exist but which will be concerned and affected by this proposed transfer.

For instance, presently, there is a very, very delicate balance set between the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control and the Bureau of Narcotics and the State officials who are involved in the enforcement of these provisions.

Mr. Chairman, I need not tell the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that over the years there have been a great deal of hearings held and a great deal of work has gone into this relationship with State officials. The State officials like it. They work well with the Bureau. They have established certain procedures that have worked effectively. I am not convinced—and the hearings which were held upon this matter did not convince me—that if this is transferred to the Department of Justice, this satisfactory relationship which now exists will continue. I fear that if once the Department of Justice is granted control over this field of operation, we will find a great number of States which will be somewhat reluctant to involve themselves to the extent that they have involved themselves with the operations of the present Bureau.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us look at the foreign situation. Presently, the Bureau of Narcotics has some 23 agents located and operating in foreign countries. If the Federal-State situation is delicate, then the foreign situation is even more delicate, because it has taken a long time and many years of hard work to build up this relationship between this agency and the representatives of foreign governments which are involved as well as the official representatives of these foreign governments.

Mr. Chairman, I am greatly concerned that if this agency should go into the sphere of the Department of Justice wherein is lodged the Federal Bureau of Investigation, we will find existing in certain foreign countries problems which do not presently exist. We are aware of what is going on in the world. We know that our Embassies and our libraries are stoned, we know that ink is thrown upon them, and that much of this is aimed at the authoritative power of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, if we substitute the Department of Justice for the Department of the Treasury, I am concerned about what is going to be the reception upon the part of foreign countries under this type of relationship.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that to transfer these agencies into the Department of Justice would amount to upsetting a very delicate arrangement between our country and other countries, as well as the Department of the Treasury.

We are told that this will bring about a better coordination of law enforcement, and I wonder where it will stop, then, if this transfer goes through, and will we later get a reorganization plan calling for the law enforcement section of the Securities and Exchange Commission to come into the Department of Justice, or the Post Office Inspectors, will they come into the Department of Justice?

The Labor Department has many investigators in the field of organized crime, and otherwise. The Federal Trade Commission has them, and there are many agencies involved in the Federal Government that, once this transfer takes place, would then be prime prospects for other transfers.

So we come to the question of whether it is desirable to open the door to the creation of a superagency in the Justice Department—is there an unhealthy concentration of power within the Justice Department?

These are things that concern me as I look at this proposal.

What little justification we have heard for placing these agencies in the Justice Department has been based on the organized crime problem. We inquired in the hearings how organized crime was involved in the drug and narcotics field. It is clear that organized crime is heavily involved in the hard narcotics—heroin, cocaine, those sorts of things, most of which again are brought in from overseas.

It is also clear that organized crime is not involved in marihuana——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

As I stated, it is also clear from the hearings that organized crime is involved, if it is involved at all, only to a limited extent in the question of pills and dangerous drugs that are controlled by the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control. So then organized crime is only a part and can only be a part of the justification for a transfer into the Justice Department based on the knowledge that we have today. But I want to talk to my colleagues about the subject that greatly concerns me in this transfer. We have to get down to the young people, the college kids, the high school kids and the junior high school kids, and who knows how much further down the grade level this thing progresses: We have to get down to them and convince them that drugs, narcotics, marihuana, LSD and all of these things are not for them. We have to conduct a good, effective, ongoing educational program. How are we going to do that?

If you transfer these two agencies into the Department of Justice, then you have got the Department of Justice people going to the schools, talking to them about narcotics, and I am convinced that the best way to get to the young people of this country and convince the young people that they ought not to be tangling themselves up with drugs is to be able to go in and talk with them from a medical standpoint, from a health standpoint, not that "if you take drugs you are going to jail, but if you take drugs, if you get mixed up with them, you are going to ruin your health and your life." That is the area that greatly concerns me when we talk about putting these agencies into the Department of Justice.

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

Mr. EWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Does the gentleman believe that the agency that has the prosecuting responsibility ought to be the same agency that goes into the schools and seeks to per-

suade our young men and women that they ought not to do this for health reasons? Is this the type of thing that the gentleman is objecting to by this resolution?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I believe it would be a tragic thing to have the Justice Department go in and talk to these young people about this subject from their particular slant.

Whatever angle they may put on it—when they are talking, they are representing the prosecuting division of the Federal Government. They are there representing the police end of the Federal Government. To me, it would be a tragic thing to carry on this fight on this basis.

Mr. WYMAN. If the prosecutor makes up his mind to prosecute, then he ought not be influenced thereafter by health factors affecting a defendant who is being prosecuted, should he? This is the judicial function, is it not?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I think you are right.

Mr. WYMAN. And if this measure, as it is proposed here, goes through, these inconsistent and incompatible functions will be mixed up in a single Government agency, the Department of Justice, is that not correct?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Surely, it will.

I might say, since the gentleman has been attorney general in his State, he knows what he is talking about in this field.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAHILL. First of all I want to compliment the gentleman not only for his statement here on the floor at this time but also to compliment him on the views expressed in the minority report, which I think are most illustrative. But I have some questions in my mind as perhaps some of our colleagues have and I wonder if the gentleman could answer a few questions.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I will do my best to answer the gentleman's questions.

Mr. CAHILL. First, there is a unanimity of opinion that there should be a merger; is that correct?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I think that is correct.

Mr. CAHILL. Where does the gentleman think—or what department of the Government does the gentleman think should have the jurisdiction?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I may say to the gentleman that my own personal opinion is that the merged entity ought to be in the Treasury Department. I would say further that I would not merge as much in the Treasury Department as is proposed to be merged into the Justice Department.

Mr. CAHILL. If there is to be a merger then is it the gentleman's opinion it should be in the Treasury Department?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. That is my own personal opinion. And that has no bearing on this partciular plan, however.

Mr. CAHILL. Has the Treasury Department through its officials expressed any opinion as to whether or not they would be agreeable to the merger and accepting the jurisdiction of the entire field of narcotics?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. The Under Secretary of the Treasury for Enforcement testified at the hearings. Obviously he was not there asking that it be put in the Treasury Department because he was speaking for the administration position. Upon questioning, he said that if it were put in the Treasury Department that it could be well coordinated and mesh in well with the Treasury function.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may respond to the question that has just been asked?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLATNIK. In further response to the gentleman may I read from a statement by Mr. Henry Giordano, the very able and respected Commissioner of Narcotics who is in charge of the Bureau of Narcotics in the Department of the Treasury.

In his testimony in response to that same question he responded as follows:

> In recent weeks, I have been working very closely with the Attorney General and members of his staff concerning the proposed transfer of our Bureau. I wish to assure you that I look forward to this transfer with great anticipation for I sincerely believe that it is in the best interests of the people of our country.

Mr. CAHILL. If the gentleman will yield further, it has been said here that the Treasury Department and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have done an outstanding job so far as narcotics are concerned. If that is true, can the gentleman explain why there has been an increase rather than a decrease in the availability of drugs and in the trafficking in drugs and in the use of drugs?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I think the answer goes into many psychological reasons and philosophical reasons that are far apart from the question of crime itself. I am not knowledgeable enough to give the gentleman an effective answer. But I would say it is the general attitude in the country—in many parts of the country—which general attitude lends itself to this idea—"Let's try this once" type of thing. And this is why, if I may say to the gentleman—this is why we suggest that the way to talk to these young people to stop this thing is not to talk to them from the standpoint of—"If you do this you are going to go to jail"—but rather, we should be saying to them that "it is for your own well-being and your own health—that you should not get yourself involved."

Mr. CAHILL. I understand, and I think the gentleman makes an excellent point. But I think that one of the things that bothers me is that we have to stop the source of supply and we have to shut the drugs off at their source. I wonder if the gentleman feels that there could be an improvement from that standpoint?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Certainly there could be an improvement. That is why again I say the minority on the committee agree that there ought to be a merger. The question, however, is where it should go and how much should be merged into the agency.

Mr. CAHILL. What the gentleman then is saying is that he and the committee agree that commonsense dictates that there should be a merging of these two groups, that there is duplication, and that the cost is doubled. Both agencies have field offices, as I understand it, in various parts of the country. I further understand that sometimes they are investigating the very same case without knowing it, and many of the drug manufacturers are being asked the same questions on more than one occasion.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. This is all correct.

Mr. CAHILL. So that actually something must be done. What the gentleman is saying is that he does not feel at this time there has been a sufficient case made out to transfer the responsibility to Justice.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Yes. What I am suggesting is that if you take the 300-odd agents we have spoken about in BDAC and the 300-odd agents in the Bureau of Narcotics and put them together, we have 600 agents, who, working together, can do a more effective job. The President himself has proposed an increase in the Federal budget for both of these agencies. I see the gentleman on the Appropriations Committee present. He may wish to talk further on this subject.

Surely this can be done. Surely you can cut out duplication in field offices where an agent is working side-by-side with an agent of a different bureau. Frequently one man could do the work of both.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a last question on this subject?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. One of the things that concerns me is the question of organized crime. In the past we in the Congress have been critical of the Attorney General. If we are not going to give him jurisdiction over one of the great sources that contributes to organized crime, narcotics, how can we then really hold him responsible if the job is not done as well as we feel it should be done in relation to organized crime? This is the thing that concerns me. If the chief law-enforcement officer of our country says it is necessary for him to combat organized crime to have jurisdiction over narcotics, and we deny him that jurisdiction, are we not then really saying that he is relieved of the responsibility as far as narcotics are concerned and their contribution to organized crime?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. May I say to the gentleman that in effect he does have jurisdiction. He does in effect have jurisdiction in that he, first of all, is the coordinator, not only of this particular one field in organized crime, but of all fields in organized crime.

Second, he is the prosecutor. He does take the cases to court. He does make the cases based upon the investigations of the Bureau of Narcotics, and he is inti-

mately involved in it as chief prosecutor for the Federal Government. It is his proper field, and he has the perspective for it.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman from New Jersey brought forth some questions here that should be answered. First, why can there not be a better job of preventing narcotics from coming into the United States? The small band of agents has done a fantastic job in the last 5 years. They have stopped almost a billion dollars worth of narcotics from coming into the United States. Furthermore, I might add, last year they went to the Bureau of the Budget and asked for 20 more agents. They have only 23 agents overseas, and that is where all the narcotics come from. They originate in Southeast Asia and Turkey, make a loop through Beirut and Sicily to Marseilles, France, where they are processed into heroin. Last year they asked for 20 additional agents, and the Bureau of the Budget cut out the appropriation for those agents. The Budget Bureau is the arm of the administration that is now so vitally interested in stamping out narcotics peddlers in the United States.

In answer to the gentleman's question as to whether Treasury feels we could move the responsibility for controlling dangerous drug addiction over to Treasury or whether it would work as well, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked the following question or made the following statement at the hearing:

> Mr. EDWARDS. I'm not trying to pull out of you where in fact it should be. I'm saying if it were in the Treasury Department, in your opinion could it be coordinated properly and effectively with Narcotics?

Mr. Hendrick, who is in charge of this agency as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury said:

> I would have to answer that question honestly in the affirmative.

So there is no difficulty here. Furthermore, I assume we all want to cooperate with the Attorney General. Some of us have been somewhat impatient that the Department of Justice has not moved fast enough, the Attorney General could coordinate all these agencies in an effort to stamp out crime at the present time.

They are the ones who go in and prosecute these cases, and they will continue to do so if Narcotics is left in Treasury. I think they have the laws and facilities to stamp out crime if they want to roll up their sleeves and get busy doing something about it.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for their contributions.

I will hit just one more point and then I will finish. That point is, what is going to happen in the event of transfer to Justice as far as business and manufacturers and wholesalers and retailers and pharmacists and druggists and physicians are concerned? All of these people now are being checked as far as their records are concerned—all those who deal in the drug field. Ninety-five percent of all drugs in this country, the pill-type drugs, are produced in legitimate laboratories. I suggest that it would be a terrible thing to have the Justice Department officials then calling on those private people, those private enterprise establishments, those small business people, those physicians. Just the fact that the Justice Department calls on them leaves me cold, when again in over 95 percent of the cases everything is legitimate and it is purely a regulatory investigation.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, I know the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control Act was passed in 1965. Can the gentleman ascribe any reason why that was not assigned to Treasury at that time instead of to HEW? Had that been done in 1965, we would not be faced with this problem today. I wonder if there is an explanation why it was not assigned to Treasury at that time?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] on that.

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe the question the gentleman asked was rhetorical. There is, of course, a difference between the functions of the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the function of the Bureau of Narcotics in the Treasury Department. In the latter case, the principal function is law enforcement in nature. In the former case, the principal function is regulatory in nature.

The drugs with which the BDAC deals are described as the dangerous drugs, and those with which the Bureau of Narcotics deals are narcotics' addictive drugs. I think that is probably the reason the distinction was made when the act was passed in 1965.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may ask the gentleman from Virginia, then, Does the gentleman believe that these agencies should remain separate and apart now, as they were in 1965?

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I believe strongly that all law enforcement functions in the narcotics field should be merged. I believe strongly that all regulatory functions in the narcotics field should be merged. I feel strongly that both should not be consolidated under the same roof.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, is it true that the Hoover Commission recommended this in 1949?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I will say to the Speaker, it is true, but I will also say there was no such thing as BDAC at that time. What the Hoover Commission did recommend was the Bureau of Narcotics be moved to the Justice Department.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, as I understand my friend, he finds the two agencies should be merged someplace.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the gentleman does not know where to go now?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. My personal feeling is they ought to be in Treasury.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know. But the report is that there is no determination where they should go. Your own personal impression is to Treasury?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I have introduced a bill to that effect; yes, sir.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, this is vitally important to have them merged together, because I think the gentleman will agree this is one field where the organized racketeer and underworld operate. Is that correct?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. In a good portion of this field, yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman talks about the user, and we can sympathize with the unfortunate person who uses these substances. When I read about the young men, whether in or out of college, or young ladies being arrested for the use of drugs, I feel very sorry for them, looking into the future in terms of their own lives and their journey through life and also in terms of their loved ones.

It is vitally important that we get at the organized crime, at these evil-minded individuals who have no regard for morals, who have absolutely no regard for the dignity of the individual, who have no regard for anything other than a corrupt intent to make money and to do it in violation of the law and under any conditions.

Does the gentleman think, in the light of this, it is vitally important that we have these two agencies merged in order that there can be coordination and effective prosecution of those whom we want to have prosecuted?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. There is no argument over that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Furthermore, I agree with my friend about the education. I have thought of that a lot. We are only human beings. A youngster today is under tremendous pressure. The world has changed a lot. We must appreciate that. We must be broad and tolerant and understanding. I agree with my friend about education and doing everything possible, but that would be done anyway.

The important thing is to get at that group, which exists in many fields, of those who are making money at any expense under any conditions, that despicable type of organized racketeer who is in many fields of operation, and particularly operates and flourishes in the field of narcotics and drugs and similar activities.

Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I agree with that.

May I say, also, of course the problem is, with respect to a reorganization plan, we either take it or leave it. I did not object to this reorganization plan until I

had introduced my own bill proposing affirmative action.

Lest anybody misunderstand my position in this thing, I believe that those who deal in narcotics ought to be put under the jail. I introduced a bill to stiffen the penalties in this field before the administration bill was even considered for introduction.

I do not want to come here and suggest to anyone that I am not just as strong as the Speaker, as to trying to find the answer with respect to hardened criminals in this field. I am suggesting to the Speaker that the President's proposal has flaws, and there is a very simple way to correct those flaws. It is by acting on legislation in this body—and it can be done quickly—to correct these flaws, and bring a bill to the floor. I am sure it will have overwhelming support.

Mr. McCORMACK. None of my questions even remotely intimated, nor did I have in mind any thought, other than the high motives of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I am sure of that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. The thought in my mind was as to the importance. This has been recommended by the President. This is a very important action in connection with the fight against organized crime. It would seem to me we ought to let this reorganization plan go through. Then we can take up the gentleman's bill.

The thing to do is to act quickly and to have this centralized somewhere, where there can be vigorous prosecution of the underworld and of the racketeers who have risen to tremendous power in this country and who use their illicit profits, as we know, to enter into legitimate business, but carry on their intents and purposes.

It would seem to me the logical thing to do—and I am talking to my friend because I know his fairmindedness—is to let this reorganization plan go through and then let us take up the other question. By the reorganization plan going through we will have it in an agency where there will be complete coordination in getting at the underworld and the organized racketeers.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I thank the Speaker for his comments.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I certainly want to join with the gentleman from Alabama in the statements he has made. As a member of the Committee on Government Operations, I recognize his leadership in this area. It seems to me that his position is the correct one. These agencies should be merged, but they should not be merged in the Department of Justice.

To the extent that quick action is required, and indeed this is a very serious subject, I believe the urgency should be recognized by the committees of the House that have jurisdiction over the legislation introduced by the gentleman from Alabama. As he properly pointed out, the Reorganization Act is simply a technique of legislating. It is a procedure whereby we either vote the administration's proposal up or down. Certainly the Reorganization Act and this particular bill do not preclude in any way the Congress of the United States or in this instance the House of Representatives from dealing with this matter on our own and using our judgment as to how we can best deal with this very serious problem.

I do feel that the gentleman has made a very important statement, and I am pleased to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the President—and I do not ordinarily run around saying this—for bringing this proposal to the attention of the House. I think he has done a good job in stimulating thought on our part bringing it to us, but I very strongly feel that what he has proposed can be improved upon and the way to do this is to have the committee act on it.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I want to make sure that the record is absolutely clear. We agree wholeheartedly with what the honorable Speaker has said and none of us here who oppose this reorganization plan condone the despicable individuals who prey on our youth in this country in regard to the problem of narcotics and narcotic peddling.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. However, I want the record to be completely clear that I have heard no one—no one at all—criticize the job that the Bureau of Narcotics has done under that great Commissioner Anslinger, and more books have been written about him and his leadership, and now the present Commissioner Giordano. Everyone has praised these people for the job that they have done. I was very critical when the administration came up before our committee and the Narcotic Bureau asked for 20 more agents to help stamp out these peddlers in the United States to stop them from bringing in narcotics from oversea countries. They were denied these 20 extra agents. All of a sudden they have become alarmed about this problem which has been with us for many years.

Let me tell you what Mr. Anslinger said when he was before our committee. He said:

> Do you want to help stamp out narcotics? If you do, get judges to mete out tougher sentences, because they do not do it now in New York City, which has 50 percent of the addicts. We did it in Massachusetts. We got tougher laws with mandatory jail sentences. In the States that have done it, narcotics peddling has gone down. Massachusetts is one of these States. I was the author of one of the laws there. This is what we need. We need tougher laws and tougher judges to mete out tougher sentences.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would like to finish with one or two comments, and then I will be glad to yield to whoever would like to have the floor.

I want to point out one additional thing. Presently the determination of what is a dangerous drug is made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and by medical people and those who know what is in the drug and what makes it dangerous. Under the proposal that has been presently sent up, where this agency will go to the Department of Justice, this determination of what is a dangerous drug will be made by the Attorney General of the United States. Obviously he will make that determination based on medical evaluation, but in a proper analysis under the plan the determination of what is a dangerous drug will be made by a lawyer rather than a doctor. I think this is a material fault in the transfer plan as it is set up. I think we need strict enforcement. We are getting it now, and it can be helped by merging certain functions of these two agencies, but I think we need to have the Congress act on it in order to correct the flaws in the present proposal and bring an early bill to the floor in order to do what we have suggested here today.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, if I have any more time.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman.

My question is this: In view of the fact that two separate committees of the Congress have jurisdiction over these matters, can we really merge these operations by a single act of legislation that comes out of a single committee?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I would suggest to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] that the Speaker routed my bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce wherein it is presently lodged, a bill which was drawn to merge the two agencies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Now, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I am addressing myself and my remarks to the point made by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama wherein the Attorney General would have the authority to determine which drug is dangerous; that statement, essentially, is true. However, in its full context it does not work that way. In connection with that statement I would like to quote from the hearings which were held upon this resolution and this reorganization plan, on the procedure in arriving at a determi-

nation as to whether or not a drug is dangerous. All of us must admit that this decision is extremely complicated and delicate. Therefore, I wish to read from the testimony of Mr. Finlator, Director of the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, wherein he states as follows:

A thorough knowledge of these dangerous drugs and what they do, coupled with an understanding of the drug abuser and why he abuses drugs, is essential to BDAC's mission.

We have an Advisory Committee on Stimulant and Depressant Drugs composed of eight nationally known scientists who report administratively to me. This Committee studies and advises us on any drug before it is placed under control. The Committee and its functions will be transferred to the Department of Justice with this Bureau.

Further, he stated as follows:

In order for the Committee to consider a drug for control, a large amount of information must be gathered. One of the sources of such information, especially for stimulants and depressants, is the Investigational New Drug Forms (IND's) and the New Drug Applications (NDA's) which are submitted by the pharmaceutical industry to the Bureau of Medicine of FDA.

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to associate myself with the views so capably and patiently expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, my colleague on the Government Operations Committee [Mr. EDWARDS], with whom I have joined in introducing this resolution of disapproval of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 to merge the Bureau of Narcotics—now in Treasury—and the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control—now in Health, Education, and Welfare—and transfer them to the Department of Justice.

As with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS], my opposition to the reorganization plan does not arise from a disagreement with the merger idea. That opposition springs primarily from the proposed location of the merged bureaus in the Justice Department under the control of the Attorney General.

While "organized crime" certainly is a factor in the traffic in narcotics, it is less a factor at present in traffic in dangerous drugs. The narcotics trade has been a threat to our people and has been a factor in organized crime for some years. An outstanding job in the control of this traffic by the Bureau of Narcotics within the Treasury Department has been done and there has been full cooperation with the Justice Department where organized crime has been involved.

As a matter of fact, one need only note recent figures to discover that a majority of cases instituted against the organized underworld have originated in agencies outside the Department of Justice. In addition to the Post Office Department, the Securities Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and many others—the Internal Revenue Service, the Bureau of Customs, and the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division of Treasury have joined with the Bureau of Narcotics to be among the most aggressive agencies in our Government in referring cases against organized crime to the Justice Department.

The Bureau of Drug Abuse Control, a recently created agency, has also joined this list.

There was little evidence submitted in the hearings before the Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, to indicate that the Department of Justice, in general, or the Attorney General, in particular, had any special expertise with regard to narcotics or dangerous drugs, or even organized crime, that is not matched or surpassed by the Treasury Department or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Justice Department simply does not have the relationships with either the nations from which narcotics originate or the industry which does the research and development on potentially dangerous drugs to do as effective a job as is now done by Treasury and Health, Education, and Welfare. There is even a severe question in my mind as to whether the relationships with State and local governments by Justice Department personnel is as effective as the relationships enjoyed by Treasury and HEW with their enforcement counterparts at the local and State level.

To suggest that crime can only successfully be tackled by a monolithic administrative structure is essentially naive. The danger from the threat of corruption or maladministration within the enforcement structure compounds with centralization. Two or three agencies tackling organized crime from different vantagepoints would seem to be more than two or three times as effective on the strength of the evidence we now have.

The Justice Department does not enjoy the delicate relationship with drug manufacturers which it is important for the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control to have. It does not enjoy the delicate relationship with foreign countries which it is important for the Bureau of Narcotics to have. Some of the present assignments of Justice—in the field of antitrust activities, for instance—are not designed to encourage full cooperation by private firms with that Department in BDAC matters; and the reputation of Justice as a primarily domestic agency involved in the anti-Communist battle may not be an image that would help maintain its agents in foreign countries where they must tackle the narcotics problem at the source.

Nor again, does the inexperience of the Department of Justice in the technical area of medical science and research encourage me to feel that Justice is the best repository for either of these agencies.

I am not impressed by the administration's sudden concern with the threat from organized crime. The Justice Department has been aware of this threat for years and the problem has grown worse. And other departments of the Federal Government have done as well or better in the enforcement area than has Justice.

Neither is the administration's sudden concern with the danger to our Nation from narcotics and drug abuse very impressive. As late as 6 months ago, a public conflict between the head of the Food and Drug Administration and the head of the Bureau of Narcotics indicated an unfortunate ambivalence within the administration on this delicate problem. To resolve this administrative conflict between two experts by the expedient of throwing the "soft line" versus "hard line" argument into Justice would appear to me to be an administrative folly. I am personally not ready to resolve this conflict in governmental approach by throwing both approaches into an inexpert "enforcement" agency.

However, again, with my colleague, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, I have introduced legislation to combine BDAC and the Bureau of Narcotics in a coordinate relationship within the Treasury Department. The purpose of this substantive legislation is to bring about hearings so that the appropriate committees in the Congress can make a final and logical determination as to how the combination of these two exemplary agencies can best be accomplished without having an adverse effect on the work of either one and under what administrative cabinet leadership the two can be best represented.

As the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] has noted, our legislation has been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on which I serve, the committee of jurisdiction over the Food and Drug Administration.

This legislation will be subject to subcommittee and full committee analysis and amendment, as well as analysis and amendment by all the Members of the House. In this regard, the substantive legislation is a vast improvement over the President's "take it or leave it" Reorganization Plan No. 1.

As I have pointed out on many previous occasions, the reorganization plan is a reverse legislative process, always questionable at best, specifically designed to bring about efficiency and economy in Government from the standpoint of organizational factors only. The reorganization plan procedure should not be used as a substitute for substantive legislation or to frustrate the congressional prerogative of rull hearings and amendments in order to make policy changes within the executive branch of Government. Certainly in the increasingly complicated area of narcotics traffic and drug abuse, full consideration ought to be given to what Government policy should be. Also, most assuredly, a reorganization plan recommended almost 20 years ago would no longer seem to be the appropriate justification for the specific plan we are debating today—particularly when one agency involved in the plan was not even in existence then and many of the drugs which that agency is designed to control were not even dreamed of.

I would suggest to my colleagues that the way for the Congress to tackle the serious problems presented by drug abuse and narcotics control would be to defeat

this "frozen" unamendable plan of the President's and take up through the normal committee procedure immediately, the substantive legislation the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] and I have introduced so that it can be considered in committee, amended, and perfected.

Surely, such an approach, if the leadership within the Congress will encourage prompt action by the appropriate Members of the Congress, will not unduly delay our arrival at a prompt and best solution to this threat from narcotics and dangerous drugs—at least it will delay it no more than the administration's recent refusal to permit the addition of 20 agents of the Bureau of Narcotics.

I urge you to cast an "aye" vote today in favor of the resolution of disapproval in order to defeat this proposed reorganization plan so that the Congress can give full study to this matter.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], a member of the subcommittee as well as a member of the full committee.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the President's reorganization plan.

I have just listened to the very responsible and cogent presentation of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS]. I am glad that the gentleman has narrowed the argument and the dialog by endorsing the idea of putting together in one department the Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control.

So the only thing before us in the Committee this afternoon is where is the best place to put them? I believe the President, on balance, has done the right thing in directing under the plan that they be centralized in the Department of Justice. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] feels that the Treasury Department would be a better place.

Well, the men we pick nowadays for our Secretaries of the Treasury tend to be more experienced in finance, in taxation, in the dollar, in gold, and they are not likely to have much experience or learning either in the problem of drugs or in the problem of the enforcement of drug control legislation.

Equally, the men we call to the office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, are likely to be long on the social sciences, and are not likely to be full of expertness in the field of law enforcement.

The reason the President has selected the Department of Justice as the central focus for these tough problems is because the primary task is to coordinate our criminal law enforcement activities, and the crime prevention program of the Federal Government.

Equally, it is important to preserve the congressional intent that the State law enforcement programs and the local law enforcement programs be afforded the finest training in law enforcement and crime prevention that the Federal Government can extend.

By consolidating these two bureaus in the Department of Justice as a new bureau, equal in stature to the FBI, the President has indicated his deep concern with the drug problem. Law enforcement simply is not a primary responsibility of the Treasury, nor is it a primary responsibility of HEW, which are the two loci of the programs today.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a matter of fact, ultimately where there is any prosecution it comes to the Department of Justice; does it not?

Mr. REUSS. That has been true, and of course it would continue.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let us see the journey it has to take before it gets to the Department of Justice now.

Here is the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, and here is the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control, which is under the Food and Drug Administration. It has to go from there to the Administrator of the Food and Drug Administration; then it goes right across to the same Department, to the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. From him it goes to the Secretary. From there it goes to the Department of Justice. There are four moves before it gets to the Department of Justice.

Let us take the Treasury Department. Here is the Bureau of Narcotics. The Bureau of Narcotics has to go through the Special Assistant to the Secretary, then from him up to the Secretary, before it gets over to the Department of Justice. There are three moves involved there.

Now it is proposed to merge this activity in one division under the Department of Justice, and on the same level as the FBI, the Bureau of Prisons, Immigration and Naturalization, Community Relations Service, and the U.S. attorneys. So it goes from there directly up to the Attorney General, the same as the other agencies on the same level.

So by this action of merger you have direct action, the other way it has to go through several routes before it ultimately gets to the Department of Justice.

Furthermore, when one agency now finds out that they come across some activity which belongs to another agency, like the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare finds it belongs to the Treasury Department, or vice versa, they practically cease their investigation, and they have to turn it over to the other agency, whereas under this merger, recommended by the Hoover Commission years ago, there would be direct action. And in the bill introduced by the gentleman from Alabama nobody knows how long that will take. It may take months, if at all. And in the meanwhile in the enactment of this reorganization plan we are directly attacking the organized criminal.

Mr. REUSS. The Speaker of the House has made an important point. As he has just suggested, under the present arrangement, narcotics matters, before they get to the Department of Justice for law enforcement, have to thread a bureaucratic maze, which inevitably means that law enforcement cannot be as efficient as it can be under the proposed plan.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true, also, that a Narcotics Bureau agent apprehending and arresting a man who has heroin in his pocket and also has LSD material and "speed" material and marihuana—that agent can only arrest him for possession of heroin. As to the other elements, he has no authority to arrest him for those other elements.

On the same cross basis, the Drug Control Abuse agent is looking for marihuana and LSD and "speed" and these other types of hallucinatory or hallucinogenic drugs, and if he finds heroin, he cannot arrest the person for having possession of heroin and make a criminal case against him.

But under the consolidation of the 300 agents in the Drug Control Abuse and the 300 agents in the Bureau of Narcotics there will be in the new Bureau authority for every agent to arrest for all purposes, both heroin and the drugs that I have mentioned; is that not true?

Mr. REUSS. Yes, that is true.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And at the present time—and this just illustrates the divided fight on crime—everyone knows and the testimony shows that many of these young people who get hooked on marihuana and "speed" and LSD eventually go to the stronger drug, heroin, and many of these pushers who push marihuana and LSD graduate into heroin selling and become opiate pushers. So you have a concentration on the part of organized crime to make money out of the illegal use of narcotics and drugs and on the other hand you have diversity and a split operation on the part of the Government in attacking the organized crime syndicate.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman from California has indicated a real absurdity, if I may say so, in the present structure—in that a Bureau of Narcotics agent may frisk a dope pusher and find heroin on him and then, because there is also an LSD aspect to the case, it then trickles up through the bureaucratic maze within the Department of the Treasury, as the Speaker of the House has described, and then goes through a Secretary of the Treasury who is concerned with the London gold market, let us say, and then it goes over to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, going through a Secretary who is primarily concerned with broad social issues rather than with law enforcement, and finally it gets down to the Bureau of Drug Abuse and Control agent who then—theoretically—can participate in the law enforcement. It is to this difficult problem and the absurdity of that sort of thing that the reorganization plan is directed.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And furthermore the narcotics agent has no right to confiscate the marihuana or the LSD material and thereby loses that phase of the prosecution which would be involved in securing the evidence.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. And in the meanwhile the organized criminal is operating.

Mr. REUSS. Yes. That is the point that

we need to address ourselves to, I think. Because while, of course, there are social and health aspects of a most important nature in the drug problem, what we are here concerned with is the enforcement of drug control laws, and that is why it makes such sense to centralize them in the Department of Justice.

If one looks at some of the agencies in the Department of the Treasury, they almost all have a functional relationship to Treasury business. The Secret Service, for example, protects the currency, and that is Treasury business. The Internal Revenue Department collects taxes, and that is Treasury business.

The Customs Service collects the import duties, and that is Treasury business. But narcotics has no more to do with the Treasury than almost any other function of the Department of Justice, and its presence in the Treasury in the first place is nothing but a historic anomaly.

This reorganization plan will unify and better direct the efforts of the two presently existing bureaus, and increase coherence among Federal, State, and local law-enforcement agencies in their fight against the traffic in drugs.

Presently, both enforcing units hold training schools and seminars for local and State law enforcement officials. Except for the differences in the drugs involved, each organization teaches advanced investigative methods and the legal ramifications involved in conducting criminal investigations. These schools have a twofold value. In addition to gaining information concerning drugs, the attending law enforcement officers are sharpening their skills and updating their knowledge in the area of general criminal law.

Combining these two educational programs will avoid duplication of training in law enforcement and will substantially increase the scope and the number of individuals who receive this training.

These two bureaus will now be joined and as part of the Department of Justice can attack to get at the drug problem and the racketeering syndicates. The Attorney General plans to continue and to expand the cooperative educational program with State and local enforcement agencies. Educational and enforcement cooperation will now have the benefit of being under the direct supervision of the one Cabinet officer who maintains daily contact with law enforcement offices throughout the Nation.

I commend the President's action, and urge that the disapproval resolution be defeated.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman believe that the U.S. Coast Guard in peacetime should, by the same logic, not be an arm of the Department of the Treasury?, and/or now the Department of Transportation?

Mr. REUSS. Yes; I happen to believe that that is a burden on a finance-oriented Secretary of the Treasury that it is well we freed him of. That is not before us this afternoon.

Mr. HALL. I would like to say that this was handled by the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of the Congress insofar as the assignment of surveillance, oversight, review, and jurisdiction is concerned; before the resolution passed overwhelmingly by the other body was emasculated here by various techniques.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 1101 and I support the proposed Reorganization Plan No. 1, which would place the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control in the Department of Justice in a single, consolidated Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

I feel that we do need a single unified effort to meet the increasing illegal traffic in marihuana, the hard narcotics, LSD, and other hallucinogens, stimulants, and depressant drugs, such as the amphetamines and barbiturates.

Of course, this subject has been discussed. There are about 300 enforcement agents in the Bureau of Narcotics and 300 enforcement agents in the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control, and presently each group, for the most part, works independently of the other, and thus there is lacking a concentrated effort which is needed to curb the increasing drug abuse.

By consolidating the Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control into a single bureau, the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, we are in effect doubling the effective manpower which can be deployed to meet this problem. The Department of Justice is responsible for coordinating the general Federal law-enforcement efforts, because both the Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control are also essentially and mainly devoted to law-enforcement, and they can be easily assimilated into the unified effort envisioned in Reorganization Plan No. 1.

Moreover, this consolidation would mean better contact with State and local agencies concerned with illegal drug traffic and abuse.

I have expressed some concern about this reorganization plan and I have felt that it might be attempting too much because of the clinical and pharmacological determination of what drugs should be controlled would be taken away from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and placed in the Department of Justice.

However, in discussion this question with the officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, they do feel that this determination should be placed within the Department of Justice because they feel that when the enforcement people and the people in the field who are involved with the finding that certain drugs or combination of drugs are being used, they feel they can more quickly meet the problem if we center in the one agency the determination of what drugs should be curbed and placed on the dangerous drug list.

I have discussed this with the chairman of the committee concerned with this particular reorganization plan—and I might ask him to respond to this—to the effect that if we feel the scientific determination on what drugs should be on the list to be enforced should remain in HEW, in the scientific community, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Alabama, then this can be done by a simple amendment to one of the bills put out by the legislative committee. It is my understanding that the gentleman who is now chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], would give sympathetic support to this approach, if this was determined to be a better determination at that time, even though HEW now feels it should go to the Department of Justice.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman raises a very valid point. I am not only sympathetic, but rather supportive of the fact that a committee of Congress ought to give this a good hard second look, and I hope perhaps hold hearings, and see whether or not a better mechanism can be set up, if necessary to handle this very important and responsible and difficult matter of determining just what drugs are dangerous, and why, and how to respond.

We are getting not only dangerous drugs, but synthetics, and users are using them not only singly, but in combination, and they are getting complex side effects and other reactions, physical as well as psychological and emotional. It is a complicated problem.

There are other areas also. I hope we make this clear, while we do want to make the enforcement area more efficient, by having a single office rather than dual offices and dual regional offices and dual local offices and dual sets of officers going to pharmaceutical companies, one going through the narcotics ledger, and another at another time going through the drug roster and inventory.

We admit—and not only admit, but we want to call attention of Congress to this—that there is an enormous amount of work to be done. We hope the legislative committees will hold hearings not only in the area referred to by the gentleman, but in other areas, such as medical, sociological, psychological, and other functions now being carried on by HEW, through the Bureau of Medicine and through FDA, through Public Health and the Institute of Mental Health, and by other agencies. We feel that many of these should be upgraded and supported by further funds and further authority. I commend the gentleman from Florida for his fine statement.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman making that very clear.

With that reservation, I heartily support this, because I do think enforcement should be placed in the Department of Justice and should be combined. I do not think this should be delayed because of the immense problem we have. The appropriate legislative committee should later consider the question of what department can best determine which drugs should be controlled.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy the gentleman raised the point he made, and I am interested in the answer of the chairman of our subcommittee, inherent in which there is an admission that there may be some difficulties in the President's plan. This is exactly the point we who introduced the resolution of disapproval referred to. A committee of Congress can do better on this, rather than just accepting this merger without having further attention given to some of the other functions. There are regulatory functions as well, which probably ought not to go to Justice.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit,, I understand that, and I am trying to make this clear. We all have this concern. But this does not stand in my mind as a barrier—and I have been working for some time on this. This should not be a barrier to going ahead and doing something about the enforcement. It is a critical and growing problem, and we ought to get on with the business of combining this and doubling the enforcement part to do something about this.

These other problems do not have the same urgency.

There is a list now of the drugs with respect to which there should be enforcement, on illegal use, to try to get at the "pushers." This is an immediate problem we can meet.

Later this year we can go into the problems of how to determine what other drugs should go under control or what other educational programs we should go into.

This will not stop any educational program, because that is being carried on by the National Institute of Mental Health, as I am sure the gentleman knows, and by the Food and Drug Administration itself. This is to be continued.

I would hope the gentlemen would review their position and support this plan, to go ahead and let us start enforcing the provisions of the law against the illegal use of drugs. Then we will have plenty of time to go into determining what specific drugs may need to be added to the dangerous drug classification.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. It seems we are so close together. It seems unfortunate that still we should be wide apart.

I have listened to the debate. It would seem to me vitally important to get the enforcement operating as quickly as possible, to get at that group of sinister-minded individuals we all despise, the organized racketeers who operate in this field and who prey upon the weakness of poor human beings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I would urge that who—I know in all sincerity—have brought these points up, to reconsider. It is good to have had these points brought to our attention on the floor, but I would hope the Members would reconsider their position, with the understanding that we are going to look into this business of the determination of drugs in the future, and educational programs.

Certainly we should go on and adopt this, and get on with the job of enforcement, trying to prohibit this illegal traffic in drugs.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. I have heard a complete discussion of drugs, but I believe we have missed the most important factor involved. I believe it is incontrovertible, in terms of cost to our society on drug abuse, that what is most costly is the result of the use of alcohol. Where do we put that?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I might tell the gentleman that we have before us a bill in our committee, on which we have conducted hearings, that will help try to meet the problem of alcoholism.

I am sure the gentleman also knows it is now the procedure—in fact, the problem is in the courts and the courts have already held—that a person cannot be penalized criminally for alcoholism, but it must be treated as a disease. So we are in this country now undergoing a new look at this whole problem, and we are going to try to treat alcoholism as a disease. I am sure the gentleman will be interested when this legislation is brought to the floor to meet that problem.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I listened to the observation of my friend from Iowa [Mr. KYL] with reference to alcohol. We all have a deep feeling of sympathy for those who have become addicted to alcohol, when they cannot exercise their willpower to regulate its use.

I sympathize very much with those who cannot control themselves. I admire the one who went down into the gutter, so to speak, and through his willpower fought his way back. I have seen several of my friends do it.

Might I make the observation that alcohol, as a problem of organized crime, was prevalent during the prohibition days but it is not now. We are trying to attack as quickly as possible the organized criminals, the underworld, who are engaging in this field of activity, which means so much to the youth of America.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman as the ranking minority member of the Treasury-Post Office Appropriations Subcommittee, I have followed closely and with great interest the activities of the Bureau of Narcotics which annually appears before our subcommittee concerning its budget requests.

I have been deeply impressed by its operations and it has proven to be, I believe, one of the finest agencies in the Government with an excellent record of achievement and accomplishment.

For example, during the last 5 years more than $615 million in narcotics has been seized in international cases alone, including some $140 million seized in narcotics last year. This action has involved close cooperation with foreign authorities and agents, a status which the Bureau has been very successful in establishing.

The Bureau also has established close and valuable working relationships with various State and local authorities who deal with the drug abuse problem at their own levels.

I do not believe that anyone is really questioning the level of success of the Bureau in its present status under the Treasury Department.

Rather, the main question appears to be whether greater accomplishments could be achieved by a combination of the efforts of all the agencies presently combating drug abuse under the auspices of the Justice Department.

My belief that the future successful operation of the Bureau of Narcotics in the fight against drug abuse could be more endangered than assisted by any transfer to the Justice Department leads me to oppose the reorganization being considered here today. I would like to note that my objections to the reorganization are not founded with respect to any combining of efforts by the Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control. They are rather founded in the removal of narcotics from Treasury and its transfer to the Justice Department.

The Bureau of Narcotics has been a part of the Treasury Department since it was first formed on June 14, 1930, for the purpose of administering the controls of narcotic drugs on the Federal level.

During its 37 years of existence, the primary mission of the Bureau of Narcotics has been a specialized one. Its role has been to deal with the highly complex and difficult task of containing and eliminating narcotics at the source of supply level.

Since just about all of the narcotic drugs originate outside of the United States, this has meant that a very large part of the Bureau's operation must be focused upon the interdiction of narcotics prior to its internal distribution throughout the United States. Further responsibilities of course deal with interstate trafficking in drugs and in some cases the Bureau will become involved in significant intrastate violations.

This specialized mission of the Bureau in dealing with narcotic drugs at the source level necessitates and has resulted in close cooperation and coordination with the Customs Bureau, whose jurisdiction includes the smuggling of narcotics into this country.

The existing and necessary close interrelationship between these two sister agencies of the Treasury Department could very well be seriously jeopardized by the removal of the Bureau of Narcotics from the Treasury Department.

As a simple practical matter, existing coordination among sister agencies of one Department is going to be impaired by the removal of one of those agencies from the Department.

Thus, what I am saying here in effect is that whereas a main argument being made for the transfer of the Bureau of Narcotics to Justice is that it will result in greater overall coordination, in fact, the transfer is very likely to lead to less coordination concerning the responsibilities of the Bureau of Narcotics, and especially its vital and primary mission of cutting off illicit drugs at the source level.

As I said earlier, my objections are not only to the removal of Narcotics from Treasury, but also to its transfer to Justice.

The attempt to bring the fight against drugs within the framework of the Justice Department raises the specter of our possibly taking a step too close to a national law-enforcement concept.

A gathering up of various Federal law-enforcement agencies presently operating throughout the Federal Government and placing them under one roof at the Justice Department will not necessarily lead to overemphasis on a national approach to the crime problem.

But it is important to realize that this could be the result. It is a result which I believe could be harmful and which therefore should be carefully avoided.

For the reasons I have stated, I am in opposition to the reorganization as it has been proposed by the President. I hope that the House will reject the reorganization being considered here today.

Mr. Chairman, the point I was trying to make in my colloquy with the distinguished Speaker of the House is brought out in our committee hearing of last year.

Mr. Chairman, on page 472 of last year's hearings which were held by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, the subcommittee which held hearings on the Departments of the Treasury and Post Office and Executive Office of the President, and I was leading up to this, Mr. Giordano was the witness when the question was propounded to him by the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN]:

Would it be useful to compare it with sentencing in other areas?

Really, to make a judgment, one would have to know how we sentence in California, for example, and in Massachusetts and wherever else the problem exists.

Thereupon, I interposed and stated:

Let us take Massachusetts, in view of the fact I am asking the question, will you draw such a comparison?

Mr. GIORDANO. I think you will find in Massachusetts the courts apply the penalties quite severely, and as a result they have a lesser problem. I think the prime example in this area is the State of Ohio, where they passed a law which provided for very heavy penalties, and the courts applied it. The law was initiated as a result of a citizens' group that the former Attorney General at that time selected. The group then, after the law was passed, was maintained a sufficient period of time to make sure that the courts applied the penalties in accordance with the wishes of the people. The problem dropped 85 percent in Ohio. It has never gone back up.

Then, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Gaffney interposed with the following statement:

One addict told me in New York, who had come from Ohio, that the day that law was enacted you could not get train reservations out of Cleveland.

Then I made the following statement:

You mentioned there is a mandatory jail sentence on a felony in New York. Is that what you said?

Mr. GIORDANO. No. I said under the Federal law. If they are brought in under the State law, there is no mandatory jail sentence.

Then, Mr. Chairman we continued this colloquy.

However, I went on to say that in the State of New York, where they do not have a stricter law, that State had a higher percentage of addicts, a much more higher percentage to the extent of about 50 percent than all of the Nation's addicts put together.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. Of course I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that we can all agree upon the fact that strict enforcement of the law on the part of the courts of the various jurisdictions will certainly help stop traffic in this field.

Mr. Chairman, this is not just a newly thought about idea. I state this because I am sure that the distinguished gentleman knows that the Hoover Commission in 1949 also recommended to combine these agencies into the Department of Justice.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that if we can plan to beef up the number of the law enforcement personnel in this area, along with some public spotlight focused upon the courts' enforcement activities, it is my opinion that this will help to solve the problem.

Mr. CONTE. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Florida. However, I am trying to make a record. It is my opinion in making this record that the Bureau of Narcotics has done a fantastic job. Further, I would go so far as to say that the Bureau of Narcotics can do a better job than can be done by the Department of Justice in the field of trying to stamp out illegal peddling of narcotics and let us place the responsibility where it belongs in Treasury.

And, Mr. Chairman, I am not directing my remarks to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, because I know the gentleman has long been interested in this subject matter.

But of the many who have taken the floor today who are so upset about organized crime—as I am—not one joined me last year in trying to get back the 20 agents that the administration cut out of the budget of the Bureau of Narcotics.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Let me say this: That I believe that they have done a very competent job in the Bureau of of Narcotics. I do not believe they have done a tremendous job, because I do not believe they have had the manpower. The very fact that drug abuse has grown so in this country, along with the spread of marihuana, particularly, which is fantastic, shows that they have not done the job that we gave them because I believe mainly there has not been suffient manpower supplied for them.

Now we are trying to correct this problem with this plan.

If anyone says "we have stopped drugs in this country," I am sure the gentleman knows that that is not the case, because it has grown, it has just grown the opposite way because we have not had the enforcement people to stop it in sufficient numbers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I believe the debate to date has been very useful, and I commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] for the clarity of his presentation.

I believe there is no question as to the unanimity of the committee in support of the merits of the proposed merger of the Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control. I suspect there is equal concurrence in the need for additional agents in both the fields of narcotics and dangerous drugs.

There are three points that I believe are central to our considerations of the reorganization plan.

First is the field of effective law enforcement. Second is the question of education, medical research, and prevention and the third deals with regulation of the drug industry.

On the first point, I believe the evidence is relatively clear that the proposed merger involves to a considerable degree the field of law enforcement. Of 475 employees in the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, 304 are enforcement agents. In the case of the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control, 300 of its 460 employees are agents.

I believe that the relationship between organized crime and illicit traffic in narcotics and dangerous drugs is quite well established. For example, the Federal Bureau of Narcotics estimates that 85 percent of the heroin and 50 percent of the marihuana brought illegally into the United States is introduced by criminal organizations. According to the Department of Justice, trafficking in narcotics and dangerous drugs is one of the three principal sources of income for organized crime. Even where the distribution of drugs does not involve organized crime in its traditional sense, the Department of Justice has observed that it does involve networks of criminals who form organizations to manufacture or divert and distribute drugs illegally.

For instance, BDAC has detected and prosecuted 47 illegal laboratory complexes manufacturing hallucinogens and other dangerous drugs. Many of these complexes had organized their own distribution systems. The Department of Justice has related that in one case a drug manufacturer and wholesaler who had gained alleged notoriety in illicit trade channels was recently arrested by BDAC agents. He and four other associates were reportedly apprehended in his fully equipped, clandestine chemical laboratory while in possession of pure LSD and STP, aggregating about 800,000 dosage units, having an estimated value of about $4 million in illicit drug traffic.

Therefore, I think that the preponderance of material before the commit-

tee has made it abundantly clear that organized crime is deeply involved with narcotics, and to some degree with dangerous drugs, and to the extent it is not organized crime per se, it does involve criminal elements.

In addition, while BDAC and the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, each works well in its own area, the agents of one have no statutory power to arrest for violation if the other's drug laws. Drug violators do not observe these neat jurisdictional lines. Ninety percent of all LSD raids uncover marihuana respecting which no seizure or arrest is made.

Therefore I think the facts do dictate in favor of a merger of these two entities and the establishment of a clear relationship between them and the department that is particularly concerned with organized crime—the Department of Justice.

The second point, however, is not as clear—and that is on the question of education and prevention.

The Acting Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur Cohen, who presently supervises BDAC wrote me the following on February 26:

I wholeheartedly support the President's recommendations because I believe it is more appropriate for the Bureau to be in the Department of Justice along with the Federal Bureau of Narcotics so that law-enforcement aspects of these two programs can be coordinated. As you know, the Prettyman Commission on Narcotics and Drug abuse recommended this in 1963, as did the Hoover Commission on Executive Reorganization a number of years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. REID of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Concerning the Prettyman report, the Prettyman report contemplated the establishment of BDAC. But the Prettyman report also, while proposing that the law-enforcement part of the narcotics problem go to the Justice Department, also proposed that the regulatory functions go to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. So the Prettyman report did not contemplate what the President has proposed here.

Mr. REID of New York. The gentleman is correct. I was going to deal with that when I got on the subject of the regulatory aspects. But I think it should be put in the RECORD at this point, and I will read from the Prettyman report.

Specifically the report said:

The Commission recommends that the functions of the Bureau of Narcotics relating to regulation of the legitimate importation, exportation, manufacture, sale, and other transfer of narcotics, drugs, and marihuana be transferred from the Department of the Treasury to the Department of HEW. Narcotic drugs would be regulated under the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, not under the tax power; and the importation, production, sale, or other transfer of marihuana would be prohibited except where expressly licensed for legitimate scientific purposes or for the emergency production of hemp.

And it also recommended:

The Commission recommends that a unit be established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to determine the safety and efficacy of and to regulate all narcotic and dangerous drugs capable of producing severe psychotoxic effects which can lead to criminal or lawless behavior when abused. This unit would also regulate the legitimate importation, exportation, manufacture, sale and other transfer of narcotic and dangerous drugs.

So the gentleman from Alabama is absolutely correct. The Prettyman report as regards this aspect of regulation is clearly for this being placed in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Attorney General in his testimony before the committee, however, urged that control and regulation should be in the Department of Justice as they are an integral part of the enforcement problem.

For myself I have reservations about regulation being in the Justice Department, and I think there is considerable merit in this being placed in HEW. On the other hand, this might involve a fragmentation of BDAC or of the contemplated merged entity.

To return finally to the question of education.

The Acting Secretary said:

It is our firm intention to maintain the Department's efforts in both education and scientific investigation. We are already engaged in developing with the Attorney General a mechanism which will continue the same effective coordination and operation between HEW and the Department of Justice which now exists between the various agencies within HEW.

I might add that there is a budget of some $10 million, according to the fiscal year 1968 appropriation, for the National Institute of Mental Health and for the Food and Drug Administration which was allocated to education and research activities in this area.

The Department of Justice has also observed that the reorganization plan will not affect in any way the research and educational programs now conducted by the National Institute of Mental Health, the Bureau of Medicine, the Bureau of Science, and the National Institutes of Health.

I think, however, in fairness to the Members in considering this matter today that it is clear that insufficient emphasis has been placed on the importance of clearly spelling out where the education and health roles should be placed. The committee report observes that the Justice Department would now do the following: "Plan and carry out intensive and varied target audience programs to prevent drug abuse and to create an attitude of respect for dangerous drugs."

Finally, I am particularly concerned with the fact that certain regulatory aspects of the drug problem would be moved to the Justice Department. I am happy, however, to place in the RECORD the Secretary's assurance.

I think we have to keep in mind on the should be combated by a unified enment and for strong action against organized crime. But equally I think it is very important that we recognize that narcotics and, particularly, dangerous drugs are a medical, a human, and an educational problem involving not enforcement so much as education in many respects including guidance counseling in our schools and colleges, and therefore I think that has to be weighed very carefully.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN].

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1968 calls for the consolidation of the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control and the Bureau of Narcotics within the Department of Justice. Both the Treasury Department and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which presently house these two bureaus have done fine work in developing their separate law enforcement programs. However, a study of the problem of drug abuse shows vast areas of interrelationship and overlapping between narcotics and dangerous drugs investigations. The total criminal drug problem should be combated by a unified enforcement agency within the Federal Government. I am convinced that that agency should be the Department of Justice.

We cannot and should not assume that the solution to this complex and troublesome problem lies in enforcement alone. We will never completely solve the drug problem until we know why people abuse drugs, and until we learn how to educate them to avoid such abuse. I am informed that the responsibility for research into the root causes of drug abuse is centralized in HEW, which spends much larger amounts on such research and related educational programs than these two bureaus have to spend on enforcement. That is as it should be, and I understand that these responsibilities are unaffected by the plan. At the same time, until such research develops solutions, and until knowledge of these basic drug problems increases, we must relentlessly pursue the sources of illicit traffic in narcotics and dangerous drugs.

The plan will improve our ability to cut down on the availability of narcotics and dangerous drugs to our youth and other victims of this curse. A single, more effective, coordinated bureau can best achieve this law enforcement objective.

If we direct our attention a moment to the specifics of the drug problem, we recognize that a necessary adjunct to Federal law enforcement is effective State and local law enforcement agencies which are trained to recognize, identify, and combat specific drug crimes. It has never been and, I am certain, never will be the desire of the Federal Government to create a national police force. The reorganization plan does not create one. It merely establishes a single central focal point within the Government for Federal drug enforcement knowledge. After the reorganization, State and local officers will be able to direct all inquiries concerning drug enforcement problems to this central source within the Department of Justice. Obviously, it eases Federal and State relationships to have a centralized Federal enforcement office furnishing training instruction with respect to narcotics and dangerous drugs. State and local law enforcement officers

will not be required, as they are now, to send their specialized agents to the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control School to learn about dangerous drugs, and then get the narcotics half of the drug picture by sending their agents to a school conducted by the Bureau of Narcotics. The existing method is expensive and inefficient in that it denies the smaller State and local law enforcement agencies the ability to have their men trained in both areas of drug control due to conflicting time schedules and additional expense. This the new Bureau will rectify in a comprehensive coordinated single training course covering all illicit drugs.

The reorganization is an important step in the right direction and I support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN], chairman of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the disapproval resolution and in support of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1968. For several years the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has been studying the drug safety activities of the Food and Drug Administration, including that agency's implementation of its responsibilities under the Drug Abuse Control Act of 1965.

More recently, the subcommittee looked into problems relating to the control of marihuana and at the relationship between FDA's Bureau of Drug Abuse Control and the Treasury Department's Bureau of Narcotics. From these studies it was quite apparent to me that there are problems of cooperation and coordination resulting not only from the organizational division of responsibility but also from inconsistencies in the laws under which these two agencies operate.

During our subcommittee's hearings, it was disclosed that in perhaps as many as 90 percent of the cases in which persons are apprehended by one of these agencies, they also have in their possession a drug subject to control by the other agency. Although agreements exist to promote cooperation and coordination between the two agencies, there is no question that this organizational and and jurisdictional division is uneconomical; that it makes the task of each agency more difficult; and that it is a barrier to the development of a unified effort to combat the rapidly increasing traffic in illicit drugs.

I am delighted to see that the President is recommending action on a broad front—too long delayed—to deal with the problem of narcotics and drug abuse and the illicit traffic in these drugs and to fit these activities into an overall war against crime and lawlessness. The reorganization plan under consideration is an important part of that program.

The idea of creating a single agency within the Justice Department to enforce the laws against illicit traffic in narcotics and other dangerous drugs as has already been pointed out today, is not completely new. As long ago as 1949 the First Hoover Commission recommended that the Bureau of Narcotics be transferred to the Justice Department. And in 1963 President Kennedy's Advisory Commission on Narcotics and Drug Abuse recommended that the enforcement responsibilities of both the Narcotics Bureau and those of FDA relating to illicit traffic in dangerous drugs be transferred to Justice.

The proposed reorganization offers a number of advantages. Combining the Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control—and there seems to be little, if any argument against this combination—will result in increased efficiency and economy by cutting down on administrative overhead, eliminating duplication of effort in investigation and enforcement work, and eliminating duplicate field installations, public educational programs, and training programs for State and local law enforcement officers. The reorganization should foster improved intergovernmental relations by giving State and local enforcement agencies a single locus in the Federal Government with which to coordinate and from which to seek advice and assistance. It should also result in benefits to regulated parties such as drug manufacturers, wholesalers, and retail pharmacists by eliminating duplicate paper work now required by two different agencies and cutting down on the number of Federal inspectors visiting their premises to review records.

Placing the new combined agency in the Department of Justice will make the resources of the Federal Government's top enforcement agency more readily available to Narcotics and BDAC agents and should contribute to the Federal Government's fight against organized crime since the Department of Justice is the principal agency for coordinating these efforts.

Perhaps because the advantages of combining the Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control are so obvious, opposition to the plan has thus far centered almost entirely on the location of the new agency in the Department of Justice. It has been argued, for example, that investigation and prosecuting functions should not be located in the same department. However, I believe this criticism ignores the fact that the Department of Justice already embraces both of these functions, in that the Department prosecutes cases for its own investigating arm, the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Moreover, the investigative and prosecuting functions will be separated within the Department.

It has also been argued that the new agency will be dominated by the FBI if it is located within the Department of Justice, although I do not believe I have heard that this afternoon. It should be pointed out, however, that the new Bureau will be coequal in rank with the FBI and will report directly to the Attorney General's office rather than through the FBI.

Fear has also been expressed that the agents of the new Bureau may use their access to records of regulated parties to gather evidence for antitrust or other type cases. Since these agents will have access only to those records which are designated by the law and regulations as being pertinent to their responsibilities, they will not be in a position to go on fishing expeditions—which I am sure none of us would approve. However, if agents, in reviewing records to which they have legitimate access, should discover evidence of antitrust or other violations of law, it would appear that it would be their responsibility to bring such evidence to the attention of other appropriate authorities.

There have been some other reservations about the proposed reorganization which I believe are based largely on misunderstanding of either the reorganization plan or the present division of responsibilities in this area. For example, some fear has been expressed that the reorganization plan will transfer responsibility for making medical decisions to a law-enforcement agency. In this connection, I would like to point out that the law provides for a committee of outside medical experts to evaluate a given drug's dangers and capability for abuse and to advise the enforcement agency whether or not it should be brought under control. This committee of experts is a representative group outside of Government. It will be transferred to the new agency. After the committee's recommendation is made, the remaining procedures are, for the most part, of a legal nature. The final determination by the Attorney General will be made on the basis of the same evidence that it is now made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and will be just as much a formality. Moreover, since neither the present Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare nor any of his predecessors have been physicians, there is no reason to believe that the Attorney General will be less qualified to make this formal determination.

Similarly, fear has been expressed that the reorganization will transfer responsibility for research on the causes and prevention of drug abuse and for the treatment and rehabilitation of addicts from a health agency to a law enforcement agency. I think this criticism is also based on misunderstanding. As I understand, both the research and the treatment and rehabilitation responsibilities presently rest with the National Institute of Mental Health, and neither of these functions is transferred to the new agency by the reorganization plan. They will remain within the NIMH, and I understand that preliminary arrangements for cooperation and coordination between NIMH and the new bureau have been worked out. The Bureau of Drug Abuse Control does not itself conduct research. It has the authority and funds to contract with universities and other organizations for such research, and it will continue to do so in the new bureau.

It has also been charged that the transfer of the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control and the Narcotics Bureau will result in less effective coordination with related agencies and functions which will remain in HEW and Treasury. This is mere conjecture. We never really know how any organization is going to work until it is put into effect, but because of the past close relationships with these agencies and functions, it seems more likely that cooperation and coordination will be better than it might otherwise.

Moreover, preliminary arrangements for such cooperation and coordination, I understand, have been worked out in advance. In fact, some of the strongest testimony in support of this action was given by Mr. Giordano, Commissioner of Narcotics, who made a very strong statement not only for consolidation of these two bureaus but also for transfer of the consolidated agency to the Department of Justice.

In addition, it should be noted that the functions of the two agencies which are being merged are much more closely related to one another than they are to the functions which are being left behind. For example, preventing illicit traffic in controlled drugs represents a relatively small proportion of the responsibilities of the Customs Bureau, but it is the major responsibility of both BDAC and the Narcotics Bureau.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I say that I too am gravely concerned about our rapidly increasing crime rate and about the widespread disrespect and disregard for law and order which we have witnessed in recent years. I believe that the illicit drug problem is a substantial factor in the overall situation in that an ever increasing number of people, and particularly young people, are being enticed into a drug subculture which operates on the wrong side of the law and also furnishes a steady and lucrative source of income for organized crime.

It is my hope that the proposed reorganization plan, along with some of the other measures proposed by the President in his message on crime, will help to turn the tide, and for this reason I am happy to support it.

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

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman has made a most comprehensive statement today, and I wish to compliment him. He has answered many of the fears others have expressed, and some they have not expressed.

The gentleman is not a member of the Reorganization Subcommittee, although he is a member of the full committee. He is the chairman of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, which has to do with the relationship between the Federal Government and the local States and cities and so forth. In this particular field, of course, he is thinking about the correlation of information and the interchange of information between the local and Federal levels.

I believe the gentleman's statement is most valuable, in that he has covered so completely this area with which he is so familiar and on which he has held hearings for many, many years, on the principle of intergovernmental relations.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I thank the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I yield to my distinguished colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman on the very fine and comprehensive statement he has made. I concur in the conclusions he has reached.

It was my privilege for 11 years to work very closely with the Narcotics Bureau in law enforcement. I say that it is a magnificent organization. I would not for 1 minute do anything I thought would in any way lessen the effectiveness of that great organization.

I have been assured and reassured by the statement of the gentleman that the consolidation of this activity which would take HEW drug division into the Department of Justice would bring about economy in the operation of our Government and would also increase the effectiveness of our programs to stem the tide of the growing drug traffic. I commend my friend from North Carolina and thank him for his very, very splendid statement.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I thank my colleague from North Carolina for his statement. Not only is he one of North Carolina's leading attorneys, but he is familiar with problems of law enforcement in the areas under discussion, having served so distinguishedly as a district prosecuting attorney in North Carolina for many years before coming to the Congress.

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

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I am tremendously impressed by this obviously well reasoned and effective point-by-point, logical, and comprehensive rebuttal of the many points on which there was serious misunderstanding. I compliment the gentleman and congratulate him for one of the most impressive presentations made this afternoon.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I have one further observation which is to some extent repetitious. Probably only a few other agencies in the Federal Government have more direct contact with State and local government levels than does the Office of the Attorney General.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. As the President indicated, and I believe, as most of us here in the Congress want, law enforcement is primarily the responsibility of local and State governments, but when it comes to narcotics and the criminal use of certain types of drugs, even where the Federal Government has a major responsibility all levels of government must work together in a cooperative spirit. Where you have an agency which already has so many contacts and which coordinates and cooperates with State and local governments in so many ways, including education and training, this is a natural, it seems to me—especially from the standpoint of better Federal, State, and local relations, and improved enforcement of laws against the illicit traffic in drugs.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution and wish to point out that, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over sizable portions of the legislation dealing with narcotics. Of course, a great deal of the regulation and enforcement of these laws comes under the Committee on Ways and Means. I certainly want to commend the committee and certainly the Republican members for this thorough study. I have been impressed with the minority views, the Republican views, which urge that this reorganization plan be voted down and at the same time that the Congress proceed forthwith with developing the proper kind of legislation to bring about a consolidation of these agencies which everyone seems agreed upon are needed, but which would eliminate some of the errors which are in the President's plan. As I have listened to the debate, errors in the President's plan are admitted to exist by those who are supporting it.

The argument of the Speaker in behalf of this reorganization was that we had to move, and I would interpolate, in haste. I think we have done too much of this hasty legislation. We need to consider these things in depth. This problem of narcotics enforcement has been with us for decades and it will probably be with us for decades. So let us take the time that is necessary to do a thorough job. This House, I might say, has been doing precious little this year in the way of legislation. Here we are now going into the fourth month. To argue that we have to move in haste, recognizing that there are legitimate reasons why this reorganization plan should be modified to me is not wise. I think that the committee would do well to vote this down and proceed to establish a congressional reorganization plan that meets the objections of everybody. Then we could be in accord, as the Speaker said, because we do not seem to be too far apart. We could be in accord.

The key error in the President's plan which bothers me very much is combining prosecution with regulation. I was interested that in the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN], for whom I have a high regard, he did not seem to distinguish this main point that has been stressed in the minority views.

It is most unwise to combine regulation functions with the functions of prosecution. They are two different functions. And, when one does combine regulation with prosecution, one tends to deteriorate both functions.

Then Mr. Chairman, my final remarks are these: For years I have felt that we ought to repeal the Reorganization Act. It places the Congress in the position of vetoing rather than legislating. This act deprives this body of the right to amend and therefore, it deprives it of the right to legislate.

And Mr. Chairman, this kind of legislating, wherein the President brings up a plan conceived behind closed doors wherein all the Congress can do is to either accept or reject that plan, is not conducive to enacting good laws.

This particular piece of legislation that is now pending before the Committee of the Whole House demonstrates most clearly how wise the writers of the Constitution were in giving to the Congress of the United States the power to

legislate and in giving to the executive branch of the Government the right to veto. Let us turn this around and let Congress legislate and the executive accept or veto.

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

Mr. CURTIS. Of course I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman in the well, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], has spoken about the necessity for regulation and enforcement. A short time ago during the general debate upon this issue I brought up the matter of alcohol as representing a dangerous drug and pointed to the period of time when we had prohibition. We had, as I recall, a central control enforcement agency.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. KYL. What kind of a job did we do in preventing crime and in reducing the incidence of the use of alcohol?

Mr. CURTIS. I would say that it was a very sad record, so much so that we were compelled to repeal the law itself.

Mr. KYL. And, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Missouri will yield further, in this situation we have an essence which is so important here when we talk about certain drugs and other matters which bring about a physical dependence, a psychological disturbance, a disturbance that would be different if taken care of through the procedure of prevention and cure, which procedure is difficult in both cases. It is not primarily a matter of enforcement which exists in these fragile areas.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Iowa for his making that telling point.

Of course, as the distinguished gentleman knows, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over the enforcement against bootlegging because——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CURTIS. Because it is through imposing the $10.50 tax per gallon on liquor that we essentially enforce the laws against bootlegging.

I recall that the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives said that this was not, today, a base of financing national crime. However, permit me to say to the distinguished Speaker that, regrettably, bootlegging is still one of the main sources of financing national crime. It represents about a $2 billion-a-year business. There is that much bootlegging going on today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Thirty-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 81]

Abbitt	Green, Pa.	Mize
Anderson, Tenn.	Gurney	Nix
Ashley	Hansen, Idaho	Resnick
Conyers	Harsha	Roth
Corman	Holland	Selden
Denney	Karsten	Teague, Tex.
Dent	King, Calif.	Whalley
Dorn	Long, La.	Zablocki
Dowdy	Lukens	
	Matsunaga	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HUNGATE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Resolution 1101, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 404 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] for 15 minutes.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which has the legislation in charge said so well, this, indeed, is not a partisan matter. By every yardstick it is bipartisan in the concern that has been expressed on both sides of the aisle, a concern which is prompted, I am confident, by a genuine desire to do the right thing in this critical area. This is a question upon which reasonable men can reasonably disagree.

And, Mr. Chairman, I am glad, too, that our distinguished Speaker said as he did: "We are not really too far apart." Essentially we agree. This should be made crystal clear.

Mr. Chairman, I favor the merger of law enforcement functions in the field of narcotics control. I favor the merger of regulatory functions. I do not favor consolidation of the two. Notwithstanding certain claims to the contrary, it is clear that the reorganization plan intends just such a consolidation. Beginning on page 15 of the committee report appears an 11-page catalog of functions within the Treasury Department and the Food and Drug Administration which would be transferred. Even a cursory examination reveals that many of these deal with auditing, registration, licensing, and inspection of books, records, statements, and papers. Such functions can only fairly be classified as regulatory. While the combination of such regulatory functions with law-enforcement functions might arguably make the prosecutor's job more convenient, most people will agree as a matter of policy that the same man ought not be both prosecutor and regulator.

Favoring merger of law-enforcement functions as I do, I must confess that I am not yet prepared to decide where in the governmental structure the new agency should be located. There is not enough evidence at hand. The committee hearings lasted approximately 10 hours in the course of 3 days. Significantly, the transcript of the hearings does not disclose testimony by any witnesses representing the medical community, the legitimate drug industry or State and local law enforcement agencies. The advice such witnesses could bring to bear upon the question would be most helpful in deciding whether the new agency belongs in Treasury, in HEW, in Justice, or in some independent category. A respectable case can be made for each. Under such circumstances, merger should be postponed until a proper study can be completed.

I would gladly put my concern about mixing regulatory and law-enforcement functions aside and support this reorganization plan if I were convinced that it would enhance the cause of prevention, investigation, apprehension, prosecution, and conviction of narcotics criminals. I am compelled to the conclusion that with the wholesale uprooting of functions, dislocation of coordination and transfers of men and missions which this particular plan would involve would be counterproductive in the fight against narcotics crimes and drug abuse. I reach this conclusion for five reasons:

First, effective narcotics control must focus first upon the source of supply. That source is and always has been predominantly foreign. Since it was first established in 1930, the Bureau of Narcotics in the Treasury Department has patiently fashioned an elaborate international apparatus of informants and undercover agents. That apparatus monitors the channels of narcotics commerce from the poppy fields in East Turkey to American ports of entry. Only recently, BON has reached an informal understanding with France increasing the French staff investigating heroin refineries in Marseilles. Transfer of personnel from Treasury to Justice could scramble these delicately balanced enforcement mechanisms.

Second, effective narcotics control at the Federal level requires careful coordination among participating agencies. Under narcotics statutes, the principal participating agencies are the Bureau of Customs, which has a special responsibility with respect to illegal imports, and the Internal Revenue Service, whose responsibility arises from the tax features of the narcotics law. Both of these agencies and the Bureau of Narcotics are in the Treasury Department. Transfer inevitably would shortcircuit the coordination network which now functions so efficiently.

Third, effective narcotics control requires careful Federal coordination with State and local law-enforcement authorities. Here again BON over the years has developed close working relationships. This is partly because the Treasury Department operates a full-time law enforcement school with permanent, professional faculty, the most modern facilities, and the most advanced curriculums. That school already had graduated and returned to their home precincts some 3,200 State and local law-enforcement officers. Particularly in the field of narcotics control, these local officers are trained to cooperate with BON. This school, it should be noted, cannot be transferred bodily under the reorganization plan. This is because the curricula is broader than narcotics control. This means that a new school would have to be established in the new agency.

Fourth, effective narcotics control requires sophisticated laboratory facili-

ties. Currently, the Treasury Department operates three systems of laboratories throughout the Nation. One is in the Secret Service; one is in the Bureau of Customs; and one is in the Alcohol and Tax unit. The latter serves the Bureau of Narcotics. Treasury laboratory facilities have only recently been reorganized. Transfer would mean, not abandonment of the old laboratories, but the creation of new ones. This would involve a needless proliferation and expense.

Fifth, and perhaps most important, effective narcotics control requires the most versatile investigative techniques. Unlike other law-enforcement agencies which rely principally upon informants, Bureau of Narcotics employs the undercover agent technique. Both at home and abroad, its agents have successfully penetrated and infiltrated the ranks of organized crime. It would take a long time for a new agency to establish the contacts necessary to perfect such a system. Finally, BON has, over the years, assembled an impressive library of information and evidence through electronic surveillance, a technique which the Attorney General has outlawed and which he is unwilling to embrace even with the constitutional safeguards defined in the most recent Supreme Court decision. The success of these investigative methods is reflected in the record BON has written. Approximately 96 percent of the cases which BON has brought to court have resulted in convictions, and in the last 5 years BON has seized some $615 million worth of illegal narcotics.

Opponents of the reorganization plan seek to console us with the argument that not only the facilities but the people in the BON will be transferred en masse when the new agency is created. The testimony of some of the witnesses raises doubts as to when personnel transfers will occur and whether all personnel or only some will, in fact, be transferred. More significantly, nowhere in the hearings or elsewhere can one find any assurances as to who will be the head of the new agency. Under present law, the Commissioner of Narcotics is appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The head of the new agency will be appointed by the Attorney General, and his appointment will not be subject to Senate confirmation. Moreover, the reorganization plan specifically vests the Attorney General with absolute discretion to appoint four new positions in the competitive service and to fix the title and duties of each. We are left to wonder who these people will be and whether they will strengthen or weaken enforcement of the narcotics criminal law.

While I will welcome merger legislation, treated in the normal legislative process, prudence compels me to vote against Reorganization Plan No. 1 by voting aye on the resolution of disapproval.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. It has been mentioned several times this afternoon that the Hoover Commission suggested a reorganization. Is it not strange indeed that 20 years have elapsed since 1949 when that recommendation was made, and nothing has been done by Democrat-controlled Congresses in all but 2 years since 1949?

Mr. POFF. Of course, the gentleman makes a most poignant point. The recommendations of the Hoover Commission have certainly not been under lock and key for 20 years. If this is a matter of some urgency, then it was a matter of some urgency last year, the year before that, and the year before that. I think the Hoover Commission recommendation, valid as it was 20 years ago, was made 16 years before BDAC was born, and is therefore largely irrelevant to this debate.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. It has also been stated this afternoon that the President supports this bill. It occurs to me that it might be well to know how the junior Senator from New York, who has served as Attorney General, feels about this measure. I say that because I understand that in the near future there is to be a summit conference between the President and the junior Senator from New York. Of course, I am in no position this afternoon to know what will be undertaken at that momentous conference when it takes place. It just could be that the President will at that time surrender the sword to the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. POFF. I am afraid that I am not possessed of sufficient information to make a responsive reply.

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

Mr. POFF. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. The gentleman has indicated he does favor a merger of the regulatory functions with relation to narcotics. Will the gentleman inform the House in what branch of the Government he feels that should be vested?

Mr. POFF. I am frank and candid to tell the gentleman that I have not reached a conclusion. It is significant that in the hearings that were held before the committee—and they were most fairly conducted, I might add—there was no testimony by witnesses representing the medical community or the State and local law-enforcement agencies or the legitimate drug industry. I think the advice these witnesses could bring to bear upon the question would add much that would help me to make up my mind whether it belongs in the Department of Justice, the Treasury Department, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or perhaps in some more independent category. I really cannot say.

Mr. CAHILL. Does the gentleman think that the regulatory function should be in a different department than the prosecuting function?

Mr. POFF. I most certainly do.

Mr. CAHILL. Does the gentleman have any thoughts as to what department should handle the regulatory function?

Mr. POFF. I migh respond further by saying that the regulatory functions are such as require a continuing practice in order to develop a particular expertise. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, operating through BDAC, has developed such an expertise. It has established appropriate liaison with all other agencies within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I do believe that further administrative improvements can be made. But I am not prepared to say that HEW is not the proper place for the regulatory function.

Mr. CAHILL. Am I correct in my understanding that if there is a merger, the personnel that presently is operating within regulatory functions under HEW would be assigned to the Department of Justice so the expertise would, in effect, be transferred from HEW to the Department of Justice?

Mr. POFF. I am not certain that I can agree with the gentleman. On the contrary, while it has been said that personnel and missions would be transferred en masse, I find nothing in the language of the reorganization plan or in the hearings which would guarantee this. On the contrary, I find in the language of the reorganization plan an authorization for the Attorney General to appoint a new head of a new agency.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman. Just one last question——

Mr. POFF. I have not quite concluded. As Members of the House well know, the Commissioner of Narcotics presently is appointed by the President, subject to the advice and consent of the Senate. Under the reorganization plan the new head of this agency would not be subject to Senate confirmation. More than that, under the reorganization plan the Attorney General would be empowered to name in the competitive service 4 additional positions, to fix their titles, and to prescribe their duties.

Mr. CAHILL. A last question, if I may: It has been represented here that the drugs which naturally find their way into this country in a large measure are controlled by organized crime. Does the gentleman agree that that is a correct statement?

Mr. POFF. With respect to narcotics, I agree that it is altogether correct, that it can be documented, and it can be documented in court records by chapter and verse and by name and address.

I must say parenthetically, however, that it cannot be shown quite so clearly that organized crime is directly involved in the illicit traffic in the other drugs. Obviously criminal combinations are involved, but the evidence available tends to show that the Cosa Nostra is involved only indirectly.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I have the highest regard for the gentleman who just addressed the House, but I am in emphatic disagreement with him.

Both Bureaus are law enforcement agencies working on crime control, a major national problem. They belong in Justice because Justice is the agency responsible for coordination of general Federal law enforcement efforts.

Justice leads the efforts against organized crime—both the traditional Mafia

type and other criminal networks which form organizations to conduct criminal activities systematically—85 percent of the heroin and 50 percent of the marihuana in illegal channels originates with organized criminal elements. Criminal cases currently before the courts show that criminal organizations are operating also in the dangerous drug area. Profits from narcotics and dangerous drugs are one of the three principal sources of income for organized crime.

Both Bureaus are essentially devoted to law enforcement and maintain the same kind of close contact with State and local agencies concerned with drugs as Justice maintains for general law enforcement. The plan permits better coordination of these relationships.

While FBN and BDAC each works well in its own area the agents of one have no statutory power to arrest for violation of the other's drug laws. Drug violators do not observe these neat jurisdictional lines, and all drugs are increasingly found together. Ninety percent of LSD raids by BDAC agents uncover marihuana, respecting which no seizure or arrest is made.

That should be a complete answer to the argument made by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished chairman yield?

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

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, respectfully I say it is not an answer. On the contrary, I agree with what the gentleman has said about the need to merge law enforcement functions in both agencies. I have never disagreed with that. Never have I disagreed that regulatory functions should be merged. I simply disagree with my chairman that regulatory functions and law enforcement functions should be merged.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I have studied the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1968 very carefully and have come to a conclusion that, on balance, it is a necessary and well-thought-out move in combating the ever-increasing spread of organized crime throughout our society. As the Department of Justice is the principal Federal repository for law enforcement activities, it naturally is the logical place in which to consolidate the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control. At the hearings, the statements made by the representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regarding the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control, and the high esteem in which that Bureau is regarded, speak well for the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control's efforts in combating the dangerous drug problem. The hearings pointed out the fine record established by the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control in its year and a half of active operation, pointing out the various law enforcement programs that Bureau has taken in fighting the ever-spreading "drug culture" engulfing large segments of our young people. But most important of all, the hearings clearly indicated what, to my mind, is an anomaly; that is, the existence of a law enforcement bureau, operating as a law enforcement bureau, within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which is predominantly concerned with health and social problems from a nonenforcement viewpoint.

Whatever the original reasons were for having a Bureau of Drug Abuse Control within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, those reasons no longer seem applicable in the present changing complexion of the dangerous drug area. A combined Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs within the Department of Justice will, to my mind, be better able to combat the drug problem than would be possible in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that nobody will view my remarks to mean that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not have a continued ongoing role in combating the drug syndrome presently facing this Nation. That Department does have an important role and, to my mind, an expanding role in educating the public on the dangers of these drugs and in conducting basic research into the effects that these drugs have on human beings. While the new Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs in the Justice Department must be attuned to such developments, the predominant educational and scientific approaches to the problem should still be carried on by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The plan, which puts enforcement in Justice and leaves these other programs in HEW, properly apportions functions in the fight against drug abuse.

Finally, I think this reorganization plan is a good one and should be strongly supported by every Member of the Congress. Before we can adequately and effectively wage a war on crime in the drug area, we must insure that our organizational structure is designed to meet this challenge with the greatest possible efficiency.

This plan is an important step toward bringing such order to our law-enforcement efforts.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUNT].

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting here most of the afternoon listening to the dialog and the arguments which have prevailed on the floor. I could not let this opportunity pass without adding my slight or minute contribution to the discussion.

I am not going to speak today from book knowledge, but I am going to speak from actual experience. For a number of years I was the supervisor of a narcotics squad of the New Jersey State Police, and formulated, organized, and conducted many raids. I have lived with narcotics and the people who are engaged in the illegal traffic of and the suppression of this narcotics traffic.

It was my very good fortune to have been able to cooperate with and work with the Federal Bureau of Narcotics. I want to state that I have the highest regard for that Bureau. It is one of the divisions in our Government that actually have been unsung heroes.

To work in narcotics and to talk about narcotics from book knowledge or from selected witnesses before a committee are two separate things altogether.

I should like to take this opportunity to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] for his very explicit description of the division which exists and should always exist as between regulatory and prosecution powers. He quite eminently, in a very qualified manner, explained the differences.

I am amazed, from time to time, that we have gentlemen of his caliber, who spend so much time trying to bring before the body of the House needed information.

We talk about the narcotics field. Actually, many people talk about narcotics, but very few really understand, except those who have been in the field.

Today I heard the term marihuana used as an addictive drug. Actually, marihuana is not an addictive drug, it is a habit-forming drug, a part of the hashish family.

You have heard people speak today about heroin. Heroin again was not explained. No one told you it is the most highly addictive drug that anyone has ever known, a derivative of opium, with a morphine base, and a very complex drug. No one discussed this. We have been discussing matters here which are very important. We should be discussing matters of the utmost importance insofar as law enforcement is concerned as to just what we are trying to do in the field of law enforcement with relation to the field of narcotics and who it is we are trying to protect and how we can go about this.

Very little mention has been made of the work done on the local law-enforcement level. This is not generally referred to, but in every major city and in every State constabulary unit there are established and there have been for a number of years enforcement units which deal with narcotics specifically, who have been in the habit of cooperating with the Federal Bureau of Narcotics. It is my pleasure to have been associated with Commissioner Anslinger for a number of years. It was also my pleasure to work with Commissioner Giordano. It has been my great privilege to have organized one of the largest single narcotics raids ever made in the United States, in 1958, which was completed after a 3-year investigation.

So I speak to you today from experience. I say to you do not pass any legislation that will confuse the regulatory situation with the prosecution functions. This is a sad mistake. We will only come to grief by doing it.

I believe most strongly, as the author of some bills in the New Jersey Senate dealing with this subject, that we should have strong mandatory laws and strong mandatory sentences for those pushers who sell to minors of the age of 18 and under. In that way we might stop this nefarious traffic at its root. This is the group that they attack. In the galleries today surrounding this Chamber you see what we have in this country. These are

the very flower of our youth. They are the people whom we seek to protect. I was in the State senate when I had some bills that passed both houses but which were vetoed by two Governors that would have imposed a mandatory sentence on those who sold drugs to youths under the age of 18. My bill said, in effect, in the last paragraph, that no judge shall have the power to suspend the sentence. That is the way we must go if we are going to do something about this. Let us stop fiddling around and let us do what is right and get down to the basic fundamentals of enforcing the law.

How in the world can you expect an agency like the Bureau of Narcotics to stagger along for years with 240 men and then later with 280 trained personnel and now with only 304 in the entire Nation and expect them to suppress the dealings in narcotics? It is true that they work very closely with local people and it is true that we are borrowing from one another, but this business is a specialized one and it should not be determined otherwise. The men in this field are specially selected. They are selected for their vocabulary, for their linguistic ability, and for their courage. They work under cover. If you really want to do something to help a narcotics agent, then, for goodness sake pass a bill which will make it a Federal crime to murder an undercover agent, which we have never done up to now. Suddenly today this great burden falls on us and we are going to try to rectify in 15 minutes what we have not done in 15 years.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HUNT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the personal background and experience of the gentleman. Does he mean an undercover agent in a foreign nation or one here?

Mr. HUNT. No. An undercover agent in a foreign nation cannot be covered by U.S. law.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course, there is a law against the murder of anyone in our jurisdiction, but when men go overseas, of course, and particularly when they are nationals of other countries, we could not pass a law that would punish those who murder an undercover agent who is a national of another country, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. HUNT. I recognize that. I do say this to you, though: If you care to apprise yourself of it, the Federal Bureau of Narcotics has a dossier prepared in which there are about 40 photographs, the most lurid that you shall ever see, of agents who have been murdered in this country who are undercover men.

Now these were men who were not actually, per se, the agents but they were the undercover informers of the Bureau who were the agents acting on behalf of law and order as that action distinguished between the criminal elements.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, would not the laws of the United States apply against the people who do that? In other words, you do not need an additional law for that purpose?

Mr. HUNT. Yes, you do.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Then if we do, I shall vote for it.

Mr. HUNT. We have laws which are designed and drawn and adopted for the protection of people in this field. The undercover agent engaged in the informer field is a man for which there can be no return if he is discovered. As such there can never be agreement between the pusher and the agent. There can never be a tie ball game between the law-enforcement officer and the pusher of the drug. There can never be a replacement of some of the laws. But, still we know, that this problem must be faced.

I thank, however, the gentleman from California for his contribution.

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

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for the very fine statement which he has made. I do not feel, however, that we should let this occasion pass without speaking again of the necessity to educate not only the youngsters, but adults as well who are not aware of the dangers that exist in the use of these drugs. We do not yet appreciate the dangers. That is the plain fact of the matter. I have had the experience of viewing this situation, not from an enforcement angle, but from the social standpoint which is involved. Most of the youngsters who use drugs have not listened to the information which has been furnished to them with reference to the destructive effects of the use of these particular drugs. Most of them have no knowledge with reference to the effects of the use of the drugs and most of their parents have no knowledge as to their effect.

Mr. Chairman, we will take, for example, the case of a youngster in the District of Columbia whose father complains to the police that they have no jurisdiction in this matter, that they have no reason to "poke their nose" in a private affair. The man said, "My boy has a high intellect; his use of LSD is simply a matter of intellectual curiosity." The officer pointed out that 60 trips in 5 months covered a lot of intellectual curiosity.

Mr. Chairman, when we have 400 or 500 people in this area, in the District of Columbia, not deprived people, not people deprived because of lack of intelligence, using LSD and marihuana, we have a serious lack of education.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the gentleman makes a very valid point.

Mr. HUNT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, who has spoken the absolute truth of the matter. Education and the protection of our youth are paramount, but I wish to go to the basic concept of the matter now pending before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to go back to the basic concept, and that is whether we should merge the prosecuting and regulatory agencies, or whether or not we will vest the sole jurisdiction in the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I simply say to you that if you do that—pass this bill—removing this jurisdiction from the finest organization we have ever known in the field of narcotics, the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, you will insult the intelligence of the American people in doing so.

Mr. Chairman, all of us must remember that if the American Congress gave to this bureau the necessary money, as well as the necessary responsibility in court, narcotics suppression would take on a new look. To take this away from this bureau by transfer and merger we will set them back for the period of at least 20 years.

Mr. Chairman, we need not change the basic operation of this program or undertake to change the Bureau of Narcotics. We simply need to invest it with more power, more men, more money, better tools with which to do the job, and faith in their work. I thank the members of the committee.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me this time. However, I doubt if I shall consume the 10 minutes allocated to me. Mr. Chairman, I hope that this reorganization plan will be adopted.

For a good many years, now, I have been very much interested in the whole subject of narcotics and dangerous drugs. As a matter of fact, for several years I headed a subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means which looked into the whole subject of narcotic addiction. We went all about the country holding hearings. We went to the Public Health Service hospital in Lexington, Ky. We went to many of the State hospitals and other institutions in our country, and we recognized the tremendous difficulty of rehabilitating people, whether young or old, but particularly young people who had once become addicted to narcotics. We found that there was a progression that the young person would begin with the amphetamines and barbiturates, the various chemical compounds—and this was prior to the development and the establishment and perfection of these hallucinogenic drugs such as LSD, speed, and the others that are now very common and widespread—and we found that they progressed from one to another. Marihuana cigarettes quite frequently led to heroin, and the other so-called heavy narcotics. Once this had transpired, the chance of rehabilitation was very, very limited.

The number of patients treated, for instance, at the Public Health Service hospital in Lexington, Ky., is quite large, but the sad thing about it is that so many of these people and, as I said a moment ago so many young people, continue to come back time and time and time again. In many ways this is a type of slow murder or slow suicide. And as all of you know, and I am sure it has been said here today, of the methods employed by people to satisfy this addiction, this craving, the most common method, of course, gets to be criminality

of one kind or another, starting with the most common kinds such as theft and then on to selling narcotics in order to obtain funds to satisfy the craving and the addiction.

In the case of women, they turn to prostitution. The amount of money involved is quite large.

The question is not only one of enforcement, of course, as everybody has pointed out here, but the question of community relations, of efforts to provide proper hospitalization, proper care after the addicts have gone to places like Lexington, and so on.

I am very proud of the Bureau of Narcotics. I believe that Commissioner Giordano has done a very fine job, but there has been a separation of authority here which has been quite bad.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has had jurisdiction over drugs other than the narcotic drugs. And we have discovered, as I said a moment ago, that these so-called chemical derivatives today in many cases are doing just as much damage, if not more, than the so-called heavy narcotics. As a matter of fact, LSD is so much more easily obtainable than heroin that those who would engage in the heavy traffic have moved over into the hallucinogenics. And there is a reason for that.

The Congress, as a result of our work on the subcommittee, enacted very stiff penalties for people engaged in the narcotics traffic. We removed, over the objections of many members of the Federal judiciary, the discretionary power of judges in the cases of second offenders, and we made the penalty tremendously heavy in cases involving selling to juveniles.

These lesser penalties for selling have encouraged criminals to move over into the sale of other types of drugs, such as LSD, that I just mentioned.

I am sure from what has been recounted here today about the impact of these drugs, there is no doubt about it that in some cases they promote suicide. In other cases, they promote murder and homocidal tendencies. In other cases they promote a sense of the unreal. People have been known to think that they are able to fly through the air and so on, and many of them actually have been killed in that fashion. These drugs have contributed immeasurably to violent death on the highways in automobile accidents and other kinds of accidents.

Now the House is considering in the appropriate committee amendments to laws that we passed here a few years ago. I might say that before my subcommittee worked on this matter there was practically no legislation having to do with barbiturates and amphetamines. Under the direction of the former chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Congressman Harris, we passed the first act in that field several years ago, and it has been most helpful.

Now there are a number of bills pending before the same committee having to do with LSD and these other drugs.

The point I am making is that these are all related functions and they need to be combined under one jurisdiction, under one administration, so that the various facets of enforcement, and the necessity for community action particularly at the local level can be coordinated.

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

Mr. BOGGS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There has been a great deal said today about mixing the regulatory and enforcement together. At the present time in the Bureau of Drug Control and Abuse the regulatory and enforcement is combined. It is only when criminal prosecution occurs that it is referred to the Department of Justice.

Mr. BOGGS. That is exactly so.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And the same is true as to the Bureau of Narcotics.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman is right.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The regulation of narcotics sales and the enforcement of illegal diversions go together in the same agency, in the Bureau of Narcotics. But then when a criminal prosecution comes about it is referred to the Department of Justice and the Criminal Division takes care of that.

Now you have those same functions of the Bureau of Drug Control and Abuse and the Bureau of Narcotics put together in one separate agency—not in the FBI—but a separate agency—but of the same national prestige line as the FBI. And when they once perform their function, the same people are performing the function that perform it today—it will be turned over to the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice to prosecute in the courts. So I say that argument fails completely because they are doing practically the same thing now that we will be doing then.

Mr. BOGGS. Except that you will bring together the various enforcement agencies.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right. When we do bring the 600 agents together and give them cross-jurisdiction, when an agent arrests any possessor, or finds LSD on him, he can prosecute him on both issues—but he cannot do it now.

Mr. BOGGS. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has most effectively made my next point; namely, the way it is set up now if you have a violator involving heroin, for instance, then the Bureau of Narcotics handles it. And a different set of agents presently handle cases involving LSD and other dangerous drugs.

I would hope that Commissioner Giordano heads the reorganized agency because he is an extremely able man.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I might say that he testified in favor of this plan and I have every reasonable expectation that he will be the head of this new agency.

Mr. BOGGS. I hope so. I might say that he worked for the subcommittee that I mentioned just a moment ago and did an outstanding job. He is a dedicated person.

On the other hand, to follow through on my point—this control of these other drugs such as LSD, is in Health, Education, and Welfare.

Now if the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is to amend these acts and increase the penalties where required and provide for the necessary community services, which are also required, it would seem to me, it makes good sense to take one agency which is now in the Treasury Department—and the only reason the Narcotics Bureau got into the Treasury Department was because originally the Harrison Act, which was the first act in this field dealt with it as a revenue matter—as a matter of taxation of these narcotics that are being brought into the country. That is the reason why it got into the Treasury.

I think the Treasury Department has done a good job. I am not a bit critical. But the idea of the Treasury Department being the enforcement agency for narcotics laws—any more so than the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should be in the case of dangerous drugs, is in my judgment, not good administrative procedure. The normal agency for the enforcement of the laws of the Nation is the Department of Justice, and what we are talking about here today is law enforcement.

I would hope that the House in its good judgment would recognize the basic issue involved here and would put aside extraneous considerations that certainly have no bearing on the issue and would vote to support the committee and support this reorganization plan.

The problem of narcotic and drug abuse is one of the most serious and distressing problems facing our country today. Our young people in particular, seeking justification for their existence in today's complex society are turning in greater and greater numbers to chemical crutches. To counter this mass exodus from reality, we must take firm measures that will meet this crisis head on. The initial step in this direction is combining, for greater efficacy, those agencies of the Federal Government which deal in this area. The joining of the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control with the Narcotic Bureau under the auspices of the Justice Department will be a great stride forward organizationally in combating this problem. The coordination of existing facilities and personnel will enable a better focusing of effort and assure greater accomplishments. The joining of these fine agencies will permit easier and more efficient relationships with private industry and those professions that come under their control instead of dealing with multiple agencies and conflicting regulations, the drug industry will be in contact with only one agency enabling even greater understanding of individual problems and cooperation toward the various goals sought.

Centralization will enable this new agency to achieve greater coordination and most important, permit the formulation of new and meaningful regulations. The existing ties will be strengthened and new ones acquired. Information will be channeled through one source permitting quicker dissemination and compliance. Regulations and procedures will eventually be standardized permitting greater efficiency both in industry and government.

May I conclude by saying this centralization of drug law enforcement will result in smoother relationships with industry and the professions and a stronger weapon against those engaged in the illicit trafficking of these dangerous drugs and narcotics.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I agree with a number of those who have spoken that Reorganization Plan No. 1 shares the infirmities of most reorganization plans. I think there is much to be said for the position of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], who spoke earlier today, that the Reorganization Act does rob the Congress of much of its initiative.

And yet I think we all must, on occasion, give the devil his due, and I think personally that his is a case where action under the reorganization plan is appropriate.

It was said earlier today that it was irrelevant that the Hoover Commission first brought the question of the organization of our fight against narcotics to the public attention in 1949. I think it is very relevant to the question of whether or not we are proceeding in the best practical way today, because it is not the reorganization plan that has robbed Congress of its initiative in this case; it is 19 years of inaction on the part of the Congress that has lost us the initiative here.

It was in 1949—19 full years ago—that the Hoover Commission commented that the Bureau of Narcotics was misplaced in the Treasury Department. We have had that recommendation before us for 19 full years.

Then 5 years ago, in 1963, the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs reminded us of this earlier recommendation of the Hoover Commission and gave us a more specific proposal, which I think should have demanded our action long before today.

Thus we see that for 19 years Congress has not acted on a recognized problem, and that even after a sharp reminder 5 years ago.

If ever the Reorganization Act seems appropriate, if only by reason of our own default, this is the time.

On the merits of this question, there seems to be very broad and general agreement among parties on all sides of this question who have spoken here today, and who have commented on this problem at other times and in other places, that the continued division of responsibility for the control of the illicit traffic in drugs among the Department of Justice, the Treasury Department, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is not in the public interest. So at least we start this debate with that kind of general understanding among ourselves.

There seems to be less agreement on where these functions should go. The Prettyman report, which I think is an outstanding contribution to this subject, recommends a new mix of authority between the Justice Department and Health, Education, and Welfare. I would recommend to all who have not read the Prettyman report that Members should review at least the italicized recommendations of the Prettyman Commission, which I think are extremely helpful in reviewing and discussing the reorganization plan.

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

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I will be delighted to yield, but the committee has said my time has to be curtailed, and if I can just complete my statement, I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia first, if there is an opportunity to do so.

Under the plan, the Justice Department will take over the enforcement and investigation and regulation when—and I would like to emphasize this point—when drugs and narcotics are out of the legal channels. This is the point at which the Justice Department is triggered to act including, of course, sufficient monitoring to determine the existence and extent of illegal activity. It is at the same time my clear understanding that HEW will retain authority for research in the field of drugs and narcotics and for educational activities in the area of drugs and narcotics. On this question of regulation which has been talked about so much today, HEW will, of course, retain the regulatory authority over the manufacture, sale, distribution, and fixing standards of purity which will apply to drugs and narcotics which move in legal channels. That is not going to be disturbed by Reorganization Plan No. 1.

I see headshaking, but I think that a review of this plan will indicate that is correct.

It seems to me that whatever differences we have as to any single point in the plan, the most pertinent overall consideration for the House is that this plan is probably going to be more successful in combating the abuse of drugs and narcotics in illicit hands than the present system has been or is likely to be.

That is what is pertinent today, the fact that with whatever infirmities the plan may have it is going to be better than what we have today.

The gentleman from New Jersey commented that we need more men in the fight against the abuse of drugs and narcotics, that we need more than 300 men. Of course, we need more than 300 men. We will in this plan put together two units of 300 men, and we shall add another 300, and we shall have 900 men working in this field, which I think is the minimum that is required.

Mr. Chairman, I have been very critical of the Department of Justice in recent years. I have been critical specifically of the manner in which it has conducted the fight against organized crime. I have been critical of the effort it has made, and I have been critical of the results. I find it difficult to deny today to the Attorney General the additional powers to do the better job that I have for so long thought it was necessary to do.

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

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. I promised I would yield to the gentleman from Virginia, because my time is somewhat limited.

I find it difficult to deny to the Attorney General the additional powers to do the job which I believe is necessary to do. If this will be a new weapon in the fight against organized crime, I do not believe we in this House can withhold it.

I would say at this point to the Attorney General and to his associates in the Department of Justice, however, that with this new authority goes new responsibility that exceeds and transcends the mechanical reshuffling of duties.

The drug traffic is a principal activity of the "mob." This is a new commission to escalate this particular war across the entire front. Less than this kind of response to the action of the House in approving the reorganization plan will disappoint our hopes and our confidence.

Reorganization Plan No. 1, I am sure, is not perfect. Acceptance of the plan does not crystalize the law or render it immutable. The laws of the Medes and the Persians do not run in the United States.

I believe congressional oversight should be vigilant and our responsibility sharpened by our long period of inactivity in this field.

Let the plan be approved. Let the resolution be voted down. Then, in the months and years ahead, let the Congress act as we should have acted in the past, and the law be amended if, as, and when necessary. But today let us take the logical step which the crime rate and the statistics on the drug traffic demand, which is to vote down the resolution and to approve the plan.

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

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I assure the gentleman that I have read the italicized and other portions of the Prettyman report. I know the gentleman will agree with me that the thrust of the report is substantially in accord with the position I took during the course of the debate; namely, that while the functions should be consolidated the regulatory functions should be preserved to the present agency.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. I believe the gentleman will find that the legal drug traffic will still be regulated by HEW. It is the illicit drug traffic which comes under the purview of the Justice Department under Reorganization Plan 1.

Mr. POFF. If the gentleman will read again the language of the reorganization plan he will find the functions are transferred. I direct specific attention to pages 24 and 25 of the committee report, which deal specifically with education programs, training programs and research programs now conducted by BDAC.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. I am familiar with the language of the report to which the gentleman refers. This relates that some activities in research and education can take place in the Department of Justice. Indeed, I would think an intelligent application of the law would require that they do. This does not prevent the activities from going forward in HEW, nor does it refer to the regulation of the manufacture, sale, or distribution, or fixing standards of parity for legal drugs.

Mr. POFF. The gentleman will find those items so delineated on pages 24 and 25.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. I would not read the language on those pages as the gentleman has done.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to give my full endorsement to the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1968. There is no question in my mind that placing the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control and the Bureau of Narcotics in the Department of Justice under the direction of the Attorney General will greatly strengthen the law enforcement effort in the area of drug control. The recent attention given this major social and law-enforcement problem is warranted. One of the principal methods used in combating this problem is, of course, strict enforcement to control and, hopefully, to eliminate the sources of supply of these illicit drugs. At the same time, it must be recognized that there are psychological and social aspects of the drug abuse problem which are equally important. Recent studies concerning the alienation of the youth of this country, together with analysis into the so-called drug culture, indicate that there is a need for continued scientific, medical, and psychological examination of the problem.

The reorganization plan recognizes this need and wisely leaves the major scientific, medical, and educational aspects of this program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The sociological-medical problems can best be handled by the segments of the Government whose traditional mission is the development of medical information, the understanding of psychological problems, and the education of the citizens to what is as much a health problem as an enforcement one.

The Bureau of Drug Abuse Control, of course, will take a small contingent of scientifically and sociologically trained personnel, not including physicians, with it to the Department of Justice to aid in the necessary scientific and educational aspects in the enforcement effort. These people will act as liaison for the proposed new Bureau in its dealings with the scientific and academic communities regarding health and educative efforts in combating growing drug abuse. It is those communities that will initiate and control the bulk of the experimental efforts in science, medicine, and education in the drug area.

An examination of the budget indicates that the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control has a budget for fiscal year 1969 of approximately $10,700,000. The functions associated with this budget would be transferred to the Department of Justice. At the same time, the National Institute of Mental Health of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will allocate approximately $30,500,000 for fiscal year 1969 for programs to study the medical, pharmacological, and sociological problems of drug abuse, and additional funds have been budgeted within HEW's functions concerning education for studies on youth problems which have obvious relation to the root causes of drug abuse.

I fully favor the proposed reorganization and feel that the division of functions between HEW and Justice are logical and warranted.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending disapproval resolution and I urge all my colleagues to join with me in voting it down.

As a Representative of an urban constituency in the Greater New York area, drug addicton has become our most serious problem. Fortunately local law-enforcement officials are doing an outstanding job. Sheriff George Bonelli, of Hudson County, to name just one official of our area, has been a most effective fighter against the evils of drug addiction. He has been a dedicated crusader against narcotic addiction, particularly among young people. Our hard-pressed local officials need all the help they can get. It is for this reason that I urge support for the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1, which would combine drug abuse control under the auspices of the Department of Justice.

Under President Johnson's proposal a Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs would be created in the Department of Justice. This new agency would combine the functions now exercised by the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Treasury Department's Bureau of Narcotics.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot overemphasize the serious problems posed by drug addiction. Let me cite just a few figures:

The Bureau of Narcotics, reports that in 1960 there were 45,000 active narcotics addicts; by 1967 this total had risen to a staggering 62,000. I might point out here the fact that 2.12 percent of the new addicts were under 21 years of age. It is in this area that we must take action.

Sheriff Bonelli has pointed out time and time again to civic groups in northern New Jersey that it is among young people that this particular problem is most severe and it is to protect the young that we need vigorous law enforcement.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is time we declare war on drug addiction. The reorganization is not a panacea or a cure-all, but it is an important step in mobilizing our efforts to stamp out drug addiction in that agency of Government best equipped to handle this growing problem.

The administration proposal is far reaching and deserves the support of every Member of this House. Therefore, I ask all of my colleagues to vote against the pending disapproval resolution.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have been requested by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] to place his statement in the RECORD. He planned to be present to give it. He is in favor of Reorganization Plan No. 1. He was suddenly called downtown.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my wholehearted support of Reorganization Plan No. 1, which transfers Treasury's Bureau of Narcotics and HEW's Bureau of Drug Abuse Control to the Department of Justice. The plan is a simple but vital step in the fight to suppress the illegal traffic in narcotics and dangerous drugs.

Each of these Bureaus has been doing a fine job, within its own statutory jurisdiction. But there is needless waste of personnel by needless duplication of effort and services which result from the fact that the agents of one Bureau have no statutory power to deal with the drugs which are the responsibility of the other Bureau. They are policing separate sides of the same street.

This situation simply cries for better coordination—for more effective law enforcement—for better use of the valuable time of the haru-working agents of both Bureaus. Bringing these law-enforcement Bureaus together in the agency which has overall Federal responsibility for general law enforcement will permit such coordination and better use of personnel. Combining them in one agency will facilitate the exchange of information about the criminals who traffic in drugs—and criminals peddling their illicit wares do not respect the jurisdictional lines that now separate BDAC and the Bureau of Narcotics.

There need be no apprehension that this plan will either change our tested methods of enforcing laws against drug abuse, or take away from this vital work any of the personnel of both Bureaus who have been doing such a fine job. The plan provides that all of the current operations and personnel of both Bureaus will be transferred in toto to the Department of Justice. I have the assurance of the Attorney General that he expects both Bureaus to continue using the same enforcement methods that they are now using so effectively, strengthened by additional personnel and combining the resources of the two Bureaus. As everyone knows, the fine record of convictions obtained by U.S. attorneys of the Justice Department is on the basis of evidence furnished them by investigators of both Bureaus.

I am convinced that this is a good move, and the time for it is now. There are many problems in the area of drugs that require much further study. No further study is required, however, to know that it make sense to take these law enforcement agencies from Treasury and HEW—to bring them together at last in the Federal department primarily charged with law enforcement—which is where the Hoover Commission would

have placed these enforcement functions almost 20 years ago.

This plan of reorganization is an important step in the fight against organized crime. I urge every Member to vote nay on the pending resolution so that this useful measure may quickly go into effect.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may require to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, for a number of reasons, I believe the most prudent vote on the pending reorganization plan would be a negative one—that is, a vote for the resolution of disapproval.

I recommend this course only very reluctantly. For some time, I have been convinced that much closer coordination between the Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control was most desirable. This conviction was reinforced last fall as a result of the testimony before our Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, testimony which disclosed an important area of duplication in the activities of the two agencies, a serious gap in the regulatory pattern in the area of narcotics and drug abuse control, and, perhaps most significant, a major inconsistency in the regulatory and law enforcement philosophies of the two Bureaus.

More recently, hearings before the Executive and Legislative Reorganizations Subcommittee also showed the need for closer cooperation and coordination—perhaps even a merger of the two Bureaus.

The more closely I have studied the question, however, and pondered the alternatives, the more it appears that we simply do not have adequate evidence today on which to base a compelling argument for merger of the two agencies in the Department of Justice. Neither am I convinced that a merger would be justified which placed both agencies either within the Treasury Department or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There are nagging and unsettled questions relating to all three alternatives, and until these doubts can be resolved, I believe we would be wise to disapprove the pending plan.

I would add two other observations as a result of this experience, Mr. Chairman:

In questions of this kind, Congress should be encouraged to explore alternative solutions to any reorganization proposal. We should not arbitrarily be limited to consideration of a single plan. For example, it may well be that further study would show that a separate kind of coordinating device would be the proper solution to the present issue—a coordinating committee or council which could establish basic policy for the two agencies but allow each to develop patterns of regulation and enforcement best suited to their individual needs.

Second, I strongly suggest that our experience with Reorganization Plan No. 1 once again demonstrates the limitations of approaching governmental reorganization on a piecemeal basis and, conversely, the need to adopt a broader, more comprehensive view of the structure of the executive branch as a basis for reforming and reorganizing it. It is true that every solution creates new problems, but we can minimize this greatly by examining in greater depth the possible consequences of any specific plan.

This goal cannot be achieved on an inhouse basis. It requires the objectivity of outside experts as well as officials within the Government. In brief, the time has long since arrived when we need another independent commission to study and recommend improvements in the organization of the executive branch. We have put this off too long already. Federal programs are multiplying and creating administrative chaos, often defeating the purpose for which they were devised.

If we are truly serious about economy and efficiency in the Federal Government, if we really want results from the money we spend, we will start at the beginning with a thorough restructuring of the departments and agencies.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCCLOSKEY].

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the reorganization plan because of a point which I do not think has been previously brought out. I think this point transcends the arguments of efficiency and economy which are ordinarily associated with reorganizations of the executive branch. This principle is that of the historic separation between the office of the prosecutor and other governmental functions. The prosecutor has traditionally held the awesome responsibility of determining which violations of the law should be prosecuted and which should not. Ordinarily when a violation of the law is brought to the attention of the prosecutor, prosecution is a necessity, so that no complaint can be made that the law is enforced differently as among individuals of different class or station. In the present instance I would have to disagree with the statement made by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS]. On page 25 of the report, listing the functions transferred by the Food and Drug Administration to the Department of Justice under this reorganization plan, there are listed science programs, education programs, and public information. Now, it has been my experience in the State of California for many years that we have sought to attack the drug problem through punitive law enforcement actions. In more recent years we have attempted to attack the problem of marihuana use through a program of education of the young. Now, this is the situation at the present time. We have found in California that it is wholly impossible for the prosecuting agencies, such as the attorney general and the district attorney's offices, to communicate with the youth in the high schools and grammar schools who are accustomed to having marihuana available to them. The punitive functions and the law enforcement functions in the State of California have not been as effective in stopping the use of drugs as has been the program of education. In my county of San Mateo, Calif., we have made many attempts to reach kids in the schools. This function was finally recommended to be turned over to the department of health and to the department of education of the county, because those departments were able to reach the kids and to talk to them and convince them against the use of these drugs. If this job of education of the kids is put under the Department of Justice, I submit that very probably it will be difficult for the representatives of the Department of Justice to carry out convincingly with the Nation's youth these programs of education, public information, science, and research. This is so because when they attempt to do so, they represent the same authority that prosecutes the law. If, in their communications with these young people, they are apprised of violations of the law, then under the obligation and responsibility resting with the Attorney General generally, those violations will have to be enforced.

We have had, traditionally, in the history of our country a separation between the office of the prosecutor and other functions of government. It will blur that separation if these functions of education are transferred to the office of the prosecutor. More than blurring this function, I think, it will make it extremely difficult to carry out that function of education of the Nation's youth which today is proving to be most effective in stamping out the use of drugs.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is quite clear from the debate which has taken place here this afternoon that all of the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union support a merger of the Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control. Many of the arguments which have been made by the supporters of the President's reorganization plan have gone into the question as to whether we should have a division of these two functions and state that it is much better to have BDAC operate under the same bureau as the Bureau of Narcotics. Obviously, the answer is that this is desirable.

So, let us not be confused with reference to the question of whether we should support or reject the reorganization plan, based upon the question of merger. Does this merger represent an improvement in placing the newly merged agencies in the Department of Justice? Mr. Chairman, I would say that just about everyone supporting this plan used the argument that this transfer will aid the fight against organized crime. Their assumption is that we will have better law enforcement directed against organized crime in the Department of Justice.

I submit that this is not necessarily true.

Mr. Chairman, historically, the Bureau of Narcotics has used undercover agents. Also, historically, the Department of Justice has used paid informers. They function differently. And, I wonder if the Bureau of Narcotics, with its excellent record of investigations and arrests, will have as good a record if merged into the Department of Justice, when the methods of the Department of Justice are used

rather than the methods used in the past by the Bureau of Narcotics.

Mr. Chairman, there comes into question the recent rulings of the Supreme Court about the use of wiretapping. It is interesting to note that in our hearings when Attorney General Ramsey Clark was testifying, he was asked the question as to whether or not legal wiretapping would be used by the Department of Justice if they controlled this newly merged agency. And, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read to the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union his answer.

In substance, he said, "No," and that even the legal use of wiretapping would not be countenanced by the Department of Justice. Further, he said, and I quote:

All the Supreme Court in its most recent decisions has indicated is that where judicial authority, analagous to the authority to grant a warrant to search, has been sought, where there is probable cause to believe a crime has or is about to be committed, that under judicial authorization, a wiretapping can be placed on domestic crime for a very limited period of time.

In other words, legal wiretapping.

Then, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] asked this question:

Does this put the Justice Department's philosophy then at odds with the Supreme Court decision? In other words, are you tougher on this point than the Supreme Court?

Mr. Clark answered as follows:

I would say we are tougher than the Supreme Court. But the mere fact that you can do something under the Constitution doesn't mean that as a matter of policy you do it. We have found that we have been very effective without its use.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, he is telling us that he does not intend to use all of the weapons that are legally available to him with which to combat organized crime.

Mr. Chairman, how can we expect better law enforcement and a better record against organized crime if all of the sophisticated weapons of the investigatory field are not used?

Many Members in debate have discussed "law enforcement" as a single function. Two functions are in fact involved. One is the investigation and arrest and the other is the prosecution.

Historically, in most jurisdictions, these functions have been separated. In most States you have the police department or the sheriff's department to perform the function of investigation and arrest. You have the office of the prosecutor which performs the function of prosecution.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that there is inherent in this separation, checks and balances that are desirable. The same is true with reference to this proposed reorganization plan. In many of our Federal bureaus and departments there is the power of investigation and arrest. The power of prosecution is already in the Department of Justice.

And, Mr. Chairman, I submit it is desirable to maintain this separation and not to put arrest, investigation, and prosecution all together in the Department of Justice and thereby lose the historical system of checks and balances.

Mr. Chairman, the other part of this proposed reorganization plan that bothers me is the merger of the power to regulate with the power to investigate and prosecute. What this, in effect, means, is that the Department of Justice, with the powers they have, will have the right to go into the drug manufacturers' books and records. It is my opinion that the businessman is not going to be particularly happy to have this power vested in the Department of Justice.

The Department of Justice investigators will have the authority to go into the back room of the local pharmacy, to go into the books and records of the physician to check on his use of dangerous drugs and narcotics. I believe that this combination of the right to prosecute and the right to regulate is very undesirable.

Lastly, I believe that the right to conduct research to determine what are dangerous drugs, and to conduct the educational programs to try to convince the youth of our Nation not to fall victim to the use of dangerous drugs and narcotics, does not belong in the Office of the Attorney General. This point has been well made by many of those who have spoken here this afternoon. The cop approach, the club approach, is not the right approach. We have to hold out the hand of friendship and helpfulness to the youth of this Nation in convincing them that they should not fall victim to the use of dangerous drugs and narcotics. I believe it will be setting us back many years to combine the prosecution and the education and research functions.

For these reasons I am opposing the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1, and support the resolution of disapproval. The Speaker [Mr. MCCORMACK] told us here this afternoon how strongly he feels about the necessity of merger. I believe we can be well assured that, should this plan be defeated, the Speaker will do all within his power to see that the bills now pending in the committees of jurisdiction that would accomplish a merger after a careful congressional investigation will be considered promptly. And I am sure that the Speaker, in view of the indication he made today, will see that this is done promptly. He will urge the committee of jurisdiction to hold hearings promptly so that we can in a proper, orderly, legislative fashion, accomplish the merger. We will do away with the duplicative functions we now have in the Bureau of Narcotics and BDAC, and will accomplish the merger that we all desire, and yet not give us these other bad results that other Members of the House and I see as a result of the President's plan.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time we have remaining on our side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota has 49 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the members of the committee have for the most part been speaking to each other today, and that there has not been a great deal of attendance on the floor. However, in order to save time, I have discouraged calling a quorum call. We have had one quorum call today, and I guess that is about enough.

I want to comment upon the opposition of the minority as set forth in the minority report. But in that minority report they also make three admissions in favor of the plan.

First, they agree in paragraph 1 that the Bureau of Narcotics now in the Treasury, and the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control in HEW, should be merged. Second, they state that the present arrangement of separation of function and facilities is undesirable, and I will quote from the minority report:

In the course of their work, they engage in duplication and overlap in the use of manpower, laboratory facilities, education, and training programs, et cetera.

And I quote again from the minority report:

The merger of the two bureaus will eliminate unneeded waste and inefficiency and make enforcement of these laws more effective.

These three admissions of the minority are in accord with the testimony of the Government witnesses. The Attorney General of the United States, our chief law enforcement officer; the Bureau of the Budget witness, Mr. Hughes; the Health, Education, and Welfare witness, Mr. Lee; the Commissioner of Narcotics, Mr. Giordano; the Director of the Bureau of Drug Abuse, Mr. Finlator; and the Special Assistant of the Secretary of the Treasury of the Law Enforcement Section, Mr. Hendrick.

Mr. Chairman, these witnesses represent five top law-enforcement agencies of the Federal Government. They are the experts in criminal law enforcement. They are charged with the apprehension and legal prosecution of criminals, imprisonment, and punishment. Under our laws they have the responsibility for the war on crime. We look to them for the protection of our people from the evils of narcotics addiction. We look to them for the protection of young people against the growing trend in the use of hallucinogenic drugs, marihuana, LSD, speed, and other illegally produced and distributed nonnarcotic but evil, mind- and body-destroying chemicals.

These experts in criminal law enforcement without reservation or qualification ask for the acceptance of Reorganization Plan No. 1. And I think this is important. I think it is important that the five men who are responsible for the Federal law enforcement all came before our committee and advocated the adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 1.

Are they unmindful of their responsibilities? Are they doing this idly or are they doing this foolishly? Or are they doing it in consonance with their oath

of office which places upon them the duty and responsibility of exerting their best efforts in law enforcement? Well, I do not think even the opponents of the plan would say that these men who are at the top of these five departments would prostitute their honor and integrity by coming before our committee and asking our committee to adopt this plan if they do not think the plan is good, and if they do not think the plan would help them in the enforcement of the Federal laws against the evil doer.

Now, keep this fact in mind. The Department of Justice at the present time prosecutes in the Federal court all criminal indictments in the narcotics and drug abuse field. They are doing that now. It acts as the prosecuting arm for the Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Drug Control and Abuse.

What then is the essential change that is authorized by this plan? It coordinates two separate facilities including the 600 law-enforcement personnel, in one bureau—a new bureau in the Department of Justice.

Why? Well, I quote again the minority's admission in their own report.

> The merger of the two bureaus will eliminate unneeded waste and inefficiency and make law enforcement of these laws more effective.

Second, the 600 agents charged with law enforcement in the narcotic and drug abuse field—and there are about 300 in each one of the separate agencies and separate departments—that are now separated and they are in two different departments of the Federal Government with separate and limited areas of jurisdiction over narcotics and hallucinogenic drugs—both will be placed in the new bureau in the Department of Justice. Each and every one of those 600 officers will be given across-the-board duties in both narcotics and dangerous drugs. No longer will the possessor of heroin go free when searched by a drug abuse control officer. No longer will the possessor of marihuana go free when searched by a narcotics agent.

The new bureau will be raised to a more important level in the organizational structure of the Government. It will be raised to the same level as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Bureau of Prisons, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Community Relations Service, and the U.S. attorneys section.

All of these bureaus report directly to the Attorney General of the United States today, and a new Bureau, as you can see by the chart, will go straight to the Attorney General for the disposition of criminal indictments and for prosecution in the courts of Federal law violators in this field. This prestige that will be in the new Bureau, this direct access to the Attorney General, has given us the most efficient law-enforcement process in the world.

Organized crime fears the FBI because they know they are coordinated, simply directed, and supported by the Attorney General's criminal trial attorneys. Organized crime will fear the same arrangement in the illegal drug field.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman commented at the opening of his remarks that he observed only members of the committee present. Certainly I am not a member of the committee, and there are a number of Members of the House who are present here on the floor who are not members of the committee.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I shall ask to correct that in the RECORD. I thought I said "mostly." But there have been others here. I recognize that the gentleman has been on the floor.

Mr. SCOTT. I share the gentleman's concern that there is not a larger attendance.

The question has been brought up by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] and others, that the question of regulation and prosecution would be in the same agency. My concern is just the reverse of this. Perhaps there would not be adequate regulation; there would not be adequate prosecution. It has both an affirmative and a negative tenor, in my opinion. I would say to the gentleman I am going to vote for the resolution of disapproval.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, but I would say that the regulation and the enforcement arm today in the Drug Control Abuse Section is in one entity, and I would say that the drug control or the narcotics enforcement, apprehension, detection, arresting, criminal indictment, and so forth is in the Narcotics Bureau. But when it comes to prosecution in the courts, of course, the Department of Justice handles that as it does for the FBI.

The gentleman will observe the chart in the well of the House. He will see that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Bureau of Prisons, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Community Relations Service, and U.S. Attorneys Office are all on the same level that this new Bureau will be in, and at the present time the prosecution of their cases is in the hands of the Attorney General. It is a long and well proven process, and I do not see why the gentleman objects to it.

Mr. SCOTT. If the gentleman will yield for a moment further——

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. I would say that I am fully familiar with the Department of Justice, having been an employee of the Department for 21 years.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad the gentleman knows that what I have said is the truth, because that is their organization chart.

Why does the minority oppose this reorganization plan? Let me quote from the conclusion of their views:

> We are not yet completely decided as to where the Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control should be located.

That is a fair statement. They are not completely decided. Every witness charged with the responsibility of law enforcement is completely decided in favor of the plan. But the members of the minority are not completely decided yet.

The minority in the conclusion of their views say:

> We certainly support a merger of these two bureaus.

But they say further, and I again quote:

> We are convinced that their transfer to Justice would cause more harm than good.

They are entitled to that opinion. It is an opinion that flies in the face of all the law-enforcement officers that have the job to do, to enforce Federal laws against criminal violators. They say:

> We do not have sufficient information or knowledge at this time to make a recommendation.

Maybe they do not have sufficient information. I feel sorry for them if they do not have sufficient information. The Attorney General had plenty of information. The head of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had plenty of information. The head man in the Narcotics Bureau, Mr. Giordano, had plenty of information, and that is his job, and he works at it 24 hours a day. He had plenty of information to make the decision on, and so on down the line.

I say to my friends that are not "completely decided" to resolve their decision.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman assert that the Commissioner for Narcotics, Mr. Giordano, favors this reorganization?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Giordano testified in favor of it, as did the Attorney General, as did the representative from Health, Education, and Welfare, and as did representatives from other agencies involved.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. So, I say to my friends that are not "completely decided" they should resolve their incompleteness of decision on the basis of the unanimous testimony of every witness responsible for the grave task of fighting organized crime in the illegal drug field.

The FBI Crime Report of 1966 indicates 3¼ million serious crimes were committed in 1966—an 11-percent increase over 1965.

The arrest of juveniles increased in 1966 over 1960 by 54 percent.

The arrest of narcotic drug violators for the same period increased 82 percent.

There are 57,000 opiate addicts listed in the Narcotics Bureau's files.

We do not have a total figure for the young people who are using marihuana, LSD, speed, and other hallucinogenic drugs, but we know that the use of these drugs has had an alarming increase.

The Attorney General in his testimony before our committee stated that there are three major sources of income for organized crime in the United States—gambling, loan sharking, and narcotics.

The Department of Justice estimates

that the gross heroin trade alone is $350 million annually.

The Attorney General says that "most of this profit goes to organized crime."

The Bureau of Drug Abuse says that dangerous drugs are trafficked in by organized criminal elements.

This plan attacks one of the three principal crime areas in the United States, narcotics and dangerous drugs.

The plan is supported by every Federal witness that appeared before the committee.

There was no personal appearance of any dissenting witnesses, although one member filed a statement against the plan and two members filed statements in favor of the plan.

I ask my friends on the minority to try to "reassess" their possession—that seems to be a good word nowadays. I know they are as much against crime and narcotics as I am—and nothing I say would indicate otherwise.

But, I respectfully say that they have argued themselves into a position of opposing a more efficient attack on one of the most vicious areas of organized crime, that is, narcotics and drug abuse.

If they have fears and are not completely decided as to where this new Bureau should go, I ask them to submerge their fears and make their decision on the side of the recommendation of every Government witness who advocates this reorganization plan.

I will say to the ladies and gentlemen of the Congress that a vote of "no" is a vote in support of the President's plan. A vote of "yes" is a vote against the President's plan. This comes about because we have a disapproving resolution. A vote of "no" is requested by the majority of the committee.

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

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

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be entirely fitting and entirely justified to compliment the gentleman from California who has given such splendid leadership not only to the subcommittee but to the full Committee on Government Operations, and particularly to the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization. I know I speak in behalf of the full committee in congratulating the gentleman on one of the finest and most earnest and certainly persuasive and sincere contributions to one of the most important problems that affects and afflicts our society, particularly the youngsters, in this field of drugs and narcotics.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his continuous attendance over a period of days, not only in committee work, but in staff work and in sessions and in consultation with his own colleagues, and with the House leadership, and in consultation with the minority.

I, as chairman of the subcommittee, am personally indebted to the gentleman. I express my personal commendation, and I know that of all of the Members. We are proud of you, CHET HOLIFIELD.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I include the following statement by Dr. Dale G. Friend as part of my remarks for the information of the Members:

BOSTON, MASS.,
March 18, 1968.

Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BLATNIK: As a result of discussing the proposed legislation with Dr. Robert Stolar whereby the Justice Department will take over the enforcement or the legal aspects of the problem of harmful drugs and any legislation that may be enacted for their control, and other problems concerned with their abuse, we agreed that it might be helpful to the Committee to have comments from various professional people with knowledge in the field. In consequence of this decision, I am writing to acquaint you with such thinking as I have in regard to this new proposed legislation.

I would like to say at the outset that a physician with the training and background such as myself sees a fair number of patients who are abusers of drugs during a year's time. These range from narcotic addicts to patients habituated to barbiturates, amphetamines and other drugs which would fall into the category under consideration by the Congress.

As a result of approximately 30 years of the practice of Medicine in which time, I have engaged in investigative work, teaching and clinical practice, there has been developed some concrete thoughts in regard to the problem of drug abuse.

First, I am in complete agreement that any possible legislation that can be devised to enforce control and the prevention of the wide dissemination and indiscriminate use of harmful drugs is all to the good. House Rules 2 which was passed, I thought, was a very good step forward and only wish that it could be made applicable to all prescription drugs since there continues to be widespread abuse in regard to the continual renewal and poor control of many drugs, some of which have harmful properties other than that associated with addiction or with habituation; for example, certain drugs have inherent toxic properties which at the present time is not controlled by any restrictive provisions in the law.

Secondly, I am firmly of the belief that individuals who deal in traffic in the dissemination of harmful drugs to our citizens should be punished, and I am in agreement with the legislation that now exists in this regard.

Third, however, as for the victims themselves of drug abuse, these individuals are sick people. They have long since lost all willpower. They become rather pathetic, weak, easily persuaded and totally incapable of making sensible decisions as regards drugs and their effect on them. In other words, these people are incapable of protecting themselves and must be considered mentally and physically ill. I think little is gained by imprisoning or punishing patients who are incapable of protecting themselves through a lack of the mental and moral capacity to do so. These helpless victims of drugs abuse need expert medical attention, physical and mental rehabilitation and finally assistance in adjusting to society and developing economic and social competence. There are available Federal Institutions for the treatment of narcotic addicts at Lexington and Fort Worth.

These programs are excellent, but unfortunately, once the patient is released from these institutions, he returns to his own community where all care breaks down, and almost invariably, at least 70% of these individuals very quickly become addicts again and become a social and economic loss to the community as well as victims of the drug trafficteers. It is indeed unfortunate that this situation has been tolerated as long as it has. What those of us who have observed this situation feel is needed is an opportunity for these people to return to their own state where they are immediately taken into an extensive rehabilitation program which reorients their entire life. For example, some of us have proposed for a long time that institutions such as the old Civilian Conservation Camp Organization be established to handle problems of this type whereby victims of drug abuse could be brought together under a semi-protective environment, be taught a trade and gradually under protective care reestablished in communities away from any possible contact with their previous environment. If this were possible, we undoubtedly would begin to reduce the number of severe addicts and problem people that we have at the present time as a result of drug abuse. In the long run, I feel that we would not only salvage individuals, but we would remove victims from the drug traffic, and in the end, find actually that it is much less expensive to handle sick patients this way than to put them into penal institutions where all effective treatment would stop.

In conclusion, I would like to point out the more we learn about addictive drugs, the more we realize there is alteration in the cellular structure of tissues. For example, isolated cells grown in tissue culture can be made addictive to certain narcotic drugs so that they are unable to even survive in the test tube unless the drug is available for them. Therefore, this should give great pause to those who feel that drug addicts are just moral outcasts who lack any willpower or have inclinations toward criminal behavior. That is definitely not the case. Something has happened to their cells which make them incapable of resisting the drug or resisting the temptation to use the drug. In other words, we are dealing with a diseased person rather than a criminal, and our program should certainly take this into consideration in any new legislation that may be proposed for the management of drug abuse and its victims.

Sincerely yours,

DALE G. FRIEND, M.D.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of our subcommittee chairman about the gentleman from California. He certainly has been extremely diligent and hard-working on this and any other legislative matters on which I have had a common interest with him.

All I can add is I am sorry he is so misguided on this particular point.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield me 30 seconds, I wish to make doubly sure, because this is an unusual procedure, the Members understand. I should like to again point out to the Members of the House that a "yea" vote is for the disapproval resolution and against the President's Reorganization Plan, and a "nay" vote is against the disapproval resolution and for the President's reorganization plan.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 1101, to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1, 1968. This plan would unite the drive against narcotic abuses under a new Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

There is no question but that a concerted effort must be made to expand and improve our actions to curb the dangerous drug abuses that are plaguing our Nation, and particularly our young people. The image of youngsters being pulled into the morass of drug addiction, with its accompanying manifestations of lawlessness and despair, is horrifying

enough. More distasteful yet, however, is the realization that this toll of human desperation is, to those involved in organized crime, merely a byproduct of an extremely profitable commercial enterprise.

It seems quite clear that an improvement in the efficiency with which we combat the narcotic racket would be obtained by combining the efforts of the present Narcotics Bureau and the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control. The major question at issue is to which Federal agency the jurisdiction over these activities should fall. I firmly believe, that, given the generally recognized nature of the perpetrators of these abuses, the Justice Department would indeed be best equipped to take on the responsibilities of the newly combined Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

A fight against the illicit drug problem is largely a fight against organized crime, and the Justice Department, with established facilities to conduct this fight, is in the best position to make the greatest progress on this front. Whereas the Treasury Department and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may well be better placed to handle certain facets of the drug problem, the root of the issue is big-time crime, and no efforts to attack peripheral facets of the problem can succeed if the activities of organized crime are not recognized and combatted.

With these factors in mind, Mr. Chairman, and in view of my long-standing advocacy of the fight against drug abuses, I introduced H.R. 16182, which would accomplish in legislative form objectives similar to those contained in the President's reorganization plan. I am delighted that the President's plan proposes to accomplish these goals, and I feel it would be a travesty if it were rejected, which would occur if House Resolution 1101 were passed. Hence, I urge overwhelming disapproval of this resolution, in order that this coordinated effort to combat drug abuses may be achieved.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Reorganization Plan No. 1 and urge that the disapproval resolution be defeated.

Although there are many aspects to the problems of drug abuse and narcotics use in this country, I consider one of the major problems to be that of the infiltration of organized crime. There is no question but that the increasing supply of narcotics is made available to the public through a highly organized network which reaps millions of dollars through this illegal operation. It is also true that many of the drugs which are being abused are supplied to the public through the channels of organized crime.

Through the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs, of which I have the honor to be chairman, we have made and are continuing to make a detailed study of the Federal effort against organized crime. We have held hearings which have included a consideration of the problems of narcotics and of dangerous drugs. We have not as yet prepared our report and made our recommendations, but I think I can safely say that the information we have collected and the tentative conclusions we have drawn would verify the wisdom of putting this new Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs in the Justice Department. One of the major difficulties has been divided jurisdiction and responsibility. Consolidated enforcement would be a major step forward.

I hope there are none here today who have any illusions about the scope and extent of the operations of syndicates and organizations in the underworld. They are in this business for profit and they have no hesitation in corrupting our youth and in feeding on the weaknesses of mind and body. A far greater effort must be made by our Federal, State, and local authorities if we are ever to succeed in reducing or shutting off the sources of illegal supply of narcotics and dangerous drugs. The Attorney General and the Justice Department are our principal vehicles for this effort. Let us take this step which will give a powerful impetus to this fight. Let us permit this plan to go into effect by voting down the disapproval resolution.

The Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control are law enforcement agencies. Reorganization Plan No. 1 would combine them into one Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, which would report directly to the Attorney General in the Department of Justice.

The Bureau of Narcotics controls marihuana and hard narcotics such as heroin. It has 475 employees, of which 304 are enforcement agents. These agents spend 80 percent of their time in street investigation and undercover work. The remaining 20 percent of their time is devoted to inspecting legitimate drug manufacturing and distribution facilities in order to prevent diversions of narcotics from these facilities into illicit channels. The remaining 175 employees are administrative personnel.

The Bureau of Drug Abuse Control—BDAC—controls hallucinogens and also stimulant and depressant drugs, such as amphetamines and barbiturates. It has 460 employees, of whom 300 are enforcement agents. These agents spend about 60 percent of their time in street investigations or undercover activity. The remaining 40 percent of their time is devoted to inspecting legitimate drug manufacturing and distribution facilities in order to detect diversion of dangerous drugs from these facilities into illicit channels.

BDAC also has a Division of Drug Studies and Statistics containing 200 employees, including pharmacologists and psychologists but no M.D.'s. It has 11 employees providing case assistance and 11 more whose mission is to provide programs for training the agents of BDAC and local law enforcement agents.

The problem of illegal drug distribution cannot be separated from the problem of organized crime. The two must be attacked together. This can be accomplished best within the Department of Justice, which is the Government agency primarily responsible for law enforcement activities directed at organized crime.

The relationship between organized crime and the illicit narcotics and drug industry is well established. For example, the Federal Bureau of Narcotics estimates that 85 percent of the heroin and 50 percent of the marihuana introduced into illicit traffic in the United States is introduced by criminal organizations. Profits from trafficking in narcotics and dangerous drugs is one of the three principal sources of income for organized crime.

Even where the distribution of drugs does not involve organized crime in its traditional sense, it nevertheless involves networks of criminals who form organizations to manufacture or divert and distribute drugs illegally. For instance, BDAC has detected and prosecuted 47 illegal laboratory complexes manufacturing hallucinogens or other dangerous drugs. Many of these complexes had organized their own distribution systems.

The dangerous drugs controlled by BDAC are either produced illegally or diverted from the legitimate drug industry. LSD and most of the hallucinogens produced in the United States are produced illegally. On the other hand, approximately 95 percent of the other dangerous drugs which BDAC has seized from illicit channels were legally produced but diverted from the legitimate drug industry. Such diversion can occur at the manufacturing, wholesale, jobber, retailer, or dispenser level. It is BDAC's job to track down the illegal diversions and provide the Department of Justice with evidence for prosecution of the diverters.

The basic job of both the Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control is to stop illicit supplies of narcotics and dangerous drugs from reaching the streets. They aim at the traffickers in these drugs, rather than at their users.

It is important to distinguish between this law enforcement mission and the vast sociological and scientific problems of the causes and cures of drug addiction or abuse. The latter call for major research and educational programs which are properly the mission of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Nothing in Reorganization Plan No. 1 will affect these programs, which are already being conducted by the National Institute of Mental Health, the Bureau of Medicine, the Bureau of Science, and the National Institute of Health. The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, like the present Bureau of Narcotics and Drug Abuse Control, will continue in close liaison with each of these organizations.

The new Bureau will also maintain close liaison with the Bureau of Customs, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Secret Service. Such cooperation should be no more difficult than the present excellent cooperation that exists between the Bureau of Customs in Treasury and the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice.

The Department of Justice, through its Criminal Division and its U.S. attorneys, has prosecuted cases for both the Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control. Through its Bureau of Prisons, the Department of Justice also participates in the administration of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966, with prison hospitals which it

operates along with the Public Health Service in Lexington and Fort Worth.

For the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs to be placed in the Department of Justice is as logical and desirable as for the FBI to be placed in the Department. It is infinitely more logical than transferring BDAC to the Department of the Treasury. Nor is there any logical justification for lodging law enforcement agencies in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Hoover Commission in 1949 called for the transfer of the Bureau of Narcotics from the Department of the Treasury to the Department of Justice. The Prettyman Commission in 1963 suggested abolishing the Bureau and dividing its functions between Justice and HEW.

The testimony at the hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 1 made it clear that in today's rapidly evolving drug spectrum the determination of what drugs should be controlled and the detection of diversion from legitimate channels must be handled by the agency charged with enforcement of the laws. In determining what drugs should be controlled, the advisory committee of scientists who presently advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through BDAC will provide such advice to the Attorney General through the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs under the reorganization plan.

An additional advantage of placing the new Bureau in the Department of Justice is the close ties of that Department with State and local law enforcement agencies, including those charged with enforcing State drug laws. Most of those arrested for narcotic activities are involved in lives of crime. Drug addiction is itself a leading cause of crime.

As the Attorney General has stated:

Crime control requires the control of drugs and narcotics. It is a major national problem. And the responsibility should be vested in the official in government who has the greatest concern with the control of crime. Not the person that is involved in education, in welfare, and health, not the person that is involved in financing, in balance of payments, in taxes and things like that. It is a crime problem. It is a major crime problem. It cries for control. And I think the Department of Justice provides the best opportunities for the full realization of the Federal potential in that area.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I oppose Reorganization Plan No. 1, 1968.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Post Office and Treasury of the Committee on Appropriations, under which comes the Bureau of Narcotics, I have sat through extensive hearings on the work of this Bureau. There has been much evidence and testimony on the concentrated efforts of this agency to stop the illegal importation of narcotic drugs and the dissemination of same within the United States.

The Bureau of Narcotics, a branch of the Treasury Department, must work very closely with the Bureau of Customs which is also a part of the Treasury Department. I believe that, if the Bureau of Narcotics of the Treasury Department is meregd under the proposed reorganization it would become enmeshed in the problems of the so-called glamour drugs such as LSD, barbiturates, and so forth, which, although dangerous, are not as serious as heroin and other narcotic drugs. This is a particular problem which needs particular and concentrated attention, especially in the field of stopping it at the source in foreign countries and ports of entry.

The present Bureau of Narcotics has been and is doing an outstanding job and should not be disturbed. It can, has, and will work in cooperation with the Drug Abuse Agency. This problem is so serious that I do not think that the contemplated change will help it but may very well hinder it.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I understand there are no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 1101

Resolved, That the House of Representatives does not favor the Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 transmitted to the Congress by the President on February 7, 1968.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be not agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HUNGATE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Resolution 1101, to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1, had directed him to report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be not agreed to.

The Clerk reported the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 190, nays 200, answered "present" 2, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

YEAS—190

Adair	Brinkley	Cohelan
Addabbo	Brock	Collier
Andrews, Ala.	Brotzman	Conable
Andrews, N. Dak.	Brown, Calif.	Conte
	Brown, Mich.	Cowger
Arends	Brown, Ohio	Cramer
Ashbrook	Broyhill, Va.	Cunningham
Ayres	Buchanan	Curtis
Baring	Burke, Fla.	Davis, Wis.
Bates	Burton, Utah	Derwinski
Battin	Bush	Devine
Belcher	Button	Dickinson
Bell	Byrnes, Wis.	Dingell
Berry	Carter	Dole
Betts	Cederberg	Dow
Bevill	Chamberlain	Duncan
Biester	Clancy	Dwyer
Blackburn	Clausen, Don H.	Edwards, Ala.
Bolton		Erlenborn
Bow	Clawson, Del	Esch
Bray	Cleveland	Eshleman
Findley	McDade	Ruppe
Fino	McDonald, Mich.	Ryan
Flynt		Sandman
Ford, Gerald R.	McEwen	Saylor
Frelinghuysen	MacGregor	Schadeberg
Fulton, Pa.	Mailliard	Scherle
Gardner	Martin	Schneebeli
Goodell	Mathias, Calif.	Schweiker
Goodling	May	Scott
Gross	Mayne	Shriver
Grover	Meskill	Skubitz
Gubser	Michel	Smith, Calif.
Gude	Miller, Ohio	Smith, N.Y.
Haley	Mink	Smith, Okla.
Hall	Minshall	Snyder
Halleck	Montgomery	Springer
Hammer-schmidt	Moore	Stafford
	Morse, Mass.	Stanton
Hansen, Idaho	Morton	Steed
Harrison	Mosher	Steiger, Ariz.
Harsha	Myers	Steiger, Wis.
Harvey	Nelsen	Taft
Heckler, Mass.	Passman	Talcott
Henderson	Pelly	Teague, Calif.
Horton	Pettis	Thompson, Ga.
Hosmer	Pirnie	Thomson, Wis.
Hunt	Poage	Utt
Hutchinson	Poff	Vander Jagt
Johnson, Pa.	Pollock	Waggonner
Jonas	Pool	Wampler
Jones, Mo.	Price, Tex.	Watkins
Keith	Quie	Watson
King, N.Y.	Quillen	Whalen
Kleppe	Railsback	Whitten
Kuykendall	Rarick	Widnall
Kyl	Reid, Ill.	Wilson, Bob
Laird	Reid, N.Y.	Winn
Latta	Reifel	Wyatt
Lennon	Reinecke	Wydler
Lipscomb	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wylie
Lloyd	Riegle	Wyman
McClory	Robison	Zion
McCloskey	Roudebush	Zwach
McClure	Rumsfeld	

NAYS—200

Abbitt	Friedel	Mathias, Md.
Abernethy	Fulton, Tenn.	Meeds
Adams	Fuqua	Miller, Calif.
Albert	Galifianakis	Mills
Anderson, Tenn.	Gallagher	Minish
	Garmatz	Monagan
Annunzio	Gathings	Moorhead
Ashmore	Gettys	Morgan
Aspinall	Giaimo	Morris, N. Mex.
Barrett	Gibbons	Moss
Bennett	Gilbert	Murphy, Ill.
Bingham	Gonzalez	Natcher
Blanton	Gray	Nedzi
Blatnik	Green, Oreg.	Nichols
Boggs	Griffin	O'Hara, Ill.
Boland	Griffiths	O'Hara, Mich.
Bolling	Halpern	O'Konski
Brademas	Hamilton	Olsen
Brasco	Hanley	O'Neal, Ga.
Brooks	Hanna	O'Neill, Mass.
Broyhill, N.C.	Hansen, Wash.	Ottinger
Burke, Mass.	Hardy	Patman
Burleson	Hathaway	Patten
Byrne, Pa.	Hawkins	Pepper
Cabell	Hays	Perkins
Cahill	Hechler, W. Va.	Philbin
Carey	Hicks	Pickle
Casey	Holifield	Pike
Celler	Howard	Price, Ill.
Colmer	Hull	Pryor
Corbett	Hungate	Pucinski
Corman	Ichord	Purcell
Culver	Irwin	Randall
Daniels	Jacobs	Rees
Davis, Ga.	Jarman	Reuss
Dawson	Joelson	Rhodes, Pa.
de la Garza	Johnson, Calif.	Rivers
Delaney	Jones, Ala.	Roberts
Donohue	Jones, N.C.	Rodino
Dorn	Karth	Rogers, Colo.
Downing	Kastenmeier	Rogers, Fla.
Dulski	Kazen	Ronan
Eckhardt	Kee	Rooney, N.Y.
Edmondson	Kelly	Rooney, Pa.
Edwards, Calif.	Kirwan	Rosenthal
Edwards, La.	Kluczynski	Rostenkowski
Eilberg	Kornegay	Roush
Evans, Colo.	Kupferman	Roybal
Everett	Kyros	St Germain
Fallon	Landrum	St. Onge
Fascell	Leggett	Satterfield
Feighan	Long, Md.	Scheuer
Fisher	McCarthy	Shipley
Flood	McFall	Sikes
Foley	McMillan	Sisk
Ford, William D.	Machen	Slack
	Madden	Smith, Iowa
Fountain	Mahon	Staggers
Fraser	Marsh	Stephens

Stratton	Tunney	White
Stubblefield	Udall	Whitener
Stuckey	Ullman	Wiggins
Sullivan	Van Deerlin	Willis
Taylor	Vanik	Wilson,
Tenzer	Vigorito	Charles H.
Thompson, N.J.	Waldie	Wolff
Tiernan	Walker	Young
Tuck	Watts	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Hébert Yates

NOT VOTING—41

Anderson, Ill.	Green, Pa.	Matsunaga
Ashley	Gurney	Mize
Broomfield	Hagan	Murphy, N.Y.
Burton, Calif.	Helstoski	Nix
Clark	Herlong	Podell
Conyers	Holland	Resnick
Daddario	Karsten	Roth
Dellenback	King, Calif.	Schwengel
Denney	Langen	Selden
Dent	Long, La.	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	Lukens	Whalley
Dowdy	McCulloch	Williams, Pa.
Evins, Tenn.	Macdonald,	Wright
Farbstein	Mass.	Zablocki

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Karsten against.
Mr. Yates for, with Mr. Dent against.
Mr. Denney for, with Mr. Resnick against.
Mr. Langen for, with Mr. King of California against.
Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Evins of Tennessee against.
Mr. Williams of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Podell against.
Mr. Gurney for, with Mr. Farbstein against.
Mr. Dellenback for, with Mr. Zablocki against.
Mr. Anderson of Illinois for, with Mr. Daddario against.
Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Matsunaga against.
Mr. Selden for, with Mr. Green of Pennsylvania against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Ashley with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Mize.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Hagan.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Holland.
Mr. Burton of California with Mr. Wright.

Mr. RIVERS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT]. If he had been present, he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN]. If he had been present, he would have voted "nay." I have voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 15414. An act to continue the existing excise tax rates on communication services and on automobiles, and to apply more generally the provisions relating to payments of estimated tax by corporations.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill H.R. 15414, entitled "An act to continue the existing excise tax rates on communication services and on automobiles, and to apply more generally the provisions relating to payments of estimated tax by corporations," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the resolution just rejected.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 15414, TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1968

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 15414, to continue the existing excise tax rates on communication services and on automobiles, and to apply more generally the provisions relating to payments of estimated tax by corporations, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I appreciate the concern of the gentleman from Arkansas to move this bill on toward final enactment, but in view of the action which was proposed on the civil rights bill, containing the infamous open housing section, would it not be more proper to take this bill from the Speaker's desk and concur in the Senate amendments and pass it?

Mr. MILLS. I would admonish my friend, if he will yield to me, not to try to be consistent on the treatment of all bills.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman has made the point I wanted to make.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS, KING OF California, BOGGS, BYRNES of Wisconsin, and CURTIS.

INSIDE THE INSANE ASYLUM

Mr. HULL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, efforts being made at State Hospital No. 2 in St. Joseph, Mo., in my congressional district, to help the mentally ill characterize the great new strides being made in mental hospitals throughout the Nation.

What is happening at St. Joseph and elsewhere is described in an excellent article by Harold H. Martin appearing in the April 6 issue of the Saturday Evening Post and under leave to extend, I include this article:

INSIDE THE INSANE ASYLUM

(By Harold H. Martin)

A late sun filtered through the decorative iron bars on the Gothic windows, Dr. Liam O'Brien, a short, dark Irishman with a tongue like an adder and a soft spot in his heart for all people who are mentally ill, sat at his desk in the stately old administration building of State Hospital No. 2 in St. Joseph, Mo. Just outside the doctor's office a grand staircase with a red carpet and a fine carved-wood banister led down to an entrance hall floored in colored tile. In one corner a grandfather clock ticked away the generations. Here, in the past, anguished families would bring one of their poor deranged kinsmen and, reassured by the beauty and quiet of the entrance-way, leave him forever, content that he would be cared for gently and with compassion.

"And if he proved unruly, they tranquilized him with this," said Dr. O'Brien, slapping a leather harness strap into his palm. "And here was his medication." He picked up a dusty ledger dated 1929, ran his finger down a column:

"'Two ounces of whiskey every four hours,'" he read. "Prescribed for everything from melancholia to myocarditis."

He tossed aside the ledger and the strap. "Relics," he said, "but not of so long ago. It has been only about six years since my predecessor here felt the community had advanced in its thinking far enough so that he could free the patients who were chained to the walls."

He rose. "Come on," he said, and led the way along the corridors of his hospital until we reached a large room crammed with beds. They were placed head to foot, three rows deep, along each side, with only a knee's width between one row and the next. Down the narrow center passage, about 100 women, ranging in age from 16 to 80, sat in chairs or shuffled aimlessly about. There were old paretics, chronic schizophrenics, regressed psychotics, the demented senile: the whole sad spectrum of mental illness. Some seemed little more than vegetables, but if one paused to listen to their babble, one might sense a great awareness, and a hurt. "Tell my momma tell my papa come get me . . ." a dark-haired girl repeated over and over in a toneless singsong.

"Here are our worst," said Dr. O'Brien, standing in the midst of them. A young girl, sucking both thumbs, came up and nuzzled her head against his chest. He held her gently. "I get white faced with anger every time I come in here. These are our failures of the past. And what is there left to salvage here so late? God knows. But we are going to try."

Six months later the results of his efforts were spectacularly visible. The ward was empty. The women had been moved out to nursing homes, to foster homes, to better quarters that opened up on other wards as St. Joseph's bed-patient population, under the impact of a psychiatric staff increase

from three to 16 doctors, began to drop from 2,000 to 1,450.

Dr. O'Brien's determination that the forgotten patients on his back wards shall become human beings again is a manifestation of a new spirit of confidence, a new approach to the ancient problem of the mentally ill that now prevails in a majority of the country's mental hospitals.

Until only a very few years ago the attitude of most hospital staffs toward a mental patient was that of the jailer toward a prisoner. The sick person was to be fed, clothed, disciplined—with straitjackets, handcuffs, chains and clubs if necessary—and kept until he died.

This was the situation when the *Post*, in a classic series of articles by John Bartlow Martin [INSIDE THE ASYLUM, October 6–November 10, 1956] exposed these dreadful facts of life as they affected the 750,000 men, women and children who were then hospitalized in the U.S. for mental illness. After months of research, Martin chose Columbus State Hospital in Ohio as a typical—and by no means the worst—example of the way rich, compassionate, generous-hearted America treated those of her mentally ill who could not afford the luxury of private care. There, in one of the country's wealthiest states, he found 2,700 patients served by 18 doctors, only 10 of whom (none a fully trained psychiatrist) gave daily psychiatric care on the wards. Some patients had been there for more than 60 years. On a daily budget allowance of $2.60 per patient per day, only about 400 were receiving any sort of therapy. The 2,300 others were merely there, in custody, helplessly awaiting death.

Martin's series stirred the conscience of the nation, but it was not until 1961 that a Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health, appointed by the Congress, confirmed on a national scale what Martin had uncovered in microcosm at Columbus. Its recommendations became the basis for President Kennedy's plea to Congress for a national mental-health program—"a wholly new emphasis and approach" to a problem that at one time or another will afflict one of every three American families. The legislators responded by passing the Mental Health Act of 1963. This authorized federal grants for the construction of a nationwide network of community mental-health centers, each to serve a population of roughly 200,000 people, and to provide a wide range of services, from around-the-clock emergency care for the person suddenly gone out of control to outpatient clinics, halfway houses, and follow-up support by social workers and psychiatric nurses. Of the $150 million provided, $60 million has now been awarded for the construction and staffing of 128 centers in 42 states, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia. Construction, though, is the quick and easy part. The problem lies in finding trained professionals to staff these centers. The National Committee Against Mental Illness, Inc. estimates the country needs at least 10,000 more psychiatrists than the 18,750 now in practice (private practice, mainly), and psychologists, psychiatric nurses and psychiatric social workers are in equally short supply.

The National Institute of Mental Health says that despite these shortages 175 of the new mental-health centers will open their doors in 1968, and by 1970, some 500 will be serving their communities.

For the next few years, however, the old state hospital will remain the last refuge for those who cannot afford private hospital care, with its cost of about $35 a day, or the care of private psychiatrists, with fees ranging from $25 to $50 an hour. What, then, awaits the patient who still must turn to the public hospital for help?

The picture, formerly one of unrelieved darkness, is now one of mingled light and shadow. There are still areas—in the country as a whole and within individual hospitals, including the better ones—where the gloom is as deep as ever. But more and more the asylum is emerging from its apathy and despair. Traditionally a place of custody, it now is becoming a place of healing.

In the 10 years following World War II, according to the National Committee Against Mental Illness, the number of bed patients in mental hospitals increased at the rate of 13,000 a year. But in the next 10 years the number dropped by an average of 8,300 patients a year. Today the bed population in the nation's 302 public mental hospitals has fallen to an estimated 426,000, a new low.

The reduction in hospital population does not mean that the incidence of mental illness is dropping. The pressures and frustrations of life are no less abrasive than in the past, and the "social breakdown syndrome," manifested in a retreat from reality to a world of fantasy, is no less common. In consequence more people are entering mental hospitals today than ever before. Between 1955 and 1965, while the population of the U.S. was increasing by 17 percent, the number of admissions to public mental hospitals each year increased by 76 percent, to 314,500 in 1965, the last year for which complete figures are available. In this same period, however, the number of patients discharged each year more than doubled, reaching 287,000 in 1965—an increase of 127 percent.

Thus, more people are going into mental hospitals than ever before, but they no longer inevitably follow the dreary route of the past—from violent madness, to grim withdrawal, to the hopeless gray oblivion of the back wards. Instead, a new emphasis on getting the patient into the hospital early, and then getting him out again as quickly as possible, has resulted in a considerable reduction in length of stay. Today, between 85 and 90 percent of patients entering a mental hospital for the first time can expect to be discharged within a year. In most cases they are strong enough to face once more the terrors that sent them there, although frequently they regress and have to come back again—and perhaps yet again. Of the 314,500 persons admitted in 1965, some 115,500—more than one third—were returnees. But the important thing, nearly every expert agrees, is that those who enter need no longer abandon all hope.

No one factor can account for this dramatic change; rather, a combination of many factors is responsible. First, giving impetus to all the others, is a new tolerance of the mentally ill on the part of the community, a willingness to accept a discharged mental patient as just another sick person who has been to the hospital and has come home again. The community has begun to recognize what certain psychiatrists—the brothers Menninger, for example—long have recognized: The madness that destroys the personality is a madness that afflicts us all, only expressed in greater degree. And the fragmented personality is capable of being restored to some degree of dignity and pride.

Public awareness that this can be done—and must be done in a society that calls itself civilized and compassionate—has recently been reflected in the greater generosity of state legislatures in support of their state hospitals. In the U.S. as a whole the average daily expenditure per patient in a mental hospital, while still grossly inadequate, has more than doubled since 1955. As a direct result, so has the ratio of full-time hospital employees to patients—although there are still crippling shortages in the critical professional fields. Nearly a third of the country's state hospitals have less than five staff psychiatrists, and 21 have none.

But the single most important factor in the battle against mental illness, most doctors believe, has been the development of tranquilizers and the other psychiatric drugs. It has long since been proved that the drugs do have the power to soothe the anxiety-ridden, calm the manic, stimulate the depressed and, for a moment at least, call the hallucinating mind back to the world of reality. It is equally clear that, in most cases, the drugs can only control symptoms, not cure the deeper illness. But by temporarily suppressing the symptoms of the basic illness, they do permit the doctor to get through to a patient, so that more lasting forms of therapy can be applied. These may range from a simple word of kindness, through work and play regimes, to the most deeply searching forms of psychotherapy. In many cases almost any positive action helps, when applied with love and understanding, which is why equally significant results are being achieved at hospitals experimenting with widely different techniques. They are simply different aspects of this quiet revolution.

Nowhere is that revolution more dramatically manifest than at Boston State Hospital. Behind a high iron fence, the sprawling hospital looks as it has for more than half a century. The huge brick-and-stucco buildings are shabby and run-down. But the patient population, which less than a decade ago stood at nearly 2,800, was down to 1,330 at the end of 1967—proof of Dr. William Menninger's assertion that it is brains, not bricks, that make a mental hospital a place of healing.

Ever since Charles Dickens visited Boston State in 1842 and found it "admirably conducted on enlightened principles," the ancient institution has enjoyed a reputation for zeal and skill in the treatment of the mentally ill. Its most rapid progress, however, began when Dr. Walter Earl Barton, superintendent from 1945 to 1963, took the bold step of throwing open the big iron gates that for more than 100 years had separated the hospital's patients from the world. Dr. Barton, who left Boston to become medical director of the American Psychiatric Association, was succeeded by Dr. Milton Greenblatt, a slender, tense, fiercely dedicated psychiatrist with the look of an intelligent, somewhat worried cockatoo. For three years, until he, too, moved on to higher things as commissioner of mental health for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Dr. Greenblatt sat like a nesting bird in a cluttered office in the red-brick administration building, hatching one scheme after another to convert Boston State into his vision of the mental hospital of the future—"a hospital without walls, no longer isolated from the community it serves, but an integral part of the community, drawing strength from the normal community patterns, and using its own special knowledge to keep those patterns healthy."

Beyond this community function, Dr. Greenblatt also visualized Boston State as a great laboratory for the study of all aberrations of the human psyche, a place not primarily custodial, but mainly concerned with developing new treatment techniques that could be applied in any mental hospital in the United States.

It was natural therefore that when Commissioner Greenblatt handpicked his successor at Boston State he chose a man highly distinguished in the fields of research and training. He was Dr. Jonathan Cole, rotund, balding and amiable chief of the psychopharmacology research branch at the National Institute of Mental Health in Bethesda, Md. Dr. Cole, who masks an energy as fierce as Dr. Greenblatt's behind a facade of Buddha-like tranquillity, also shares his obsession that the main goal of the mental hospital today is to heal the patient and return him as soon as possible into a community educated to accept him.

One measure of a hospital's urge to heal is the number of different programs by which it seeks to create a therapeutic community both within and beyond the hospital walls. At Boston State there is such a variety of them that nearly every patient is involved in some sort of hopeful experiment. Moreover, treatment routines were greatly modified after a preliminary study showed that

what often disturbed a patient and caused him to become unruly were small annoyances nobody had thought about. Meal hours and bath hours, the use of certain forms of treatment, and restrictions on the patients' movements were planned for the staff's convenience, not the welfare of the patient.

"Seclusion of the disturbed patient once was routine," Dr. Cole says. "When he began acting up, the attendant didn't waste any time on him. He slammed him into a cell and locked him up and left him there. Finally we began to realize that most frequently the patient's agitation was not due to his basic illness, but to a breakdown of relations between him and staff. Behind nearly every episode of seclusion we found staff errors and staff weakness—ignorance, anger, intra-staff feuds, a jailhouse psychology. Knowing this, we reduced seclusion to the vanishing point."

The study of staff-and-patient relationships soon made it obvious that many staff members experienced stresses as severe as those that tortured the patients. Attendants suffered particularly: They stood at the bottom of the hospital pecking order—poorly paid, poorly trained and subject to social discrimination if not outright abuse from other staff members.

The attendant spent hours with the patients every day, yet the doctors never consulted him about his knowledge of a patient's progress or regression. The doctors even felt that it would be a violation of medical ethics to let him know specifically what was wrong with a patient. And, though it was his duty to protect the ward nurse from violence, he was strictly forbidden to have any social contact with her outside the hospital.

In recent years the attendant has been taught that his attitude toward the patients is as much a part of the healing process as the work of the doctor or the nurse. His opinion of his patient's progress or regression is sought at staff conferences. And if he wants to date a nurse after hours, that's up to him—and, of course, to the nurse.

When it dawns on the attendant that he is looked on not just as a custodian but as an important member of the treatment team, his morale soars and his effectiveness increases. Some attendants jump at opportunities to work longer and harder with the patients. Some supervise evening activities in their spare time; others volunteer as guides and drivers, taking patients to ball games, beaches and historic sites. Some have even invited patients home to dinner to meet and socialize with their families, the doctors report.

Whenever the doctors at Boston State describe the ideal hospital employee—a man with a healing touch that transcends all medical or psychiatric knowledge, they recall with nostalgia the genius of John Moskovites. Moskovites, a roly-poly young Greek with an amiably irascible manner, was a male nurse at Boston until last year, when the Army Medical Corps commissioned him a lieutenant and sent him out to Tokyo, to practice his healing art in the military hospitals where American troops are being treated for psychiatric trauma suffered in Vietnam.

Moskovites, a doctor recalled, would go almost wild with joy when a patient with whom he had been working got well enough to be sent home. He would roll up the patient's mattress and throw it out the window. He would then tear down the iron bed and throw it after the mattress—a symbol that the patient would (he fervently hoped) never need the hospital any more.

Shortly before Moskovites left Boston for the Army, he drove me on a tour of the part of the hospital that lies to the east of Morton Street, the broad highway that divides the 200-acre grounds in half. Piled high against one building—mute tribute to John Moskovites' zeal—was a rusting tangle of old iron beds. He parked his little sports car beside a grassy square surrounded by ancient three-story buildings with iron-barred windows.

"They've been empty for months now," said Moskovites, nodding toward the two largest. "But on hot days you can still smell 'em." I remarked that the place was as quiet as a country churchyard. "It is quiet now," said Moskovites, smiling, "but just a few years ago it was bedlam—a wild confusion of people yelling and shouting and running around naked.

"A whole lot of things brought about the change. Drugs, in the first place. But mainly, I think, a lot of tender loving care. That's trite, I know. But I went over to Harvard and Radcliffe and Tufts and Northeastern and did some talking, and managed to get a lot of good kids to come in here and help us as volunteers. When I was out at Menninger's working with the disturbed children, Dr. Karl used to tell us, 'Love cures people—both the ones who give it and the ones who receive it.' I think that's what happened here."

The college-volunteer program was started in 1954, at Metropolitan State Hospital in Waltham, Mass., by a Harvard student, Larry Dohan. Today student volunteers work as attendants in more than 100 hospitals and halfway houses around the country. Nearly everywhere such volunteer aid has helped make the difference between success and failure, and Moskovites gave his eager young helpers full credit. In less than five years the population in the old chronic wards under his supervision dropped from 2,000 to less than 200, as the volunteers prepared them to go out to foster homes, nursing homes, or even to their own homes.

"We did it just by giving every patient something to do that he *could* do," Moskovites explained. "No matter how simple the task might be—even if it was just buttoning his own shirt—the fact that he could do it bolstered his ego. And we led them along that way, step by step. Not all of them responded, of course. But we didn't give up on anybody. We kept on trying. Come on."

We climbed the stairs of a half-empty building to the locked third floor. Here in a big dayroom women in various stages of undress sat staring blankly at the walls. Two nurses, watching television in the room, got up uneasily, as we came in.

"These people are just beginning to make a little progress," he said. "They are learning to dress themselves, to make their own beds. You see there are mirrors on the walls, and ashtrays, and vases of flowers. It means they're learning not to throw things. This used to be what is called a 'drag ward.' You had to drag 'em everywhere. Now they'll usually do what you tell them."

He stopped in the doorway of the long ward where the beds were lined up. Suddenly he shouted and began to run. In a corner of the ward a woman lay huddled between the beds. Moskovites ran to her, knelt down beside her, grabbed her arms and began to lift, yelling, "Up! Up! Up!" Her face began to crumple, contorting into the weird grimace of a woman weeping without tears. "Please," she begged. "Please! Please!" Moskovites tugged at her, almost manic in his anger—not at the whimpering woman, but at the attendants who had failed to notice her. "Get her up," he shouted, and they lifted her to her feet. Beneath her lay a crumpled dress. She had been on her way to the little ironing room in the corner of the ward to iron a dress—the simple task she had been assigned. The nameless horror that besets the schizophrenic had seized her and, unnoticed, she had lain down between the beds, curling into the fetal position, trying to retreat from the terrifying world into the silence and the darkness of the womb.

The nurses, taking her by the arms, led her gently to the ironing board. As they stood beside her, she straightened, looked about and calmly took up the iron. Moskovites smiled and patted her on the shoulder.

"Cruel?" he said, as we left. "No. The cruel thing would have been to let her lie there, which is what we'd have done in the past. Now I'll show you a room full of women who were once just as helpless and frightened as she is."

We drove to an old building where 34 women—all of them chronic schizophrenics, all of them once absolutely useless to themselves or to society—were busy sewing precut blouses on industrial sewing machines. Here, on a project called PROP (for Patient Rehabilitation Occupational Program), they were earning money while learning a skill. In a few months the more responsive of them would go to a home in the outside world.

Nellie, 43, gray-haired, brown-eyed, was a young and pretty woman when she came to the hospital 15 years ago. (This is not her real name; fictitious names are used for all patients mentioned in this article.) When Moskovites began his program of remotivating the chronic schizophrenics, she was foul, filthy and withdrawn. Now she lives outside in a foster home and comes back by day to work in the sheltered workshop. Neither she nor her companions could hold a job except in a "sheltered" situation. Here, though their sewing must meet a certain standard of quality, they can work at their own pace—which is about a third that of the normal outside worker. Nellie, in a week, will spend about 34 hours at her machine, and her piecework pay will average 98 cents an hour. The state supports her in the foster home. With her earnings she buys her clothes, cosmetics, cigarettes and other personal items. She goes and comes to the hospital on the bus, by herself. She is not "cured." There is no known "cure" for schizophrenia. But under mild sedation and in a protected environment, she can cope with the routine patterns of normal living. She is a useful person again. She will not die a howling lunatic on the back wards.

Katherine, white-haired at 51, with a smooth, placid face, came to the hospital when she was 22. Now she, too, was almost ready to leave, but whenever her departure was mentioned she would tremble and begin to whimper.

"She's still a little afraid," said John Moskovites. "It is a big step." He put his arm around Katherine, hugged her and patted her cheek. "She has been going out already, buying the little things she will need when she goes to a foster home," he said. "She went out the other day with Nellie and a staff volunteer. She bought a blue washrag. Nellie bought a pink one. Katherine came right back afterward, because the crowds scared her. But that's all right. Now she knows that after she goes out to live, if she gets scared she can always come back."

At Boston, with its open gates, there is a constant going and coming of patients. Some go out to work by day and come back to the refuge of the hospital by night. Others sleep in foster homes at night and come to the day hospital in the morning. In the concept of the therapeutic community, the day hospital is as important as the 24-hour custodial institution. The very fact that it does not provide bed care is one of its great advantages, many doctors believe, for the bed is an invitation to the regressed and frightened patient to withdraw still further into his world of fantasy. There are also patients who are best served by not being brought to the hospital at all. Treatment teams from the hospital—a doctor, a nurse and a social worker—go to the patients' homes for periodic calls.

These house calls by the psychiatric team were begun under Dr. Greenblatt, on the theory that the visits would give the treatment team an invaluable insight into the problems the patient faces, the forces that are destroying him. Under Dr. Cole's admin-

istration, a young social worker, Dr. David Kantor, has pushed the theory one step further. He assigns medical students to live in the home with a discharged patient and his family, thus exposing themselves to the family pressures that the patient himself endures.

Even when patients are too sick to live at home, this need not mean the severing of all family ties. Visitors are sometimes startled to see a psychotic mother with her tiny baby in her arms—a form of therapy Dr. Greenblatt introduced at Boston State after seeing it tried successfully at the Massachusetts Mental Health Center. "This was a tough decision," Dr. Greenblatt says. "It is difficult to accept the idea of allowing babies to live in wards with seriously ill adults, whose actions might be unpredictable—particularly when the disturbed mother may have hostile feelings toward the child and to her marriage. There were other dangers, too. For instance, would patients get jealous of the baby for receiving so much attention and try to hurt it?"

He opened a brown-backed folder. "Let's take a look at a case and see what happened." He read:

"Mrs. P., twenty-two years of age, gave birth to a son the day before she received a college degree. This was a bitter disappointment to her because she had wanted to go on to graduate school. It meant that her husband, also a student, and with whom she was fiercely competitive, would continue his studies without her. She rapidly became inadequate as a housewife and mother, lost vitality and became depressed and suicidal, and was hospitalized. After two months of therapy she indicated her desire to have the baby with her, and the child was accordingly admitted at age eighteen months.

"At first, caring for the child was drudgery, for it was the coming of the child which had caused all this anger and frustration. Once she burst out screaming, 'I hate it! I hat it!' Gradually, however, she discovered that she actually enjoyed being a mother, and she was rewarded repeatedly for her growing confidence in caring for the child. After six months both mother and baby were discharged, with follow-up in the after-care clinic."

The experiment confirmed what other doctors had discovered—that the presence of the baby on the ward tended to bring out the best in the other patients. Most of them welcomed it; others took its presence as a matter of course. Those who had aggressive feelings stayed away from it. Now it is not unusual to see babies, cheerful and contented, on the wards, Their presence, Greenblatt feels, adds warmth and gentleness to the surroundings.

Many patients, less fortunate than Mrs. P., have been in the hospital so long that they have no family left outside, no home to go to. Others cannot go back to their families, for it was the abrasions of family life that sent them to the hospital. Yet they cannot live alone. The answer, as Boston State Hospital has worked it out, is a highly effective system of family care, in foster homes chosen by the hospital for their friendly, homelike atmosphere.

In Massachusetts, as in other states, the change in hospital population has followed a curious and somewhat disturbing pattern. While the older patients are moving out, admission records show, more and more young people are coming to the hospital. For example, bed patients 35 to 44 years old—the age group in which most of the schizophrenics are found—have been decreasing by three percent a year, but at the same time patients under 15 have increased by 16 percent a year, and 15-to-24-year-olds by six percent.

Recognizing this new trend, Boston State now lays particular stress on the treatment of the mentally ill adolescent. Under the direction of Dr. Anton O. Kris, some 40 to 50 disturbed youngsters 15 to 18 years old are now enrolled in the adolescent program. They live on the wards with adults—"If you put all your adolescents on the same ward they'll tear your hospital to pieces," Dr. Kris says—but they spend their days together, in a program of intensive treatment. Two old buildings left empty by the decrease in adult patients have been renovated with the help of the youngsters themselves into a community house with playrooms, work shops, a lounge and a place to dance. Classes are conducted by teachers from the Boston Public School System, and there is an active program of sports for the young patients.

"The main thing we do here," says Dr. Kris, "is to go deeply into the background of every disturbed child that comes to us. Many of our kids come from impoverished or broken homes. When we have finished our study, we know the pressures and distractions a youngster has had to endure and, by understanding him, we are able to teach him to understand himself. For instance, if a boy knows why he has strange angry moods of rebellion, he can begin to control them, and he will not let them wreck his life."

Teen-agers are among the most difficult mental patients to handle, and the professional attendants are not always as gentle and understanding with them as Dr. Kris would like. Dick Sullivan, a stocky, amiable student from Northeastern University, recently described his experiences with a schizophrenic 17-year-old named Betty:

"One thing about Betty was that she was a terribly strong girl. She got hold of some glass one day and cut up a few of the attendants. She also broke a chair over someone's head. They tried to tie her down in the ward, but she got loose and ran outside. They finally caught her in the reception building where I was and asked me to help bring her back. I tried to explain to her that everything would be OK, but that she had to be good and not try to run away. She was pretty scared, but did what I asked. I found out that if you could calm her down, she was really a sweet kid—but no one would take the time with her. When I finally got her back to the ward, they immediately put her in seclusion, in an empty room with a single window. I remember one of the attendants yelled at me from down the hall, 'Don't leave that damn girl in here—we don't want her.'

"Some of the attendants really care about the patients. Others . . ." he shrugged. "It's definitely not all good here by a long shot."

This of course is true. Despite its effort to recruit humane attendants and enlist the aid of volunteers with the dedication of a Dick Sullivan, Boston State, like every other mental hospital, is still desperately short-handed. Frequently on the wards at night one young and perhaps very frightened attendant will be looking after 100 patients.

Not only because of the multiplicity of its programs but also because Boston State is an open-door hospital, it needs a high staff-to-patient ratio. Many patients who behave very well when they go out in a small group under the supervision of an attendant get in trouble when they go out alone. One patient traveled across town by taxicab to punch her mother in the nose, and then asked her mother to pay for the cab. Another, who was in the hospital for shooting her mother, went home and took a potshot at her father. Men patients, after visiting the nearby taverns, sometimes come back and take a swing at an attendant. Dr. Cole, however, has no intention of locking the gates that his predecessors opened, because he is convinced that the difficulties are more than offset by the good it does a patient to know that he is not imprisoned, that he is free to come and go. There are, of course, a few patients on every ward—roughly 200 in the whole hospital—who cannot be allowed to go out. As soon as additional help becomes available, Dr. Cole will bring these patients together in a special security unit where they will receive intensive treatment even though their freedom is restricted.

Boston is not unique in what Dr. Cole calls its drive to "jazz things up, to let a thousand things happen and to try to stimulate new ideas." All across the country the same ferment is taking place. New York, Connecticut, California and Massachusetts still lead the nation in the quality of the psychiatric care they provide, but with the help of a great increase in research grants, even the worst states are now showing considerable progress.

There are still some bad hospitals, and some bad wards in good hospitals. Across the country, though, the old snakepits are vanishing, as public compassion and concern have their effect on state legislatures. But there are still horrors a plenty, and by a tragic paradox one of the foulest of these, despite desperate efforts to improve, is located in the American city that was once the most humane and progressive in its treatment of the mentally ill. In Philadelphia in the 1790's, Dr. Benjamin Rush raised the treatment and study of mental illness to the level of a science for the first time in the United States.

The American Psychiatric Association was founded here in 1844, and the city today is the site of five of the leading psychiatric hospitals in the country. But they are for those who can pay for treatment. The remainder must look to the state hospital, known as Byberry, which over the years has been allowed to regress almost to the status of another Bedlam (the original Bedlam was St. Mary's of Bethlehem, a London asylum of the 16th century). After generations of neglect by a rural-dominated legislature, Byberry only recently has started to become again a place of healing, under the vigorous administration of a new superintendent. Dr. Daniel Blain, one of the country's outstanding psychiatrists.

Dr. Blain came to the hospital as the result of a survey conducted two years ago by the National Institute of Mental Health at the request of the Pennsylvania Welfare Department. The 12 distinguished psychiatrists and hospital administrators on the survey team looked into every aspect of Byberry, denounced it as medieval, and recommended as a first step that a top-flight psychiatrist and hospital administrator be appointed.

At first glance Byberry looks little like the pesthouse described in the confidential report. Located in an industrial section in the northeast corner of Philadelphia, with its 110 red brick buildings scattered over 1,100 acres of trees, shrubs and well-tended lawns, it could be the campus of a somewhat shabby New England prep school. At the time of the NIMH survey, however, 6,100 patients were crowded into quarters built for 4,200. They were tended by 1,800 employees, giving the hospital the lowest staff-to-patient ratio in the state. Of the professional staff, moreover, only 50 were doctors, and only six of these were psychiatrists certified by the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology. Ten others had some training in psychiatry, and there were 85 registered nurses, though this number had decreased to 69 by the time Dr. Blain arrived.

As superintendent, Dr. Blain, a tweedy, quiet-spoken, vigorous man of 69, still faces an uphill battle. Byberry's inadequacies have been fully publicized—most recently an assault of a woman employee, a suicide, and an accidental death in the hospital, all of which might have been avoided if there had been more staff supervision, attracted wide attention. But the legislature at Harrisburg has been frugal in its support. When Dr. Blain t ok over in October of 1966, he made an immediate survey of the hospital's needs. He asked for 1,759 add!tional people—psychiatrists, psychologists, nurses, therapists, social workers and attendants—all of whom

he needed desperately. He got 400 attendants. He asked for an operating budget of $25 million. He got $19.7 million. He asked for $33 million in capital funds to build new buildings and to remodel old structures that were falling apart after 18 years of neglect. He got nothing.

The shortages in professional staff still exist. Dr. Blain needs 150 psychiatrists. He has 20 doctors working in psychiatry. Only six of them are certified by the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology, and three of these six are administrators who give no therapy. He has 7 clinical psychologists but needs 40. He has 70 registered nurses but needs 300.

These shortages still exist in spite of the criticisms in the NIMH survey report, which said, in effect, that Byberry was a throwback to the snake-pit era.

Once the door slammed shut behind a patient, he was stripped, bathed, deloused, given a series of shots, issued drab hospital clothing and assigned to a ward where he might remain with only a modicum of treatment until he died. Most wards, the report noted, were so shorthanded that patients were often kept quiet by heavy doses of tranquilizers and by electric shock. There was little effort at group therapy and none at individual therapy. Due to the shortage of staff, seclusion was used extensively to control agitated patients, and it still is, though under Dr. Blain its use has been much reduced.

It is in the detention areas that the lay visitor feels the full impact of what it means to be a patient in a mental hospital. Here there is no furniture—just the oilcloth-covered mattress lying on the floor, the naked light bulb high out of reach in the ceiling. Only the eyes of the patient can be seen, at the little glass- or wire-covered peephole in the door of the tiny seclusion cell, and his voice comes through the locked door as a shrill scream or a mindless babble. When a nurse opened one of these doors, a gray-haired woman was standing there completely nude. The nurse covered her with a blanket.

"How long have you been in the hospital, Mary?" she asked the woman.

"Six weeks," the woman said.

"She has been here ten years," the nurse said, closing the door. "She could go home if she had anyone to take her. Knowing that her family won't take her back sets her raving. For her own safety, we have to put her here."

No help was sought from, or offered by, the community, which in most other cities provides some small amenities for the patients in their nearby mental hospitals. In every ward at Byberry the surroundings were bleak. The dayrooms were cattle pens where blank-eyed men or women sat and stared into space.

A *Post* researcher, on a visit to the hospital a few days after Dr. Blain's arrival there, gave his description of a geriatrics ward:

"The thing that shook me was the noise. I somehow hadn't expected this wild babbling, jabbering, shouting, chattering and mindless moaning. For the first time I understood what the word 'bedlam' meant.

"All around us as we stood in the middle of the room were the old men, bony, withered of body, their skin yellow as parchment. Over the whole place the strong smell of urine hung like a cloud. The noise, the smell, the horrible sight of two old men, stark naked huddled in their wheelchairs, stunned me. Involuntarily my mind shut out the dreadful scene, I turned desperately to a nurse. All I could think to ask was, 'How much do they pay you to work in this place?'

"She thought for a moment. 'We got a raise not long ago,' she said. 'Now I get one hundred and twenty-four dollars every two weeks.'

"As I was leaving the ward, a doctor asked if I had seen the old man who huddled in a corner with a sheet over his head. I hadn't. But I had seen the crippled man who came sidling toward me on his hands and knees with a hideous crablike motion, his hands slipping in the filth of the floor, his voice a strange gobbling sound.

The old-women's ward was even more hideous, for it was their lunchtime and they sat about, some of them stark naked, dipping the soupy food—it looked like beans, rice, meatballs and ice cream—from their trays with their hands. A few could feed themselves with a spoon. Two attendants, harassed, impatient, their uniforms smeared with spilled food, were feeding others who spat and struck at the spoon like children.

"A doctor told me that many of these people should never have been sent here at all. They could have made it very well in the protected surroundings of a nursing home. Here they have gotten worse instead of better.

" 'There are two thousand geriatrics cases here out of six thousand,' the doctor said. 'It's a case of everybody's grandma being sent up to the Funny Farm to die. They don't belong here but in Riverview, the county home for the aged. But when Riverview fills up, some Philadelphia doctor writes on their charts: Chronic brain syndrome with psychosis. When he adds, *with psychosis*, we have to take them.' "

The tragedy of Byberry is that, with a little money and a little help, many of these living vegetables might long ago have been transformed into human beings again, able to live under sheltered conditions outside. A small rehabilitation unit, functioning under a federal grant, carries on within the hospital itself a program of intensive treatment which in eight years has returned some 800 patients to the community, where 550 of them have managed to remain for three years or more. But, with a hospital population of nearly 5,000, an average of 100 discharges a year is not much to shout about. Byberry's routine therapy is now doing about as well.

By working his staff people almost beyond their endurance, Dr. Blain in the past 18 months has reduced Byberry's bed population from 6,100 to 4,850. He expects to move out another 1,000 to 1,500 in 1968 if federally supported social workers in Philadelphia find places for them in nursing homes, foster homes and geriatrics centers. By concentrating on new patients, the hospital has been able to send them out in three months, on the average, a creditable record.

"We have begun to function as a treatment center, not a warehouse," Dr. Blain said. "But I very much doubt that we can keep up this pace much longer without an increase in staff. The people we have are working twenty percent beyond their capacity.

"Also, the patients we have sent out were the easiest ones. We are getting down to the permafrost now, where it's like chipping ice with a spoon. Every tiny advance, from here on, will come only with tremendous detailed effort."

Shortchanging its mental hospitals is the poorest sort of false economy a state can practice, Dr. Blain feels.

"If we had been able to spend thirty-three million dollars to remodel this place, and if we had twenty-five million dollars a year to operate on for two years in a row, we could reduce Byberry's bed population to three thousand patients or less. When we reached this figure, the budget would begin to decrease. In fact, I would guarantee that I could reduce the budget ten percent a year for five years."

A custodial hospital obviously can be run more cheaply on a day-to-day basis than a treatment hospital, but in the long term it is vastly more expensive. "It's as simple as this," Dr. Blain says. "Spend twelve to fourteen dollars a day and get 'em out. Or spend five dollars a day and keep them forever." Since Dr. Blain's arrival, Byberry's per diem has risen from $5.15 to $8.20—still far from adequate.

Unless the legislature comes through in the next few years with a strong transfusion of new money, Dr. Blain thinks, it is hardly likely that Byberry can improve much further. There is, however, one bright hope for the future. Philadelphia, working mainly with federal funds, has done what he considers the best job in the country of setting up community mental-health centers. Ten are planned, with six in operation now, and they inevitably will take some of the pressure off Byberry. Plans are under way to tie Byberry in with each of these centers. By special arrangement among city, state and federal governments, the centers will pay Byberry for handling patients from their "catchment areas" who need intensive care, and the centers in turn will provide aftercare for the patients Byberry treats and sends out.

Dr. Blain does not foresee that under such an arrangement Byberry will revert to its old custodial role. It will in time become a 2,000-bed hospital, he said—1,000 for patients in intensive care, 1,000 for patients taking part in an elaborate program of rehabilitation and vocational training. There is the strong possibility that, for all its unhappy history, Philadelphia will, through its mental-health centers, become once again a model for the nation in its treatment of the mentally ill.

The variations in the amounts different states spend on their mentally ill are fantastic. At the top is Alaska, which last year spent $32.37 per patient per day (with a total mental-hospital population of less than 250); at the bottom is Mississippi, spending $3.99. Kansas, the District of Columbia, Colorado, Utah, Iowa and California all spent more than $15. Alabama and West Virginia, along with Mississippi, each provided less than $5. The national average in 1967 was $8.84.

This is not to say that West Virginians, for example, are naturally less compassionate than Kansans. In nearly every case politics and a shortsighted view of economy are to blame. Moreover, a state's concern for its mentally ill is a cyclic thing. The pattern is always the same. A new governor comes into office and he calls for a crash program of hospital reform. The legislature catches fire and money is provided, the old superintendent is fired and a new one is hired. He builds up a top-flight professional staff, and all goes well for a few years. The bed population drops, and the papers are full of praise for the new programs. Then a new economy-minded administration comes in. The hospital budget is slashed, and the administrator is forced to cut back on his therapeutic programs. Staff morale is shattered. The administrator and the top people he brought with him scatter like frightened birds—to states where a new cycle is beginning.

It is not a bad system for the nation as a whole. Top professional talent in the field of mental health is in extremely short supply, and the recurring cycles help to diffuse it throughout the country. For the states that lose their good people, however, it can be a long-term tragedy. When John Bartlow Martin wrote his series on Columbus State Hospital in 1956, Ohio was just beginning a period of hospital reform. But then in 1963 Gov. James Rhodes, taking over a nearly bankrupt state, announced that he was going to fire all hospital personnel hired by his predecessor after a certain date. He quickly rescinded the order, but the damage had been done. At the first hint of a political pogrom, many experts left Ohio.

Early in his term Gov. Ronald Reagan of California spooked many of his top people by announcing that about 3,400 mental-health personnel would be cut from the payroll. Immediately every hospital administrator in the country, including Dr. Hulusi Tuatay, then superintendent at Columbus State, got on the telephone to California.

Dr. Tuatay, a soft-voiced, smiling, decep-

tively self-effacing man, had been at Columbus State for nearly 10 years before he was made superintendent; and he served only 2½ years in that capacity before he was promoted to the staff of the state department of mental hygiene as assistant commissioner in charge of research and training.

In his years at the hospital, he was responsible for introducing many of the therapeutic programs that were lacking when John Bartlow Martin visited the hospital in 1956. The bed population stood at 2,700 then. It is down to 1,819 today. The huge main hospital building is still rundown and shabby, and a doctor making his rounds will walk two miles from his office to the farthest ward and back again. But the per diem allowance is up from $2.60 ten years ago to $6.80—still not enough, but an improvement. Fifty doctors, 30 of whom are psychiatrists (though only four are Board-certified), are on the staff now, compared with 18—including three psychiatrists—12 years ago, and all new patients and half of the long-term chronics are now receiving some form of active therapy. There is also an effective program of aftercare.

All across the country brilliant and dedicated doctors are using the new developments of the past 10 years—the new drugs, the new therapies, the new understanding of the needs of the mentally ill—in a massive assault on the old concepts of how a mental patient should be treated and a mental hospital should be run. These methods, though aimed at the same goals, are often surprisingly dissimilar. At Boston State the attitude is one of solicitude and gentle encouragement, a technique that works well with schizophrenics. At St. Joseph, Mo., Dr. Liam O'Brien uses methods much less tender to rouse depressed patients from their apathy. He admits that these methods may seem callous, even brutal, to an outsider, but he holds that nearly anything can be done to, or for, a mental patient if the patient recognizes that it is being done in a spirit of love and compassion.

"A depressed patient has a deep sense of guilt," Dr. O'Brien explains. "It may be real or imagined, but at any rate, it's there. And how do you expiate guilt? By penance, of course. You make up for your wrongdoing by accepting punishment. Thus, when the depressed person says to her best friend, "I am worthless, I'm a no-good,' and the friend says, 'Now, now, that is not true. You aren't a no-good at all. You are a fine, sweet person, and we all love you,' the friend actually makes the person feel worse, not better."

When a patient says to Dr. O'Brien, "I am no good, I don't deserve sympathy," he says, "Very well. Take this brush and start scrubbing the floors." But, he points out, you must do this in a loving, not a sadistic, way.

"Depressed people," he says, "are also very dependent people—they go mooning about the house, one side of them saying, 'I'm no good,' the other demanding of all those about them, 'Gratify me—gratify me!'

"We help them get rid of their sense of guilt by putting them to scrubbing floors, and we gratify them by praising them for what they have done. But there is one more step—though we praise them as they deserve it, we are never quite satisfied, we keep pushing—'There's a bit of dirt there in the corner, there's a heel mark here'—until they begin to show signs of resentment. Then we set them to work at another task, more in keeping with their background than scrubbing floors. As we push, we watch for the first hopeful signs of hostility, because justified anger is healthy anger."

A young Cuban doctor, using Dr. O'Brien's "push 'em until they push back" theory, came to Dr. O'Brien's office looking puzzled. He was not sure he was making progress with a patient, he said. The patient had called him a name, but his English was not good, and he was not sure that this was a manifestation of healthy hostility.

"What did he call you?" asked Dr. O'Brien.

"He called me a horse's ess."

Dr. O'Brien suppressed a smile. "You are making good progress, doctor," he said. "Please continue."

A thousand miles to the south, at Central State Hospital in Milledgeville, Georiga, a blunt-spoken young psychologist, Dr. Robert Francis Heap, ex-paratrooper and Ranger, is experimenting with even more brusque and demanding techniques for remotivating old schizophrenics.

"It is the job of the psychologist," says Dr. Heap, "to assess and modify human behavior, and all human beings—even those who have been judged insane—willingly will modify their behavior in ways that pay off for them."

To test this idea, he set up, in an old ward of Milledgeville, what is in effect a small socio-economic community. On Dr. O'Brien's remotivation wards, when the patient learns to scrub a floor properly, the doctor praises him and immediately sets him a higher task. At Milledgeville, Dr. Heap not only praises him, he pays him. Originally Heap used little wooden tokens sawed from broom handles. Metal slugs have now replaced the wooden currency. With these tokens the patient is required to pay for his bed, food and recreation—everything but medicine.

The first 45 "citizens" of Dr. Heap's experimental community were chosen at random from 90 dull-eyed, foul and unresponsive men living on one of Milledgeville's most regressed back wards.

The remaining 45 served as a control group. They were sent back to a typical chronic ward, there to receive only the routine custodial treatment that is all this desperately shorthanded institution can normally provide. The 45 chosen for the experiment were moved into a special ward, physically as dull and drab as any other, but operated independently of the rest of the hospital. Here they were under the close supervision of a treatment team made up of the psychologist, a medical doctor, a psychiatric nurse, a social worker, a chaplain, and aides specializing in occupational, musical, recreational and vocational therapy.

"In the past," said Dr. Heap, "most of the care and handling of the mental-hospital patient has unwittingly ecouraged passive, dependent, abnormal behavior. Our job is to stimulate him, to stir him out of his apathetic acceptance, to make him adaptive, independent, appropriately aggressive in the pursuit of worthwhile goals." One of Dr. Heap's patients immediately proved to be "adaptive, independent and aggressive in the pursuit of worthwhile goals." He got a broom handle and started counterfeiting tokens at such a rate that inflation threatened to wreck the whole project.

When the patient first comes to one of Dr. Heap's token wards—there are now five such wards—he is issued enough tokens to pay for his meals, his bed and his other needs for two days. After these are gone he must work to earn the tokens to pay for every service he receives. "The patient is taught that he must take full responsibility for his own behavior," Dr. Heap explained. "If he gets up in the morning, makes his own bed, shaves, participates in the morning exercises and shows up for breakfast, clean, neat and calm, he has automatically earned enough tokens to pay for his breakfast. If he doesn't do these things, then it is assumed that he does not want to eat. The choice is his. We don't say, 'If you don't work, you don't eat.' We tell him, 'If you want to eat, you must work.' "

Thus the patient must make a decision, and this, in Dr. Heap's theory, is the beginning of healing, for when the patient starts making decisions, he begins to make contact again with the world of reality. So far, Dr. Heap can recall no patient who has chosen to miss more than two meals in a row.

To a lay visitor, what Dr. Heap has accomplished in 18 months is impressive. To reach the T (for token) wards, the visitor must pass through a typical, old-time asylum dayroom where in the traditional moan and mutter and odor of madness, men sit like vegetables, numbed by drugs, or gabble, laugh and dance as their illness seizes them. On the other side of the locked door, in their clean, quiet, well-kept wards, Dr. Heap's patients move about busily at a dozen tasks as they work to earn their tokens. They have at least curbed the symptoms of their illness, and by controlling their conduct, they come nearer to the day when they can walk out of the hospital door. "No man," says Dr. Heap, "can help *being* crazy. He can help *acting* crazy."

Dr. Heap does not claim his patients are cured when they leave the hospital. No doctor who works with mental patients will use the word "cure" in the absolute sense. But his patients do show a remarkable capacity for keeping themselves under control, for adjusting to life in the world outside. The ward records tell a dramatic story: to date, 251 patients have been treated in the T-wards. Of these, 74 percent improved enough to be sent home, and only 19 percent of those discharged have come back. For the hospital as a whole, the relapse rate is 52 percent.

Techniques developed by Drs. O'Brien, Kris, Heap, by Mr. Moskovites and others experimenting with new approaches, will in time alter the pattern of patient population. Schizophrenics, with their withdrawal from reality, their inner fantasties, their delusions, hallucinations and bizarre posturings, now make up 20 percent of all the new admissions to mental hospitals and 30 percent of the readmissions. They are usually young—their average age is 34—and comparatively healthy. As a result, their death rate is low, and they tend to accumulate. Today, therefore, while half the beds in all U.S. hospitals are occupied by mental patients, half the beds in mental hospitals are occupied by schizophrenics.

The next largest segment of mental-hospital admissions is composed of patients suffering from such ailments as cerebral arteriosclerosis and senile brain disease. Their death rate is high, but their release rate is so low that they, too, tend to accumulate. They account for nearly one fifth of the present mental-hospital population.

Many of these patients should never have been sent to a mental hospital in the first place, for there is little that the psychiatrist or the psychologist can do for them. They need a medical doctor, a nurse and, above all, a friend. At huge Colorado State Hospital on the edge of the arid plain outside Pueblo, the senile patient may find all three of these in the person of one man. Dr. Augustus Davison is a short, tweedy, pipe-smoking man with steel-gray hair and sharp blue eyes, a harsh-voiced sentimentalist with a brusque manner, and a special talent for handling the troublesome and cantankerous oldster. Dr. Davison is an M.D., not a psychiatrist or psychologist—he pretends not even to understand their language.

"What do you mean by 'psychiatric treatment'?" he asks. "I don't know—unless it's a patient under the influence of Sodium Pentothal, lying on a couch dredging up memories of his childhood while a doctor listens and a tape recorder takes it all down. So, let us take a look at one of our geriatrics patients. He's an old man, nearly deaf, with swollen feet, a failing heart and an inability to control his bladder—plus, perhaps, a schizophrenic reaction of forty years' duration. What can a psychiatrist do for him? Nothing. The psychiatrist wants to treat a person perfect in health except for a touch of schizophrenia. He takes one look at my old guy and surrenders.

"Ten, fifteen years ago," Dr. Davison says, "I felt that way myself. I had the feeling that a geriatrics patient was hardly worth

fooling with—no mind, no hope, no future, and a feeble body that was really no challenge to the doctor.

"Then, for some reason—maybe as I, myself, grew older—I began to understand that a day in an old man's life is as important as a day in the life of a child, and that there must be depth and breadth to life, as well as length of days. So, the challenge *was* there—to the doctor and the nurse and to everybody who had anything to do with the senile old—to bring some beauty, some joy, some usefulness back into the lives of these people who have, in effect, simply been stowed away to die."

Dr. Davison starts by trying to make his patients physically comfortable. "Some of them come in here as bedfast patients," he says, "complete with bedsores and catheters. I say to a man like that, 'Mr. Johnson, wouldn't you like this damned catheter pulled out of you so you can get up and try a walker, or a wheelchair, or get some strength back in your legs and arms? Wouldn't you like to try to put your own clothes on, and wouldn't you feel better getting up and going to the table with the others?' We let him know by our words and actions that we think he can do these things. And he does try. So, out of three hundred and ninety patients in our geriatrics division—and they range in age from sixty-five to one hundred and five years old—only six are bedfast. There is not a catheter in a single patient. I take a very dim view of any institution which resorts to this scurvy trick to keep the sheets dry."

Once his patients are made comfortable with the drugs and medicines that will alleviate their physical ailments, Dr. Davison tries to find whatever hidden reserves of strength they may have left. "We lay out programs for them in group therapy, in occupational therapy of various kinds," he says. "We keep them busy doing something that we hope they like to do. Every night there's something—church, movies, a party, a dance. We let them cook and serve their own meals.

"I know of no patient who cannot, if he tries, do something useful for himself, or for those about him," he explains. "The aged patients come in here with a great feeling of uselessness. They have a great wish to isolate themselves; they hope they'll soon be dead. We explain to them that it is natural and normal for people who have been busy all their lives to find it difficult to adjust when their working days are over. But we let them know that we think elderly people *ought* to be able to take things a little easier, to withdraw from responsibility, from crowds and rush and hurry. They have a right to a gentle disengagement from life.

"Then we try to create in them the feeling that they are still needed, are useful to somebody, that they are entitled to dignity and respect. And when they are cast in the role of a needed, useful, respected person, they rise to the occasion."

In 1961, when Colorado State formed its Geriatrics Release Program, there were 2,400 patients at the hospital who were past the age of 65. By the end of 1967 there were 390. Dr. Davison, who came to Colorado State in 1965, modestly says that his only contribution was fighting to bring medical care "to a level good enough for my relative or yours."

Pueblo, Milledgeville, St. Joseph, Boston—all are relics of the past insofar as physical plant is concerned, although using modern techniques. North of Pueblo, in Denver, lies Fort Logan, a shining new prototype of the mental hospital of the future. Only its spacious tree-shaded lawns bring to mind the classic asylums of the past. New one-story buildings of glass and steel, with no bars at the windows, are scattered in clusters of "family units" around courtyards bright with flowers. In these separate cottages the mentally ill of all ages and both sexes live on wards separated only by a common day-room.

With a staff of 720 employees and 1,336 patients—only 198 of whom are on 24-hour care—Fort Logan is one of the most heavily staffed state hospitals in the country. Even so, it makes much use of the patients themselves, and it allows them to know what illness afflicts their fellows. When the day patients arrive to join in the day's routine of therapy with those on 24-hour care, the nurse in charge of the resident patient reads aloud how each of them has passed the night—giving special attention to those who showed signs of anxiety and hostility. These briefings give the day patients a clue to how they should conduct themselves in the presence of the disturbed patients.

Trusted patients are used to guide those still needing help to the various therapy areas. The older people, particularly, help each other; it is a common and touching sight to see them walking together—old men, old women or old couples—hand in hand like children. A conversation I recently overheard between an older woman, very nearly ready to graduate to day-hospital care, and a younger woman, bovine and withdrawn and still hallucinating, reveals how one patient may help another.

OLDER WOMAN: My voices are gone. I don't hear them any more. Do you?

YOUNGER WOMAN: Yes. And I am glad.

OLDER WOMAN: Why?

YOUNGER WOMAN: Because I like them. They keep me company.

OLDER WOMAN: Yes, but you are much better, for you don't scream back at them any more.

At Fort Logan, built and organized in 1961 in keeping with recommendations of the Joint Commission on Mental Health, there is a wide range of facilities for therapy—everything from basket weaving and basketball to the soul-searching agony of the psychodrama, in which the patient is induced to re-create, in dramatic form, the situations that drove him mad. There are no restraints other than the sedative effect of drugs, and these are administered sparingly. The treatment team may consist of as many as 21 people, including a psychiatrist, a psychologist, two social workers, nurses, and occupational and recreational therapists. Each team will be responsible for approximately 100 patients, about half of whom the team will see and work with every day.

There are some patients whom Fort Logan, as an "open-door" hospital, does not take—for example, those committed under criminal charges. And in the beginning it would not take persons in crisis, though it now has a Crisis Intervention Service on duty around the clock which responds to calls for psychiatric assistance. The patient in crisis is treated with great gentleness. Some months ago, as I was being shown through the immaculate wards and corridors, I heard a thin, wild screeching like the cry of some tropical bird, coming from behind the closed door of an office. A tiny, wild-eyed, toothless little woman, her black hair flying, was struggling in the arms of a woman doctor, screaming in the toneless voice of the deaf: Hel-l-l-p Murdah! You are a thief. You want my money." She clawed with long fingernails at the doctor's eyes. A nurse came to help, and the two of them led her away, still screaming.

Her story, when it came out, revealed her as typical of the lonely old. Her husband, a successful businessman, had died years before, leaving her fairly well off. For a while she had lived well and pleasantly in her own apartment, then in a boardinghouse of the better class. As time passed however, she became more and more convinced that her money would not last, that she would die a pauper. Though this was not true, she began a series of moves, from one cheap boardinghouse to another one cheaper still. When the police finally brought her to the hospital, she had been living in a tiny room in a Denver slum, going out at night to ransack garbage cans for her food.

Later that same day I saw her again. She was clean and quiet, under sedation. Her hair had been combed, and there was a ribbon in it. She was sitting in a chair with a restraining table, which prevented her from getting up, though she was free to move her legs and arms. Her eyes were glassy and unfocusing, but contact had been made. The woman doctor she had fought that morning stood beside her. When the doctor started to move away, a bird-claw hand reached out. "Don't leave me," the woman croaked.

Two days later, still in the chair, but under less heavy sedation, she took part in a group-therapy session in which the therapists were seeking to bring a mixed group of patients back to contact with their surroundings by passing around objects of various shapes and textures. For the women, there were bits of cloth—a bright print, a rough grained corduroy, a lush, soft piece of crimson velvet. As they put the velvet on the old woman's lap, her hands, all blue veins and bone, reached down to touch it. Her fingers caressed its softness, and in the drug-dimmed eyes there seemed to flicker a gleam of light.

"Maria likes the pretty velvet," the therapist said. The group sat silent, watching or dozing or staring blankly at something else. The toothless lips moved, and the neck muscles jerked with the effort of speech. The voice came harsh as a parrot's squawk—"I . . . had . . . dress . . . like . . . this. . . ."

A psychiatrist, watching, smiled. The old woman, wild with terror a few days before, was coming back to contact with reality. Her prognosis: pretty good. Within a few weeks she would probably be communicating as well as her deafness allowed. In time she would go out to a nursing home.

Would she return to the hospital? Would the old fears come back, that people were trying to rob her, that she would die a pauper? Perhaps. That is the risk an open-door hospital must take—that it may send some patient out before he is ready.

"Every time we let one go out, we know we are taking a gamble," said Don Snapp, administrative assistant to Fort Logan's director. "It really shakes up a team when it judges wrong and sends smebody out too soon. You see them leave, full of hope, strength and confidence—and you feel there's no job in the world as rewarding as this. And the you see them come back in, filthy, screaming and cursing, or dull-eyed, wooden, withdrawn. It breaks your heart. But you have to give them their chance, even if nearly a third of them do come back. There's no stigma attached to readmission."

The effort to get people out of the hospital and into the community is now being matched, in some areas, by a determination not to admit them in the first place unless they clearly require the special facilities of a mental hospital. For four years—until his recent assignment to other judicial duties—Judge Joseph Karesh of the San Francisco Superior Court stood as a watchdog between the patient and the mental hospital. A chunky, owlish, soft-spoken ex-South Carolinian with a crew cut, Judge Karesh was appointed Judge of the Psychiatric Court in 1963.

"At that time," he says, "the judge held his hearings in the ward at the county hospital. The poor sick people stood there in their pajamas while the doctor read the record to the judge. Whatever the doctor recommended, the judge so ordered, and nearly every time the order was a commitment to the asylum. The people being sent away didn't have any idea what was happening to them. Sometimes they didn't even know where they were, or who I was, or why I was asking all those questions. The first hearing I held, a patient socked me in the jaw."

Once during a visit by Judge Karesh's father, a rabbi from Charleston, the judge

took him along to watch the commitment process.

"One of the patients to come before me was an old, old man," the judge says. "I remember now how pitiful he looked standing there, barefoot, in that old, blue-denim robe. After the hearing, my father didn't say much. But not long after that, he had to go to a hospital himself, for an operation. He was 83, and when I went to see him there, he called me to his bed. When I bent over him, he whispered, 'Son, what happened to that old man?'

"I realized then what a dreadful thing we were doing. I refused to go on the wards any more. I had a courtroom set up in the hospital, though the doctors didn't like that at all. And I said that when a patient was brought to me he was to be dressed. He was to have with him any witnesses he wanted, and a lawyer if he wanted one. I wanted him to know that, crazy or not, he was entitled to his day in court.

"I remember a guy they picked up downtown raising hell, and his record showed he had 'been in Napa' (site of a big state hospital) and that he was 'under the delusion' that he was the manager of a prosperous business.

"Well, a little questioning showed he had 'been in Napa,' but not in the hospital. He lived there. And he managed a prosperous business there. He wasn't crazy, just drunk, but he came within an inch of being committed."

There is no danger that patients who get their day in a court like Judge Karesh's will be committed by accident. The judge listens to the doctor and then, with great sympathy and patience, questions the person brought before him.

"You need to understand what's going on," he says. "You'll find a woman trying to get her husband committed just to get rid of him, and vice versa. You'll find parents trying to get the courts to put away an unruly child. And you'll find children trying to turn the state into a baby-sitter for their aged and dependent parents.

"You don't have to be a psychiatrist to understand people," said the judge. "I know I take a terrific gamble sometimes, when I refuse to commit. I'll tell you this, though: If a man says he's afraid he's going to hurt somebody, I take his word, not the doctor's."

On the "bench" in his little improvised courtroom at the hospital the judge's manner was infinitely gentle.

A little black-haired woman, neatly dressed, came in on the arm of her father, a short, red-faced, well-groomed man who walked with dignity, as if he were giving a bride away. She seemed to be in her late or middle 30's, but there was something childlike about her. The record showed that she had been picked up late at night, barefooted, banging on the doors of St. Cecilia's church. She realized she needed help, her father said, and wanted to be committed voluntarily—meaning that she could leave the hospital after seven days, whether or not the hospital felt she was ready to go.

"I wonder," the judge said musingly, almost to himself, "if she has the capacity to make that decision."

"I have every capacity," she said. "You want me to tell you where I first met you? You were on the corner dispatching cabs. I know everybody. I know all the saints by name, all the fallen angels, all the good angels."

The judge glanced down at the paper in front of him. "Your name is Barbara," he said. "Barbara means 'Blessed.'"

"Yes," the little woman said. "It also means 'strange.'" She grabbed her father's hand and kissed it. "I am a strange, blessed child. I want to go home now, to my mother."

"Her mother is dead, Judge," her father said quietly.

"You go out in the hall and talk to your father for a minute," the judge said. She went out with the little man, leaning on his arm.

The judge shook his head. "I'll have to commit her," he said sadly.

One after the other, the pitiful parade passed before Judge Karesh, 14 in all. Two patients were too ill to be brought into court. The judge went to them on the ward. One, an old woman with white hair turned stiff and yellow, was trying to draw a ragged stocking over a swollen, blue-veined foot. "I'll get ready, I'll get ready," she kept saying.

"Keep her a few days," Judge Karesh said to the nurse. "She doesn't need a hospital. She needs a nursing home."

Then the judge went out. "The pitiful thing," he said, "is their helplessness, their utter helplessness. . . ."

Americans have not always shown this deep concern for the "utter helplessness" of the mentally ill. Colonial America brought from Europe the false belief that insanity is incurable except by bleeding, beating, blistering and purging the patient to make the evil spirit that possessed him so uncomfortable it would go away. There was no attempt at gentler therapy. The wealthy insane were kept locked up in barns or attics by their families; the poor were left to roam the roads, harried from town to town like dangerous beasts, or were shut away in almshouses, or simply put in jail.

This attitude began to change in the early days of the Republic, again following the lead of Europe. In 1792 Dr. Phillipe Pinel unchained the madmen in the asylums of Paris. In England four years later William Tuke founded a Quaker hospital called York Retreat, where insane patients were housed in a family environment and treated as guests. No harsh treatment of any kind was permitted, except the occasional use of a straitjacket or seclusion, to control a manic patient.

America for a time adopted and improved upon these humane methods, but the era of loving-kindness did not last long. A fiercely competitive industrial America soon forgot what a pastoral and rural America had discovered. Recognition of the madman as a human being had led to the building of the huge old asylums that still stand by the score all across the country. Their original purpose was to restore the mentally ill to health by compassionate and understanding treatment, but under the pressures of an increasingly complex and materialistic society, this goal was abandoned. The asylums became vast warehouses where the insane, the senile, the brain-damaged and the retarded were hidden away together and forgotten.

In the past decade or so we have started to realize again that the mentally ill person is a human being, and that—but for the grace of God—he might be any one of us. This realization, coupled with new therapeutic techniques, has brought a long-absent hope to those so afflicted—not everywhere, by any means, and not in every case, but more and more widely, more and more often.

Today hospital people estimate that one third of the nation's mentally ill, including nearly all those admitted to the hospital for the first time, are receiving good-to-excellent care. Of the remainder—the older, more difficult cases—about a third are getting moderately good care. The others, nearly half of the total, are still getting nothing much except token therapy and perhaps a somewhat more compassionate form of custodial care.

We have come a long way in the years since John Bartlow Martin wrote his classic INSIDE THE ASYLUM. There is still a long way to go. In 1956, when a doctor walked through the wards and a patient grabbed his arm, and, pleading, asked, "Doctor, when can I go home?" the doctor automatically answered, "Tomorrow," knowing that it was a lie. Today he can truthfully say it to thousands of patients, for, in the words of Dr. Charles E. Meredith at Pueblo, "Tomorrow comes more often now." But until we can hold out that hope to all those still hidden away in all the mental hospitals of the nation, the job is not finished. Until it is, each of us must bear in shame a share of the guilt.

THE NEED TO INCREASE TAXES

Mr. PATMAN. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that this Congress pay more attention to the dangers of inflation which threaten our economy. The Congress must take the necessary steps to prevent the damaging blows of inflation. And obviously, the quickest and the most effective solution is an increase in taxes.

Certainly, higher taxes are something most people want to avoid. But this is really a case of accepting something bad before something worse is forced on us. And certainly, ruinous inflation would be much worse for the country than an increase in taxes.

SIPHON OFF EXCESS PURCHASING POWER

We do have the economic means and the knowledge to stop inflation. It has been proven beyond a doubt that excess purchasing power can be effectively siphoned off through an increase in taxes. And by this process of siphoning off excessive purchasing power, we can prevent the onslaught of high prices and inflation. We should act now to start this siphoning off process in motion.

TOO MANY DOLLARS CHASING TOO FEW GOODS CAUSE INFLATION

Mr. Speaker, the word "inflation" is often misused and undoubtedly this fact has created much confusion around the country. But to simplify the question, I think that we should define inflation as too many dollars chasing too few goods. This is a thumbnail and simplified definition but it is descriptive of the situation which we may be facing in a very, very short time.

As I mentioned earlier this week, the tax increase as proposed by President Johnson is not excessive. It is a reasonable request and one which will not impose an onerous burden on any single taxpayer. We had a substantial tax reduction a few months after President Johnson took office and the increase that is proposed now will actually restore only about two-thirds of that reduction.

TAX INCREASE SHOULD BE ON FULLY GUARANTEED BASIS

As we restore the taxes which we previously removed, I hope the Congress will act in a manner which will protect the low-income family. The tax increase should be imposed in such a manner as to be fully in keeping with the principle of graduated income taxes. When we talk about siphoning off purchasing power, we do not mean to siphon off more of the already limited funds of the low-income wage earner. So, I hope that the tax writers in both Houses will take extreme care to impose this tax increase on a fully graduated basis.

Mr. Speaker, the tax increase is basically needed to prevent inflation, but it is also required so that we may finance our domestic programs and the war in Vietnam without huge deficits. These programs—both at home and abroad—are necessary to the future of this Nation and I am convinced that the people are willing to pay for their continuance.

TAX INCREASE NOW COULD STOP FIXING PRICE AND WAGE CONTROLS

A tax increase is also needed if we are to prevent an economic situation which would call for the imposition of wage and price controls. Wage and price controls should be imposed only as the last resort. I had much experience with wage and price control legislation during World War II and let me assure my colleagues that a tax increase is much more preferable than the heavy difficult burden that would fall on everyone from wage and price controls. We would, in effect, be attempting to set 10 million different prices and wages if such legislation had to be considered by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, effective wage and price control is extremely difficult if not impossible to administer. Wage and price controls would undoubtedly bring on a massive black-market operation in this country which would be run by the hoodlum elements. It would be impossible to effectively police wage and price controls and, as a result, the black market would flourish to the detriment of everyone. The profiteers would have a field day under such a system.

A tax increase, effectively applied now, will prevent such a situation from developing in this country. It will help protect against an economic situation which would encourage the black markets and the profiteers.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this Congress—before too many weeks pass—will heed President Johnson's repeated warnings about the need for a tax increase. Conditions are proving that President Johnson has been right all along on this tax issue. It is time the Congress acted.

U.S.-FLAG MERCHANT FLEET

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, I have just introduced a bill which hopefully would provide a new financial approach to the problem of renewing and enlarging the active U.S.-flag merchant fleet to meet evident national needs. Everyone agrees that our country should have a first-rate maritime fleet, but the problem of funding such a project is always with us.

The plan is known as "FIRST," meaning "fleet in readiness status today." I would hope that the various Federal agencies would study this unique proposition and render their reports to the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries as soon as possible.

There is growing recognition that:

First. The present reserve fleet is old and unsatisfactory; the military services require flexible new ships available in emergencies, with trained crews aboard;

Second. The construction program for the subsidized lines is inadequate to build a fleet sufficient for defense needs, as the Vietnam crisis proves;

Third. Unsubsidized U.S.-flag lines have no economical way to replace their fleets, which are reaching the end of their useful lives;

Fourth. The costs per ship of construction and operation under present subsidy programs are far too high;

Fifth. The U.S.-flag fleet is insufficient to carry even a minor share of our foreign commerce, thus contributing to the balance-of-payments crisis.

The FIRST plan would begin with the building of at least 100 vessels—at least 50 liner-type—over the next 5 years by private unsubsidized operators. These ships would be privately owned and financed. They would be leased to the Government on 20-year Government bareboat charters, at a hire sufficient to pay off principal cost of the ships and interest over the 20 years.

These 100 or more ships, privately owned but Government-chartered, would be the Active National Reserve Fleet. They would be kept active in regular commercial service by immediately subchartering them back to the private unsubsidized operators for private operation on an incentive profitsharing arrangement. The Government's profit share would, of course, reduce the cost of the program, and the Government's share could be used to fund a continuing fleet expansion.

The FIRST plan has a number of immediate and future practical advantages. Most important, it would add at least 100 newly built active ships to the merchant marine, to be kept fully manned, operating and earning in peacetime. In a military emergency these ships would be instantly available. This is a far better arrangement than depending on a rusting laid-up fleet with no trained crews available in war because the men were not employed in peacetime.

The addition of 100 active and earning ships to the American merchant marine would have a substantial favorable effect on our balance of payments.

Because the plan would spread the Government's share of the cost of ships over 20 years, there is an immediate budget advantage. For 50 liner-type ships the net cost to the Government would be only $30,000,000 a year, and in the first year of the program, when only a fifth of the fleet is built, the initial group of liners would cost only $6,000,000. In contrast, construction subsidy under the 1936 Act is all paid at once, at the beginning of a ship's life, which presents a major budget problem.

The FIRST plan is a supplement to, not a substitute for, subsidized operations under the 1936 act. Over the life of the ships, the FIRST plan would cost 30 to 40 percent less per ship than the total of operating and construction subsidies under the 1936 act. The plan allows presently unsubsidized U.S.-flag operators to continue in existence with modern ships to operate, at a substantial total saving to the Government.

Existing investments of both unsubsidized and subsidized lines would be protected. While the FIRST plan encourages the survival of unsubsidized companies, it is completely fair to the presently subsidized lines. The opportunity would be open to the subsidized lines to bareboat charter their ships to the Active Reserve Fleet, and charter them back for unsubsidized operation if they prefer the opportunities and risks of business without Government supervision. Not the least benefit of the FIRST plan would be the opportunity to compare the results of the two types of operation.

SUSPENSION OF EQUAL-TIME REQUIREMENT

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to suspend the so-called equal-time requirement from the Communications Act for the duration of the upcoming presidential election campaign.

I believe the withdrawal of President Johnson from the presidential race has made this action desirable.

If we now permit the equal-time rule to remain in effect, we will be needlessly handcuffing broadcasters and denying the public an opportunity to see and hear a free exchange of views by the candidates for the highest offices in our Nation.

Understandably, an incumbent President would be most reluctant to elevate his opponent by engaging in a televised debate with him. But nonincumbent candidates should have nothing to lose by participation in such discussions—and the voters everything to gain.

I think we all recall how enlightening the Nixon-Kennedy debates were during the 1960 campaign. Both candidates were willing to subject themselves to the scrutiny of many millions of their fellow citizens. In so doing, they generated an enormous amount of public interest in the race.

These great debates could not have taken place, of course, if the equal time provision had applied to the 1960 campaign. If the requirement had remained in force, the networks would have had to provide similar forums for all other presidential candidates, regardless of how trivial the parties they represented might have been.

In 1964, the situation was entirely changed. An incumbent President was seeking reelection. Sharing a platform with his principal rival could not be seriously considered.

But this year is different, and the principal candidates should be given the opportunity to test their mettle in direct confrontations with each other.

As a member of the Communications

Subcommittee, I would like to urge the support of all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the legislation I am offering today. Since time is now of the essence, I shall work to obtain early hearings by my subcommittee on this proposal.

My bill follows:

H.R. 16406

A bill to suspend the requirements of section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934 for the period of the 1968 presidential and vice presidential campaigns

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) that part of section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, which requires any licensee of a broadcast station who permits any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station to afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station, is suspended for the period of the 1968 presidential and vice presidential campaigns with respect to nominees for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States. Nothing in the foregoing shall be construed as relieving broadcasters from the obligation imposed upon them under this Act to operate in the public interest.

(b) The Federal Communications Commission shall make a report to the Congress, not later than March 1, 1969, with respect to the effect of the provisions of this Act and any recommendations the Commission may have for amendments to the Communications Act of 1934 as a result of experience under the provisions of this Act.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES MUST SHARE IN TREATY RATIFICATION PROCESS

Mr. COLLIER. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House joint resolution which, if adopted by both the House and the other body, would give the States an opportunity to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to give this body a share in the treaty ratification process. I am firmly convinced that this reform is long overdue.

Our present system of government came into being in 1789, when the Constitution went into effect. Among the provisions of that great document is the one that gives the Senate the sole responsibility for advising and consenting whenever the executive branch of the Government negotiates a treaty with another nation or nations. The Senate may, of course, withhold its consent. In fact, the fundamental law makes it difficult to obtain such consent, as it requires a two-thirds majority of the Senators present to make ratification possible.

Two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, or 67 of the 100 Members of the other body if all are present, sounds like a large order. I was rather surprised when I looked at some figures and learned that a two-thirds majority of the Senate can represent a good deal less than two-thirds of the population of our Nation.

The first census of population was taken in 1790, 1 year after the establishment of our present political setup. It showed a total population for the 13 Original States of 3,843,789. Eighteen Senators from nine States with a total population of 1,683,360 could have ratified a treaty—less than 44 percent of the population of the United States. On the other hand, the Senators from the five smallest States, with a total population of 536,493, or less than 14 percent of the population of the United States, could have blocked ratification.

The following table illustrates these facts:

Virginia	[1] 821,287
Massachusetts	[2] 475,327
Pennsylvania	434,373
North Carolina	[3] 429,442
New York	340,120
Maryland	319,728
South Carolina	249,073
Connecticut	237,946
New Jersey	184,139
New Hampshire	141,885
Georgia	82,548
Rhode Island	68,825
Delaware	59,096
Total	3,843,789

[1] Includes Kentucky, 73,677
[2] Includes Maine, 96,540
[3] Includes Tennessee, 35,691

New York, Maryland, South Carolina, New Jersey, New Hampshire, Georgia, Rhode Island, and Delaware had a total of 1,683,360 inhabitants or 44 percent.

New Jersey, New Hampshire, Georgia, Rhode Island, and Delaware had 536,493 or 14 percent.

I am sure that these figures will astound many of my colleagues. Let me now point out something that is even more astounding and certainly of greater importance, as it concerns a condition existing not in the distant past but right now.

The last census of population was taken in 1960. It showed a total population of 178,559,219 for the 50 States that make up the United States of America. Sixty-seven of the 68 Senators that represent 34 States with a total population of 55,982,691—31 percent—can ratify a treaty. At the same time, the 34 Senators who represent the 17 smallest States, with a total population of 11,956,189, or less than 7 percent can block ratification.

The following table illustrates these facts:

Alaska	226,167
Nevada	285,278
Wyoming	330,066
Vermont	389,881
Delaware	446,292
New Hampshire	606,921
North Dakota	632,446
Hawaii	632,772
Idaho	667,191
Montana	674,767
South Dakota	680,514
Rhode Island	859,488
Utah	890,627
New Mexico	951,023
Maine	969,265
Arizona	1,302,161
Nebraska	1,411,330
Total (7 percent)	11,956,189
Colorado	1,753,947
Oregon	1,768,687
Arkansas	1,786,272
West Virginia	1,860,421
Mississippi	2,178,141
Kansas	2,178,611
Oklahoma	2,328,284
South Carolina	2,382,594
Connecticut	2,535,234
Iowa	2,757,537
Washington	2,853,214
Kentucky	3,038,156
Maryland	3,100,689
Louisiana	3,257,022
Alabama	3,266,740
Minnesota	3,413,864
Tennessee	3,567,089
Total (31 percent)	55,982,691

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that even though it takes two-thirds of the Senate to ratify a treaty, in compliance with the Constitution, minority rule is still possible. It appears to me that a two-thirds majority ought to mean, not a group of Senators who may represent less than one-third of the population, but a group that represents two-thirds or more of the population.

It would obviously not be practicable to require that a treaty could not be ratified unless the ratifying Senators represented two-thirds of the people, when we bear in mind that the 100 Members of the other body represent States of greatly varying populations, ranging from Alaska's 226,167 to New York's 16,782,304. The only really fair method of voting would be a weighted vote system, which would be unacceptable, both because of its unwieldiness and because it would conflict with the constitutional provisions that "each Senator shall have one vote" and "no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

How, then, can the system of ratification of treaties be made more equitable, while maintaining the two-thirds requirement?

During the past few years we have heard a great deal about the principle of "one man, one vote." The redistricting of such of our States as are entitled to more than the minimum one Representative in this body has led to congressional districts that are much closer to an equitable balance than was the case before the Supreme Court of the United States intruded in this area.

Perfection has not been achieved, but even if each district in a particular State were equal in population to every other district in the same State, there would be some disparities. For example, Mississippi and West Virginia are each entitled to five Representatives, although the former State had 317,720 more inhabitants than its sister State. Delaware has just short of twice the population of Alaska, 446,292 as compared with 226,167, yet each State has one Member in this body.

Despite the disparities I have referred to, I believe two-thirds of the Members of the House of Representatives would come closer to truly representing two-thirds of the American people than would two-thirds of the Members of the other body.

Mr. Speaker, as I am a firm believer in our bicameral system of government,

I am not proposing that we deprive the Senate of its power of treaty ratification. I am merely proposing that the House of Representatives be given an equal share in this power.

There are some who will say that the Founding Fathers settled this question during the proceedings of the Convention of 1787. While the Constitution that they wrote is certainly the greatest human document ever penned, it is by no means perfect; in fact, the very first Congress submitted the Bill of Rights to the States for ratification and they were added to the original Constitution in 1791. Since then the Constitution has been amended no less than 15 times.

In No. 64 of the Federalist Papers John Jay said:

> The power of making treaties is an important one, especially as it relates to war, peace, and commerce.

War, peace, and commerce covered everything during the days in which Jay lived, but today we have treaties that cover not only the surface of the earth and the seas but the ocean floor, the air through which we fly, and the realm of outer space through which our gallant astronauts have traveled. I doubt very much that Jay and his contemporaries would want Senators representing 31 percent of the population to have the power to ratify treaties that deal with such far-ranging areas.

Let me now quote what Jay and Alexander Hamilton said in opposition to giving the House of Representatives coequal power with the Senate in the field of treaty ratification, after which I will attempt to answer their objections. While Jay and Hamilton, along with James Madison, wrote the various essays that make up the Federalist Papers, they were all signed "Publius."

Jay made the following comments in No. 64 of the papers:

> They who wish to commit the power under consideration to a popular assembly composed of members constantly coming and going in quick succession seem not to recollect that such a body must necessarily be inadequate to the attainment of those great objects which require to be steadily contemplated in all their relations and circumstances, and which can only be approached and achieved by measures which not only talents, but also exact information, and often much time, are necessary to concert and to execute. It was wise, therefore, in the convention, to provide not only that the power of making treaties should be committed to able and honest men, but also that they should continue in place a sufficient time to become perfectly acquainted with our national concerns, and to form and introduce a system for the management of them. The duration prescribed is such as will give them an opportunity of greatly extending their political informations, and of rendering their accumulating experience more and more beneficial to their country. Nor has the convention discovered less prudence in providing for the frequent elections of senators in such a way as to obviate the inconvenience of periodically transferring those great affairs entirely to new men; for by leaving a considerable residue of the old ones in place, uniformity and order, as well as a constant succession of official information, will be preserved.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It seldom happens in the negotiation of treaties, of whatever nature, but that perfect *secrecy* and immediate *dispatch* are sometimes requisite. There are cases where the most useful intelligence may be obtained, if the persons possessing it can be relieved from apprehensions of discovery. Those apprehensions will operate on those persons whether they are actuated by mercenary or friendly motives; and there doubtless are many of both descriptions who would rely on the secrecy of the President, but who would not confide in that of the Senate, and still less in that of a large popular assembly. The convention have done well, therefore, in so disposing of the power of making treaties that although the President must, in forming them, act by the advice and consent of the Senate, yet he will be able to manage the business of intelligence in such manner as prudence may suggest.

The following observations by Hamilton are from No. 75 of the Papers:

> The fluctuating and, taking its future increase into the account, the multitudinous composition of that body, forbid us to expect in [the House of Representatives] those qualities which are essential to the proper execution of such a trust. Accurate and comprehensive knowledge of foreign politics; a steady and systematic adherence to the same views; a nice and uniform sensibility to national character; decision, *secrecy*, and dispatch, are incompatible with the genius of a body so variable and so numerous. The very complication of the business, by introducing a necessity of the concurrence of so many different bodies, would of itself afford a solid objection. The greater frequency of the calls upon the House of Representatives, and the greater length of time which it would often be necessary to keep them together when convened to obtain their sanction in the progressive stages of a treaty would be a source of so great inconvenience and expense as alone ought to condemn the project.
>
> * * * * *
>
> When we . . . look forward to the probable augmentation of the Senate, by the erection of new States, we shall not only perceive ample ground of confidence in the sufficiency of the numbers to whose agency that power will be intrusted, but we shall probably be led to conclude that a body more numerous than the Senate would be likely to become, would be very little fit for the proper discharge of the trust.

Mr. Speaker, is this great body really "composed of Members constantly coming and going in quick succession" as John Jay described it? Let us examine this proposition.

The 100 Members of the U.S. Senate have served an average of 12 years, while the 435 Members of the House of Representatives have served an average of 9½ years. The latter figure is but half a year short of the average for all Members of Congress, which is 10 years. If we eliminate the 71 Members of the House who have served only 1 year, the average for the House will be raised to 11 years, just 1 year short of the average for the other body. This is not much of a difference.

The following table shows that neither body is composed of Members constantly coming and going in quick succession:

Senate:	Years
Hayden	41
Russell	35
Ellender	31
Hill	30
Aiken	27
Eastland	25
McClellan	25
Magnuson	23
Fulbright	23
Hickenlooper	23
Morse	23
Young of North Dakota	23
Holland	21
Sparkman	21
Williams of Delaware	21
Stennis	20
House:	
Celler	45
McCormack	39
Patman	39
Colmer	35
Arends	33
Mahon	33
Halleck	33
Kirwan	31
Poage	31
Gathings	29
McMillan	29
Mills	29
Bolton	28
Hébert	27
Rivers	27
Whitten	26
King of California	25
Abernethy	25
Dawson	25
Feighan	25
Fisher	25
Holifield	25
Madden	25
O'Konski	25
Philbin	25
Andrews of Alabama	24
Rooney of New York	23
Byrnes of Wisconsin	23
Corbett	23
Fallon	23
Fulton of Pennsylvania	23
Miller of California	23
Morgan	23
Price of Illinois	23
Sikes	23
Teague of Texas	21
Albert	21
Blatnik	21
Boggs	21
Burleson	21
Donohue	21
Evins	21
Hardy	21
Karsten	21
Passman	21
Jones of Alabama	21
Garmatz	20
McCulloch	20
Abbitt	20

If the House of Representatives were to be given an equal share in the treaty ratification process with the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs would have to consider the treaties before they were sent to the floor of the House for ratification or rejection, just as the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate now gives them consideration before the full Senate acts upon them.

The following table shows that neither of these two important committees is composed of members constantly coming and going in quick succession:

Senate:	Years
Aiken	27
Fulbright	23
Hickenlooper	23
Morse	23
Sparkman	21
Williams of Delaware	21
Mundt	19
Carlson	17
Gore	15
Mansfield	15
Symington	15
Case	13
Cooper	11
Church	11

Senate—Continued	Years
Clark	11
Lausche	11
Dodd	8
McCarthy	8
Pell	7
House:	
Bolton	28
Fulton of Pennsylvania	23
Morgan	23
Burleson	21
Gross	19
Hays	19
Zablocki	19
Kelly	18
Adair	17
Berry	17
O'Hara of Illinois	15
Fountain	15
Frelinghuysen	15
Mailliard	15
Selden	15
Diggs	13
Fascell	13
Broomfield	11
Farbstein	11
Nix	10
Derwinski	9
Gallagher	9
Monagan	9
Murphy of Illinois	9
Whaley	7
Thomson of Wisconsin	7
Findley	7
Morse	7
Rosenthal	6
Fraser	5
Roybal	5
Buchanan	3
Culver	3
Hamilton	3
Tunney	3
Taft	1

The average service for the Senate committee is 16 years, while the average for the House committee is 12 years. The latter figure is only a year short of the average for all members of both committees, which is 13 years.

John Jay spoke of the necessity for "perfect secrecy and immediate dispatch," while his collaborator, Alexander Hamilton, declared that "decision, secrecy, and dispatch are incompatible with the genius of a body so variable and so numerous" as the House of Representatives.

As to secrecy, I believe the House will be just as trustworthy as the other body, should it ever receive a share in the treatymaking process. It was only recently that the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate discussed important issues relating to the war in Vietnam while television made it possible for millions throughout the United States to view its proceedings and listen to the interrogations and responses as the Secretary of State testified before the committee. I am sure that our distinguished Speaker would follow the example of his eminent predecessor and forbid the telecasting of such proceedings by committees of the House and I am equally confident that the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this body would not permit such telecasting.

As to dispatch, let me say that once a treaty reached the floor of the House of Representatives, the House could work its will promptly, certainly with greater promptness than is often displayed by the other body. There are times when delay would be the greater virtue and I make no criticism of the rules of the Senate which encourage delay rather than dispatch. Should speed be necessary, however, the House could be relied upon to do its duty once a report on the treaty had been issued by the Committee on Foreign Affairs; no individual Member could frustrate the proceedings with endless and irrelevant verbosity.

The two political progenitors from whom I have quoted also wrote regarding the necessity for knowledge and experience in the field of foreign affairs. Many of the Members of this body have expertise in this important field, having visited foreign nations on every continent, either as Members of the House of Representatives, as members of the Armed Forces, or as representatives of the business, industrial, and labor communities of our society.

While the Senate presently has sole jurisdiction over treaties, Members of this body have had the responsibility for frequent consideration of such matters as the implementation of the treaties negotiated by the executive branch and ratified by the other body. They have also dealt with the multitude of foreign aid programs that have been enacted by the Congress since the end of World War II. They have dealt with matters that have inevitably arisen because of wars such as the Korean war and the war in Southeast Asia—such matters as the dispatch of troops, the furnishing of ammunition and other supplies, and the authorization and appropriation of funds to carry on the conflicts to victory.

Not only the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but the members of the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Committee on Ways and Means have of necessity become experts in varying degrees on foreign affairs as they have struggled with the problems associated with war, peace, and commerce. I am sure that if Madison, Hamilton, and Jay, the erudite authors of the Federalist Papers, were here today that they would concede that the Members of this body are possessed of sufficient patriotism, knowledge, experience, and honesty and that they are endowed with an adequate sense of responsibility, thus making them worthy of an equal share with the Senate in considering and ratifying or rejecting treaties with foreign nations.

Article VI of the Constitution declares:

> This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. Speaker, if the treaties to which our Nation is a party are that important, surely the branch of Congress that represents the people, and whose Members are responsible to them every 2 years, should have a voice in ratifying or rejecting such treaties.

The House of Representatives has had an equal part with the Senate in the writing of every law that has been passed by the Congress from 1789 to this present hour. It has also had an equal share with the other body in the drafting of every constitutional amendment that has been submitted to the States.

If the House, a coequal branch of the National Legislature, has an equal share in the making, amending, and repealing of laws and an equal share in the submission of amendments to the Constitution, it seems only logical that it should have an equal share in the treaty ratification process. The joint resolution which I have introduced today is the initial step toward securing such coequal power for the House.

REPORT OF X-RADIATION FROM COLOR TELEVISION SETS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the National Center for Radiological Health conducted a survey of color television sets earlier this year to determine how many emitted X-radiation.

The results of that test survey were announced on March 14, but the report did not include the names of the manufacturers of the sets. Dr. James G. Terrill, Director of the Center, said that the survey was a random sample and was not necessarily valid for the Nation.

However, it did appear that the public should be given the information from the survey, including the brand names, since Dr. Terrill qualified the conditions under which the survey was made.

I would also like to commend the Washington Post for exercising its right of information in seeking the names of the companies.

The survey points out that 6 percent of the sets tested were emitting radiation in excess of the recommended level. It is also important to note that Dr. Terrill estimated that between 5 and 10 percent of the 14 million color television sets in the Nation might be emitting radiation in excess of the recommended level.

The House passed H.R. 10790, which I introduced, so as to protect the American public against the potential dangers of excess radiation. I hope the Senate will take like action, as the problem is a national one which has great potential unless checked.

At this time I would like to include the story in today's Post and the release issued by the National Center for Radiological Health on the survey:

> FOUR BRANDS BLAMED IN TV RAY HAZARD
>
> The director of the National Center for Radiological Health estimated yesterday that as many as 1.4 million color television sets in this country emit excess radiation.
>
> James G. Terrill, who made the estimate, said surveys indicate that between 5 and 10 percent of the 14 million color TV sets in the United States give off more than .5 of a milliroentgen per hour of X-rays—the safe limit set by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurement.
>
> Terrill also made public the brand names of sets found in a survey in the Washington area to emit excessive amounts of X-rays.

The survey showed that 6 percent—or 66—of the 1124 sets tested gave off excessive radiation.

Four brands were responsible for 86 percent of the excess radiation found in the Washington-area survey he said at a news conference. The brands are RCA, Zenith, Magnavox and Setchell-Carlson, a Chicago-based firm that sells mainly in the Middle West.

General Electric, the company that sparked special interest in excessive radiation from color TV last May when it called back 90,000 sets, came through this survey with no sets leaking more X-rays than they should. Terrill cautioned that findings in the Washington-area survey with regard to brand names do not necessarily indicate a similar situation in the rest of the Nation. He said the survey here did not include enough sets of all manufacturers for a mathematically accurate sampling.

He also said that parts made by other manufacturers could be responsible for excessive radiation in some brands.

The National Center refused to make public the brand names when it gave out results of the survey March 12. It gave them out when The Washington Post made an official request for the names under the Federal Freedom Law.

Excess radiation can cause long-term genetic damage and is believed to be responsible for some tumors.

Terrill said that most of the 700,000 to 1.4 million American homes which have color TV sets that leak excessive radiation will never find out about it.

He said there are not enough trained technicians or special Geiger counters to test all the sets in the Nation. Rather than start a testing program, he said, the Center is working with manufacturers to make sure that all sets now being sold meet minimum standards.

At the same time, he said, the Center is checking leads developed by surveys such as the one taken here.

He advised owners of color TV sets to make sure the high voltage on their sets is no greater than it should be and to sit about ten feet away.

NEWS RELEASE OF NATIONAL CENTER FOR RADIOLOGICAL HEALTH

(NOTE.—The following statement was made today by James G. Terrill, Jr., Director, National Center for Radiological Health, Public Health Service, with respect to issuance of additional data on the survey of 1,124 color television receivers in the Washington area for X-ray emissions.)

Results of the Washington, D.C. Metropolitan area survey of color television receivers were initially made public March 14, 1968, in the report titled "A Survey of X-radiation from Color Television Sets in the Washington, D.C. Metropolitan Area." The report stated that X-radiation was detectable in 268 of 1,124 sets surveyed and that, in 66 of the 268 sets, the observed X-radiation was above the 0.5 milliroentgen per hour limit of the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements.

The National Center for Radiological Health did not include the names of makes and models in the initial report because the survey was not designed to provide clear information on this point for either the receivers or the components. Representatives of various news media subsequently asked for such identification. A consideration of these requests by legal and public information experts resulted in the conclusion that the Center should make such information available as well as other pertinent data even though the survey was not designed with that objective in mind. Accordingly, the raw data on the 1,124 sets, and copies of the data available on the 66 sets are now being made available. This includes data on possible sources of X-radiation; identification of sets by makes, models, and/or distributor/retailer; identification of line voltage and receiver operating high voltage; identification of set components as possible sources of X-radiation by manufacturer.

In view of the request from news media, all of the tabulations are being made available for review. It should be noted that the term "manufacturer" in the table of data may refer to the actual manufacturer or to the distributor. In some cases a distributor may handle sets made by one or more manufacturers. It should also be noted that set components refer to the shunt regulator or high voltage rectifier tubes and the picture tube and that the manufacturer of a component is not necessarily the manufacturer or distributor whose name is associated with the receiver.

It is important to remember that set owners may not assume that a given model or make of color television receiver is or is not an emitter of X-radiation elsewhere in the United States because a similar make or model was or was not found to be emitting X-radiation in the Washington, D.C., area survey. The Washington, D.C., survey was not designed to produce such conclusions. In the case of some makes, the survey included too few sets to make possible a mathematically accurate nationwide extrapolation of the observations made in the survey. Although the Washington, D.C., Metropolitan area survey might possibly be representative of all color television sets in the Washington, D.C., area, the survey cannot be considered as representative of the estimated more than 14 million color television sets in use in the United States.

The sets selected for the Washington area survey were picked for logistic reasons from among sets of Public Health Service employees in the area after the Surgeon General asked PHS employees to volunteer their sets for a survey. On the basis of a relatively small number of sets as compared to the total number, it was possible to reach the relatively limited objective in the survey, which was to determine whether X-radiation from color television sets might be an industry-wide problem. It was determined that this was so on the basis of the Washington area survey.

For a make or brand name survey to be meaningful, the population of sets selected would have to be statistically representative of the entire industry, both in terms of numbers as a portion of all sets in use and geographical distribution. Furthermore, within the total set population the sample of each brand name to be surveyed would have to be sufficiently large to represent the brand adequately, including specific models and types which could be expected to be significantly different from the standpoint of X-radiation production. Other factors that would need to be considered include the interchange of components by the manufacturer, and interchange of components by servicing personnel.

STUDENT UNREST

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the majority of the people of this country, and certainly every Member of this great legislative body, should be disturbed by the pattern of behavior being established by many students in colleges throughout the land.

The action by the student group at Bowie State College over the weekend is tantamount to a strike and goes far beyond the liberty of students to participate in responsible dissent. Unfortunately, this type of thing is becoming a fad. We have now had instances at Bowie, Morgan State, Howard, Virginia State College, Tuskegee, Carolina State College, and Central State College in Ohio. This form of behavior in defiance of not only school authorities, but in defiance of State authorities as well, cannot be, and should not be condoned.

In general, no one argues the point, that taxes should be used for education at all levels, including the institutions of higher learning. We have recognized from the beginning in this country, that education is a public trust. With each generation we have endeavored to improve it, to broaden the opportunities for the individual, and to provide a system in which no one, because of circumstance, is denied the right to pursue his own excellence. But with the right to be educated go certain responsibilities. One of these responsibilities is to accept the discipline of the institution. Discipline itself is as important to the development of character, which is part and parcel of the development of the mind, as is science, the arts, or the universal search for truth.

When we see our universities paralyzed by student revolt, we see in fact, the retrogression of education itself. If the many who seek new horizons in learning are penalized by the few who seek power through rebellion, we have indeed lost some courage. Our institutions which knuckle under to the demands of the radical leadership of militant students have themselves violated the tradition that has led to academic freedom. The courage to expel the rulebreaker who, through revolt and civil disobedience, interferes with the orderly function of a college or university, must be a part of the very existence of the institution itself.

EAST-WEST TRADE IN DEEPFREEZE

Mr. MONAGAN. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, East-West trade has probably been relegated to the deepfreeze by the war in Vietnam, and the hardening of the Russian line and the concurrent flexing of Muscovite muscles.

Perhaps it was inevitable that the cautious advances made by the United States and countries beyond the curtain should have become a casualty of the Southeast Asian war on the grounds that such trade would assist nations who were helping to kill American boys in Vietnam.

Admittedly this is not an easy point to counter and it is one that is full of emotional content.

At the same time, one cannot help but point out that were it not for the war in Vietnam, the provision of trade opportunities in the West would now be of great assistance to the new Czech regime

who wish to relax and liberalize and who find their trade relations with the U.S.S.R. a restraining and constricting influence.

To the extent that the Czechs could find economic connections in the West, it is now clear that they would move in that direction and away from the Russians. To the extent that this is not possible, they will be forced to remain allied with the Russians.

Politically the atmosphere in this country is not favorable for an increase of trade with Eastern Europe. It is not conceivable that legislative action will be taken in this direction, even though Western European countries are moving in this direction.

Nevertheless it is instructive to realize the impetus and stimulus which such trade might provide and to understand the basis of argument of those who advocated such trade on the grounds that it would encourage and support those elements in Communist countries who favored closer relations with the West and whose increased influence would greatly lessen East-West rivalry and accordingly advance the cause of world peace.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE ACT OF 1962—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 295)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Communications Satellite Act of 1962 requires that the President transmit to the Congress an annual report on the activities and accomplishments of the past year.

This is the fifth annual report under this landmark legislation. It reflects, as did the others, steady progress toward the ultimate goal of providing mankind with new capabilities for worldwide communication.

In the brief span of five years, satellite technology has grown dynamically. The possibilities envisioned in 1962 have been greatly exceeded.

Indeed, the rapid tempo of progress in telecommunications has created challenging problems in the proper use and orderly expansion of this vital national resource. Last August 14, in a report to the Congress on our communications policies, I announced the creation of a task force to examine the course we should follow in the future.

We know that we must provide the environment in which telecommunication can play its increasingly crucial role in the affairs of our nation, and provide bridges of understanding among all nations.

The role of communications is not limited to commercial use. It must also provide a "network for knowledge" so that all peoples can share the scientific, educational, and cultural advances of this planet.

Failure to reach these goals can only contribute to apathy, ignorance, poverty and despair in a very large part of the world. Success in our telecommunications policies can be a critical link in our search for the understanding and tolerance from which peace springs.

Communication by satellite is a tool—one of the most promising which mankind has had thus far—to attain this end.

We must use it wisely and well.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 2, 1968.*

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 294)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress the Second Annual Report of the Appalachian Regional Commission, for fiscal year 1967.

This report marks the end of the second year of the Federal-State effort to lift the 18 million people in Appalachia up to economic parity with the rest of America.

The Congress has already expressed its confidence in the program by revising and extending it for another two years. More than $300 million have been obligated for programs which will help the people of Appalachia on their way to self-sufficiency.

The framework of the program is commendable in itself. Federal, State, and local authorities have been working together, recognizing that need does not respect State lines, and poverty does not stop at the boundaries which separate communities.

This report shows proof, I believe, that such a partnership—seeking common solutions to common problems—can work to rebuild a segment of America, to provide its citizens with a chance to share in America's plenty.

Our ultimate goal is to assist Appalachia to attract and hold public and private investments—the cornerstones on which economic well-being is built.

We have not yet achieved that goal, but in two years we have made a strong beginning.

One of our first aims was to unify Appalachia internally—and to make it accessible to the affluent nation outside. Had it remained an enclave of poverty, it would have withered and died.

As the report testifies, we made substantial progress in Fiscal 1967 on the Appalachian Development Highway System.

Highways that today are lines on the planner's map will tomorrow be asphalt bonds to the rest of America. We are providing access to opportunity.

For a region to survive, its people must be healthy, its children educated, and its land productive.

Among the programs approved for construction in Fiscal 1967 were:

—100 facilities for vocational and higher education
—75 for health care
—27 libraries
—37 facilities to combat water pollution
—And 20 projects to restore ravaged mine areas.

On December 28, I signed an executive order which will increase the strength and efficiency of our partnership for regional economic development.

Under this order, the Secretary of Commerce will provide effective liaison between the Federal Government and our six regional commissions.

He will also become the chairman of a Federal Advisory Council on Regional Economic Development. This council will help him coordinate the activities of the Federal Government in the six regions.

By placing this authority in the hands of the Secretary of Commerce, I intend to encourage the private and business resources of our country to take a hand in these regional ventures.

Our work has just begun. I am confident that future reports will justify the faith we have placed in this program.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 2, 1968.*

GONZALEZ URGES INVOLUNTARY LOAN SURCHARGE TO COMBAT INFLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ST. ONGE). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday edition of the Washington Post carried an article by Hobart Rowan under the headline "Businessmen Fearful of Return to New Wage and Price Controls." Mr. Rowan reports that when asked about the prospect for wage and price controls, Arthur M. Okun of the President's Council of Economic Advisers replied:

> I can honestly say that I haven't spent ten minutes on that all of the time I have been in Washington.

Nevertheless, Mr. Rowan reports, businessmen remain very uneasy, in the face of congressional reluctance to pass a tax bill to pay for Vietnam.

I can personally attest to the inability of Congress to acknowledge, or at least to act on, the fact that Vietnam spending has seriously affected our economy. It has greatly restricted the flow of funds to the home construction industry, suggestively known as the "soft underbelly of the economy." I have learned of the general desire to escape from the complications of our Vietnam commitments during my uphill fight to strengthen the Renegotiation Board to deal with the high level of military contract awards and prevent war profiteering.

But even if the 10-percent surtax is quickly approved by Congress, Mr. Rowan notes, Government officials as well as businessmen concede that the

vigorous upward trend of prices and wages cannot be reversed in 1968.

This echoes the remarks of Chairman WILBUR MILLS on February 29 in connection with the Tax Adjustment Act. His comments bear repeating. He quoted administration spokesmen that even with passage of the entire tax package, including the 10-percent surtax, that inflation of at least 3 percent could be expected. Then Chairman MILLS went on to say:

> Then they said that if we did not enact the measure, we could expect a slightly higher figure, although they never said how much. Nobody knows that we would have just 3 percent or some approximation of that figure. Bear this in mind—and this is what I think we overlook completely—we had more inflation than that in the time of World War II and more inflation in the time of the Korean war, when we had price and wage controls. We did everything we could do in those days, and we enacted a tax bill at least every 12 months. But we still had inflation. Nobody can tell you and nobody can tell me that the passage of a tax bill, when we are spending at these levels, and we have a cost-push situation such as we do now, will necessarily reduce the inflationary rate to any appreciable extent.

The 10-percent surtax is designed to offset much of the deficit due to the Vietnam war, thereby improving our balance-of-payments position and also helping combat inflation. However, it has become increasingly evident that inflation would continue to be a danger to the economy.

To further combat inflation, I reiterate my involuntary loan proposal with flexible repayment provisions. I propose a 5- to 10-percent tax surcharge on individual and corporate income. To compensate for the forced nature of these personal loans to the Government, the surcharge could possibly accumulate interest in the same manner as a series E savings bond.

The surcharge would be repayable to the taxpayer within 5 years. But the exact timing of the repayment should be at the discretion of the President, perhaps with the consent of the Congress, and would therefore be an effective fiscal tool to boost the economy when conditions so warrant.

Under this repayable tax plan, the surcharge could be put aside in a trust fund, like that for social security, to be given back to the taxpayer when the inflation danger has passed. The trust fund could be held in the Treasury as an asset to offset the liability. This would safeguard repayment and discourage increased Government spending that might otherwise be prompted by the inflow of funds.

This anti-inflation device proposal has been advocated by several responsible economists; I refer anyone interested to my remarks in the RECORD of September 20 and October 4, 1967.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the involuntary loan surcharge deserves careful consideration as an anti-inflation device.

ANOTHER STEP TOWARD MONETARY REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to applaud the action of the nine major industrial nations in reaching final agreement on an acceptable plan to supplement the world's supply of international liquidity, a plan which I have long advocated and given my strongest support. The refusal of France to go along with the decisions of the remainder of the group of 10 on monetary reform is regrettable; nonetheless, the unanimity displayed by the other nine nations on the structure of the desired international monetary reform bodes well for its ultimate acceptance and efficacy.

The new plan, calling for the deliberate creation of international credit by the International Monetary Fund, constitutes a valuable step by the free world trading nations away from an irrational dependence on arbitrary supplies of gold. Far from reflecting a tendency toward financial irresponsibility, as the French allege, this new credit system will be developed and employed according to the rational discipline of well-managed international monetary policy.

Events have thus far proven the great benefits for international economic progress to be derived from cooperation among national monetary authorities. The results of these joint efforts have been limited, however, by the constricting effect of our reliance on gold. International cooperation within the more flexible framework of the new IMF special drawing rights system of credit creation is bound to have an even more salutary and expansive effect on mutual economic development.

No plan for international monetary reform will relieve the United States of the burden of correcting its own balance-of-payments deficits. However, the acceptance of the IMF plan by the free world nations will allow all nations to develop and trade in a manner dictated by economic needs and forces, not by the restrictions of an obsolete metal standard. It is to be hoped that, as the constructive results of this monetary reform become evident, France will rejoin the community of Western nations in its progress toward a more stable system of international economic relations.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I applaud the actions taken by nine of the Group of 10 nations this weekend in Stockholm, and I look forward to the acceptance of the new monetary reform plan by the entire membership of the International Monetary Fund.

BOSTON NEGRO GROUP GETS $1 MILLION FOR HOUSING

Mr. McCORMACK. 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 Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in Boston recently a noteworthy event took place when the Department of Housing and Urban Development signed a million-dollar housing commitment with an all-Negro business group, headed by Boston Celtics basketball star Tom Sanders, to rehabilitate homes in the Roxbury-Dorchester area. This represented the first time in the Nation that a Negro business group of fine Americans has been involved in an undertaking of this magnitude.

The event was marked by a number of press reports, including articles in the Boston Herald Traveler, the Boston Globe, the Record American, and the Bay State Banner. There were also editorials in the Bay State Banner and the Boston Herald.

In my remarks, I include the articles and editorials that appeared in the above mentioned newspapers.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald Traveler, Mar. 21, 1968]

BOSTON NEGRO GROUP GETS $1 MILLION FOR HOUSING

(By Tom Murray)

A million dollar federal rehabilitation housing commitment in the North Dorchester-Roxbury area was granted to a group of Negro businessmen yesterday—the first such move in the nation.

The Federal Housing Administration granted 40 year mortgages in the move to rehabilitate 83 dwelling units in seven buildings.

The commitment was signed at a press conference yesterday by Massachusetts FHA director John W. Flynn who said no other signature gave him "greater satisfaction." Also at the meeting was Executive FHA Commr. Edwin Callahan.

Callahan said the occasion indicated "Boston is entering a new phase of urban rebirth and renewal."

The group is headed by Boston Celtics basketball star Tom (Satch) Sanders. Members are Samuel L. McCoy, Roxbury realtor and insurance broker; Jack E. Robinson, businessman, 5 Burton Ave., and Lester Clemente, president, Clemente Construction Corp., 227 Roxbury St. The group will be known as Thomas Sanders Associates of 101 Warren St., Roxbury.

In another unique move, four banks will join to provide the construction loans. They are the First National Bank of Boston, the National Shawmut Bank, State Street Bank and Trust Co., and the New England Merchants Bank.

The buildings are located at 25 Nazing St., 60 Seaver St., 11 Brinton St., 102 to 112 Talbot Ave., 312, 562 to 563 and 572–572A Warren St., 48–50 Brunswick St., and 1–3 Intervale St.

The rents will range from $100 monthly for one bedroom apartments; $133 for two bedrooms; $124 for three bedrooms; $129 for four bedrooms and $134 for five bedrooms with all utilities supplied except telephone.

Rehabilitation work is scheduled to begin April 15, with Jan. 15, 1969, as the completion date. McCoy and Robinson own or have options to buy the property, and the rehabilitation will be done by Clemente. Sanders is providing working capital as an investor.

Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates, parent company of Boston Gas Co., is giving some assistance in the beginning stages of the program.

"Our group was organized in response to our belief that the local businessman should participate in the government's housing program for the ghetto areas," Sanders said.

He called the project "an important beginning step" in bringing together community business, big business and the federal mortgage assistance programs in helping to solve the critical housing shortage.

He said present tenants would receive first

preference in renting the renovated apartments. Twelve of the units already have been leased by the Boston Housing Authority.

As many Negro construction workers as possible will be used on the project and it is hoped that they also will be able to begin a training program for unskilled Negro workers.

[From the Boston Herald, Mar. 25, 1968]

EYES ON ROXBURY

There are so many significant aspects to the million-dollar housing rehabilitation program announced Wednesday for the Roxbury-North Dorchester area that it is difficult to single out the most important.

Obviously the improvement of 83 dwelling units will be a step toward meeting the need for better low- and moderate-cost housing in Boston. But the project also stands to provide additional employment that the Negro community must have. The firm undertaking it, Thomas Sanders Associates, is made up of Negro businessmen, and they have pledged to use black labor as much as possible, and to try to incorporate a training program for some who heretofore have been unemployable.

In addition, the project has an encouraging involvement of the private sector. It is under the auspices of the national government, with mortgages guaranteed by the Federal Housing Administration, but four banks are providing construction loans and Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates is assisting in early stages of the program.

Finally, and perhaps most important, the undertaking is unique because of this blending of effort by Negro businessmen, by other representatives of the business community, and by the government. It will be watched from all across the nation. Therefore, the pressure is great on all those concerned to make it a success.

[From the Boston Globe, Mar. 21, 1968]

NEGRO FIRM GRANTED $996,000 TO FIX ROXBURY APARTMENTS

(By Alan Lupo)

An attempt to begin answering one of the American Negro's biggest complaints was made Wednesday in Boston with a $996,000 housing rehabilitation commitment to a new Roxbury business firm.

The complaint, heard not only in Roxbury but in every black ghetto in the nation, is that Federal housing programs are too often carried out by white firms with white labor and that the profits do not remain in the Negro community.

On Wednesday, however, the Dept. of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) awarded a black firm headed by Celtics star Tom Sanders almost $1 million to rehabilitate 83 apartments in the Roxbury-North Dorchester area.

The $996,000 mortgage insurance backs up a 3 percent, 40-year loan to provide low and moderate income housing. The 83 units will be added to some 2700 units now undergoing rehabilitation in the same area. All are sponsored by the Federal Housing Administration office of HUD.

The firm, Thomas Sanders Associates of 1010 Warren st., was organized late last year with the help of Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates, which is participating in some of the other rehabilitation in the area.

Four banks, the First National Bank of Boston, National Shawmut Bank, State Street Bank and Trust and the New England Merchants National Bank, will provide construction loans.

A spokesman for Eastern Gas, which is the parent of the Boston Gas Company, said the company is participating because "it is important to help black businessmen develop the competence in real estate construction and finance that will enable them to take their full place in the economic mainstream of this country.

"Also from a standpoint of enlightened self interest, a utility company cannot stand by while an important segment of its franchise territory deteriorates. We believe it makes business sense to make an effort to supply a significant portion of the fuel requirements of this area."

FROM $100 TO $134

The spokesman said businesses in other cities were watching the new program.

The refurbished apartments will rent from $100 for a one-bedroom unit to $134, including utilities, for five bedrooms.

The Sanders firm said it would try to get a rent supplement program and lease some of the units to the Boston Housing Authority. Both measures would enable low-income families to move into the new apartments.

Construction is scheduled to begin Apr. 15 and to be completed Jan. 15, 1969.

The firm promised to "use as much qualified black labor as possible." One partner, Lester Clemente, president of the Clemente Construction Corp., of 227 Roxbury st., said he hoped to train some hard-core unemployed men.

Spokesmen for both HUD and the Sanders firm said Wednesday they had not surveyed the area and did not know the exact number of persons to be relocated.

"We've visited each tenant involved," said Jack E. Robinson, a realtor and partner in the firm, "and explained it to them."

The Boston Redevelopment Authority will help relocate tenants. Some tenants have suffered hardship under the larger rehabilitation program.

The apartments to be renovated include 31 one-bedroom, 31 two-bedroom, 12 three-bedroom, seven four-bedroom, and two five-bedroom units.

Sanders is providing the working capital as an investor; Robinson and another realtor, Samuel L. McCoy, own or have options to buy the properties, and the Clemente firm will do the renovation.

Sanders called the program a small but significant first step.

McCoy predicted it would "open another door in similarly sponsored ventures throughout the country."

[From the Boston Record American, Mar. 21, 1968]

CELTICS' STAR HEADS PLAN FOR $1 MILLION HOMES RENEWAL

A group of Roxbury businessmen, headed by Boston Celtics' star Thomas "Satch" Sanders, yesterday received a Federal Housing Administration commitment for $1 million to rehabilitate 83 units of housing in seven buildings in the Roxbury-Dorchester area.

Sanders is providing the working capital in the project. His associates, all Roxbury residents, include: Samuel L. McCoy, a realtor; Jack E. Robinson, a businessman, and Lester Clemente, a contractor.

Four Boston banks joined in aiding the financing of the efforts, including the First National, National Shawmut, New England Merchants and State Street Bank and Trust. This is the first time four banks have jointly cooperated in a housing project in Boston.

The buildings to be renovated are located at 25 Nazing st., 60 Seaver st., 11 Brinton st., 102-112 Talbot ave., 562-568 Warren st., 572 Warren st., 48-50 Brunswick st. and 1-3 Intervale st.

Work will start on April 15 and plans call for the project to be finished by Jan. 15, 1969. All present tenants will be given preference in the new apartments. The rehabilitation will consist of new kitchens, plumbing, lighting, heat, windows, floors and walls where necessary, as well as complete outside renovation.

The rents will be $100 a month for a one bedroom apartment, $113 for a two-bedroom apartment, and $124 for three bedrooms. Six of the buildings will be three-story dwellings and one will be a four-story dwelling.

Peter N. Brownstein, assistant secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and it was "gratifying to work with community people "interested in renewing their own neighborhood."

He met with the Sanders group at the J. F. Kennedy Federal Building in Boston.

Sanders, famed Celtics' cornerman and defensive expert, and his group (the Thomas Sanders Associates) was formed "in response to our belief that local businessmen should participate in the government's housing program for ghetto areas. We hope it will be an example that can be used in other cities. When the project is completed, the tenants will be well housed in clean, efficient apartments with thoroughly modern appliances."

The government participation is a "mortgage insurance comitment."

[From the Bay State Banner, Mar. 21, 1968]

BUSINESSMEN GET MILLION TO REHAB HOUSING

BOSTON.—A group of Roxbury Businessmen headed by Thomas E. Sanders, Boston Celtics basketball star, received on Wednesday a Federal Housing Administration commitment of over $1 million to carry out a housing rehabilitation project in the Roxbury-Dorchester area.

This is the first assignment to an all-black business group of federal funds on this scale for housing rehabilitation.

The FHA commitment totals $1,032,000 in guaranteed mortgages to rehabilitate 83 dwelling units in seven buildings which are now in sub-standard condition but which can be renovated and brought up to FHA and local building code standards.

Members of the limited partnership in addition to Sanders, a Roxbury resident, are Samuel L. McCoy, realtor and insurance broker, with offices at 100 Warren Street, Roxbury; Jack E. Robinson, businessman, of 5 Burton Avenue, Roxbury; and Lester Clemente, president of Clemente Construction Corp., 227 Roxbury St., Roxbury.

Sanders is providing the working capital as an investor in the enterprise; Messrs. McCoy and Robinson own or have options to buy the properties to be rehabilitated, and the renovation work will be carried out by the Clemente Construction Corp.

The group was formed in response to the need for developing within the Roxbury community the real estate and construction skills essential to increasing and improving the housing here.

"Roxbury is my home now," said Sanders. "I bought a house here and I plan to stay. This real estate project gives me the opportunity to do something good for my community and it's also a good investment."

Clemente, whose family has been in the construction business for several decades in the Caribbean, stands to ga'n a lot from the project. "This is about the biggest deal I've ever had. It required a bond of a little more than half a million dollars. I'm the first Afro-American in the state to get a bond of this size. Now I can bid on jobs involving up to a $1 million bond."

With this new contract Clemente expects to add another fifteen or twenty men to his crew. If we can maintain business at this high level, we hope to keep the men on and improve somewhat the employment conditions in the area," he said.

"Cooperation" is the major breakthrough of the project, according to Jack Robinson. "Black businessmen have always had the handicap of not associating together. Each wants to be a prima donna and operate alone. Here we have worked together and in six weeks have gained approval of a 221D3 project. This is a record. Normally a project takes 2 years for final approval," Robinson asserted.

Sam McCoy is regarded as the elder statesman of the group. He has been in the real

estate and insurance business in Roxbury since 1953. His father opened the insurance business in Boston in 1907. "This is the biggest deal I've been a part of and it is an encouraging breakthrough. We hope that our success will make it easier for the younger fellows to get ahead.

Assistance in the initial stages has been provided by Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates, Boston, which is participating in an earlier rehabilitation program now underway. Counsel for the group is provided by the firm and Tucker.

The Sanders group expects to start rehabilitation work by April 15 and to complete the last unit by January 15, 1969. Work will start on vacant apartments in the buildings. Tenants of the occupied apartments have been notified of the work to be done and will be given preference as tenants for the rehabilitated apartments. The apartments will get new kitchens, new plumbing, lighting, heating, windows, floors, and walls as necessary, as well as exterior renovation.

Construction loans for the Sanders project will be provided by four Boston banks—the National Shawmut Bank, the First National Bank, N.E. Merchants National Bank, and State Street Bank and Trust Company. This is the first time that these four banks have joined together to finance a real estate project.

[From the Bay State Banner, Mar. 21, 1968]

THE NEW PIONEERS

A group of Roxbury businessmen have taken the initiative to associate together and rehabilitate housing units in the ghetto.

For Thomas Sanders it is his first real estate venture. For Lester Clemente, the contractor, it is the largest single project of his career. For Jack Robinson and Sam McCoy, real estate operators, it is by far their largest business deal.

With the assistance of Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates, and with the cooperation of Boston's four largest banks, National Shawmut, State Street Bank & Trust, New England Merchants and First National, the entrepreneurs were able to obtain a $1 million FHA-insured mortgage. Though never associated in any project before, they were able to come together, form a limited partnership, and obtain approval of the mortgage and the loan money in the record time of 6 weeks.

Much hard work lies ahead for these men. They are pioneers, crucial to the development of a productive community. The Banner salutes their efforts.

EDWARD D. RE, AN EXCELLENT JOHNSON CHOICE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, in 1961, soon after his appointment by President Kennedy as Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, there appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several articles praising the selection under remarks, entitled "Prof. Edward D. Re, an Excellent Kennedy Choice." Those of us who have followed Dr. Re's career with interest and admiration were delighted by President Johnson's recent appointment of Dr. Re to become Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs.

News of the appointment on January 12, 1968, has prompted a stream of articles which have appeared in leading publications from New York to Rome. All have congratulated President Johnson for recognizing the eminent qualifications of a dedicated member of his administration to serve his country in a new and important post.

Dr. Re is a widely known scholar and writer in American jurisprudence, and has written several authoritative textbooks used in leading law schools of the country. He has published many articles on law, diplomacy and legal education. Only recently, he addressed the American Council on Education on the subject of "Public Service and Higher Education."

Members of Congress are especially aware of his outstanding administration of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. During the 7 years he served as Chairman, the Commission commenced and completed the largest claims program of its history—the general war claims program—which resulted in awards of $340,000,000. During his chairmanship the Commission also adjudicated thousands of nationalization claims involving Czechoslovakia, Poland, Red China, Cuba, and Yugoslavia, and administered special programs involving Canada and the Philippines.

Both President Kennedy and President Johnson recognized the competence and administrative abilities of Dr. Re by reappointing him as Chairman of the Commission for 3-year terms in 1963 and 1966, respectively. As Assistant Secretary of State, Dr. Re will be responsible for the educational and cultural programs administered by the Department of State, including the Fulbright Scholarships and U.S. Government activities relating to UNESCO.

President Johnson's selection of Dr. Re to head the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State is also "an excellent choice." A summa cum laude graduate of St. John's Law School in New York, he had been a professor at the law school for 14 years before coming to Washington in 1961. Awarded a doctoral degree in juridical science from New York University in 1950, he has also served as a member of the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York since 1958. The board has jurisdiction over the 16 colleges which comprise the University of the City of New York. Having served in the Air Force from 1943–47, he is currently a colonel in the Judge Advocate General's Department of the USAF Reserve. Recently he completed two terms as chairman of the section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association.

In a major news story, Il Tempo, a leading newspaper in Italy, observed that the appointment "conferred prestige on the entire community of Americans of Italian heritage." Italian-American newspapers and other publications in this country have hailed Dr. Re's appointment as another example of the equal opportunities afforded all who live in our American democracy.

Perhaps the article that best catches the spirit of the appointment is one which appeared in the Tablet, the Catholic weekly in the Diocese of Brooklyn where Dr. Re resides. The articles, under the byline E. H. Wall, and entitled "From the Bottom to the Top," follows:

FROM THE BOTTOM TO THE TOP

(By E. H. Wall)

The nomination by President Lyndon Johnson of Dr. Edward D. Re to be Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs is a splendid example of truly discerning executive statesmanship.

We are grateful to the President for securing for the nation the services in this demanding post of so eminently well-qualified a scholar, teacher, jurist, and civil servant as Dr. Re. Rarely, indeed, have the demands of a position and the qualifications of the nominee been so well matched.

We are also grateful to President Johnson for the honor that he does Brooklyn by this appointment. Dr. Re has long been one of the truly outstanding laymen of this Diocese. He is one of us, and when he is thus honored by the President, we too feel a natural pride because he is one of us.

This is the second time that Dr. Re has been honored by a President of the United States with an appointment to a position of national importance. The late President Kennedy thought so highly of Dr. Re's abilities that he called him from his post as professor of law at St. John's University and asked him to come to Washington to serve as chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. From this position with its demand of extraordinary juridical knowledge, President Johnson has now called Dr. Re to a post in which his broad, rich cultural and educational background can be placed in the service of the nation.

Surely, then, this is an occasion for gladness. Surely too, however, it is also an occasion for serious contemplation of what we might call "The Promise of America."

Dr. Re, you see, was not born to wealth and high position. He came to these shores from Italy in 1928 as a young, immigrant boy. By dint of hard work, intensive study, and unflagging courage he rose to become one of the most noted jurists of our day, an internationally renowned scholar, and a civic leader and public official whose record has been consistently acclaimed and honored.

America offers a promise to every man, but it lies behind a locked door. To open that door, each man must find within himself the metal to forge the key to success. It is an alloy of rare human qualities; hard work, study, courage, integrity, a willingness to give of oneself without asking "What's in it for me?"

Dr. Re has shown these qualities in lustrous brilliance. As a member of the Board of Higher Education, his tenacious refusal to compromise with principle has testified to his total integrity. His willingness to give of himself—whether it was to the service of the Air Force, of the Department of Justice or of the State Attorney General's Office—has been amply demonstrated.

Surely, this man is a model for all our young people: An immigrant boy who rose to become an Assistant Secretary of State because he carried the key to America's Promise within him.

BANKERS BONUS BILL WOULD COST TAXPAYERS MILLIONS OF DOLLARS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, this morning the chairman of the House

Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], testified before the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Welfare on S. 3098, the Higher Education Act of 1968. Basically, this legislation is designed to provide loans to students to complete their higher education and, as such, the bill is an extremely worthwhile proposition.

However, there is one "trick" section of the bill that would pay a huge bonus to commercial banks because they have made profitbearing loans to students.

This section of the bill would pay financial institutions up to $35 for each loan that they make and include a retroactive feature on the payments to June of 1967. Several weeks ago, Chairman PATMAN testified on the House version of the Senate legislation and pointed out that at that time, these bankers' bonuses amounted to more than $13 million. In today's testimony, Chairman PATMAN pointed out that the payments have now increased to nearly $15 million and continue to grow.

One of the most recurring themes during the 89th Congress, has been that of cutting Government spending. Hundreds of speeches have been given on the floor of this House on that subject. Yet, at the same time Government spending is being lambasted, there is legislation before this Congress that would provide a multi-million-dollar bankers' bonus. I do not feel that we can sit by and criticize Government spending if at the same time we allow this bankers' bonus bill to be enacted.

The student guarantee loan program under the Higher Education Act is well on its way to reaching the goals that were set for it. As Chairman PATMAN pointed out this morning, more loans have been made during the first half of the current fiscal year than were made during the entire last fiscal year. And, during the next fiscal year, it is estimated that some three-quarters of a million loans will be made. All of these impressive figures have been achieved without the aid of bankers' bonus provision.

Chairman PATMAN is to be commended for bringing this bankers' bonus situation to the attention of Congress and I sincerely hope that when this legislation is brought to the floor, the bankers' bonus provision will not be included in an otherwise extremely worthwhile measure.

I am including in my remarks a copy of Chairman PATMAN's testimony before the Senate Committee on Education so that all Members can fully acquaint themselves with the bankers' bonus plan:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT PATMAN BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE ON S. 3098, U.S. SENATE, APRIL 2, 1968

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate the honor and privilege of appearing before you to discuss S. 3098, the Higher Education Act of 1968.

Since your Subcommittee is made up of experts on educational legislation and has a far vaster knowledge of what is needed in educational fields than I do, I would like to limit my testimony this morning solely to the question of the placement fee payments of the guarantee student loan program contained in S. 3098.

Last August when the House had the Amendments to the Higher Education Act under consideration, there was a great deal of pressure to quickly enact the conversion fee section into law. It was suggested by witnesses that unless the conversion fee section was immediately put into effect and even made retroactive to July 1, the whole student loan program would fold and thousands of college students would not be able to return to school. This was only a baseless emotional appeal and the dire consequences predicted by those who were crying "wolf" never happened. Not only did the student guarantee loan program not fold but rather it prospered and now shows every sign of reaching the heights originally predicted for the venture.

During the last fiscal year, ending June 30, there were 328,943 loans made under the program. As of February 29, 1968, the current fiscal year, there were 404,469 loans made. Thus, in only a little more than one-half year, the program has passed its entire output during the previous year and there are indications that in the current fiscal year beginning June 30, 1968, 750,000 loans will be made. Thus, it can easily be seen by even the most casual observer that the program is not on its last legs but rather is doing a brisk business. The gains, of course, have been made without the necessity of paying bonuses in the form of conversion fees to financial institutions.

I feel that one of the problems of the program in its formative stage was that it was being judged solely on the basis of how many loans were made as compared to the number of loans that had been predicted would be made. It was said that the program was in trouble solely because it had not reached the number of projected loans. Even so, by June of 1967, the program was operating at slightly more than 60 percent of its projected level.

But projections, unfortunately, are not totally reliable, particularly when a new program is born. If newspaper stories had reported that by the end of June 1967, more than 357,000 loans had been made to college students under the student guarantee loan program, this fact would have been widely hailed. It would have been pointed out that more than one-third of a million students were being helped and that the program was doing a wonderful job. But instead, the program had a projected figure of more than one-half a million loans hanging over its head and the only way it could be credited with doing an outstanding job was to exceed the projected figure.

I feel that the student loan program has performed an excellent service from the very beginning and its record of achievement is constantly increasing. Perhaps the projection was unrealistic or not enough information was plugged into the decisions that lead to the projection or, perhaps, as is too often the case, there were too many variables.

New programs must experience growing periods. There has to be adequate time for the word about the program to reach all corners of our country and for students and their parents not only to become acquainted with the program, but to have faith in it. I feel that the experience during this fiscal year shows that the program is now ready to stand on its own two feet.

From the beginning, I have felt strongly that the placement fee, whether it be $35 or $25 or whatever the figure, should not be allowed. I feel even more strongly at this time that the conversion fee feature of the legislation should not be adopted.

First, let us look at the amount of money it would cost the government if the conversion fee were adopted. If, as predicted, there are 750,000 loans made during the next fiscal year and a $35 conversion fee is enacted, it would mean that the cost of paying the conversion fee on that amount of loans would be more than $26 million. And, if the government were also required to pay 6 percent interest on each of these loans, it would mean an additional $56 million outlay. But since the 6 percent interest would be paid whether or not the conversion fee is adopted, let us drop that figure and consider only the conversion fee payments amounting to $26 million. If, for example, we take an average one-year college loan as being $1,000, we could send 26,000 deserving students to college for one year, instead of handing the money to the banks.

If the government set up its own loan revolving fund, it would save the 6 percent a year, plus the conversion fee payment or a total of $82 million. Of course, the cost of obtaining the lending funds would have to be deducted from that amount but there would still be a multi-million dollar savings.

If instead of operating the student loan program as a basis for further subsidizing the banks, the government set up its own loan fund, the savings obtained by not paying the bank subsidies each year would equal the initial loan fund investment in ten years. Eventually, the repayments into the fund would make the program virtually self-sustaining on a monetary basis.

Of course, it would require additional funding to get the program in operation. To accomplish this, one alternative might be a new type of government bond to be issued and sold directly to the public as savings bonds are now sold. The sale of these bonds would be a one or two time affair at the most, since once the program had adequate initial funds, it could operate on a revolving basis. These bonds would carry a yield slightly in excess of existing savings bonds, but would have longer maturities so that they would not compete with savings bonds. In addition, the bonds which we, perhaps, could call U.S. Educational Bonds, would be sold only to individuals who hold a specified number of savings bonds. Thus, the educational bond not only would not compete with our regular savings bond program, but, in effect, would stimulate the sales of the savings bond. Under such an arrangement, the student lending program would not require an appropriation and as the program progresses, I believe that the 6 percent interest rate could be reduced because of the revolving fund nature of the setup. And, because defaults on student loans are so small, less than 1 percent I believe, there would be little chance of money being lost in the program. Based on this, I feel that a direct government lending program would be far more in the public interest than the bank subsidy program being recommended by the American Bankers Association and Under Secretary of the Treasury Barr.

One of the great disappointments of this program to me has been the role played by Under Secretary of the Treasury Barr. He has joined the American Bankers Association in the fight to gain the $35 placement fee. The American Bankers Association is, indeed, fortunate in having such an outstanding individual as Mr. Barr helping, whether intended or not, in its lobbying campaign. But, I am afraid that Mr. Barr is doing a great disservice to our country, to millions of college students, and to thousands of banks across the country.

During Mr. Barr's appearance before the House Special Subcommittee on Education in mid-February, it was pointed out by Congressman Hathaway that he had been told by a number of banks in his district that they did not want the extra money but felt that the guaranteed loans should be made as part of the bank's public service program. I have experienced a similar situation in that a number of bankers have written to me expressing opposition to the placement fee payments. These bankers have pointed out

that they would rather see a cutback in the amount of paper work connected with the loans rather than an increase in the fees paid to the banks. Almost every one of the letters I have received in this regard has touched on the belief that the college loans should be made on a public service basis.

Why then is the American Bankers Association and Under Secretary of the Treasury Barr fighting so hard for the extra payments, if, in general, banks do not want the money? Perhaps the answer is contained in the February 23rd issue of the American Banker. In discussing the possibilities of the placement fee's adoption, the paper, in part, reports:

"It also made some American Bankers Association staff members nervous because some banks were enticed into the program with the expectation that the loan fee would be approved by Congress . . ."

Although there is no mention of who the American Bankers Association staff members might be, I am sure the article refers to the bank lobby's hired Ebenezer Scrooge, Dr. Charls Walker, who last summer, told bankers to start making the college loans because the $35 placement fee would be retroactive to July 1, 1967.

Of course Dr. Walker had no basis for such a statement and he later admitted that he had, indeed, crawled out on a limb in making the statement. It would appear now that Mr. Barr is leading the effort to get Dr. Walker off the limb before it is sawed out from under him. Certainly such a motive should not be the driving force behind any type of legislation, particularly if it affects the future of thousands or even millions of college students.

But there is, perhaps, a hidden reason why Dr. Walker and Mr. Barr are fighting so hard for the placement and conversion fee section of this legislation. Section 426 of the legislation provides that the payment of the $35 fee shall be retroactive to June 1, 1967. At first blush, this language seems fairly innocuous but upon closer study, it develops that this section of the bill is a hidden bankers' bonus that will cost the taxpayers, in addition to other charges, nearly $15 million in placement fees.

A check with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reveals that from June 1, 1967 through the end of February 1968, there were 427,848 loans made that would be eligible for the $35 placement fee if this legislation were passed. That means that the taxpayers are going to have to come up with $14,974,680 to hand over to the banks. And, additional money will have to be obtained to pay the banks for the loans they have made from the end of February 1968 until the bill is enacted.

In light of this hidden bonus I think it is clear why the American Bankers Association is pushing so hard for the legislation.

I sincerely wonder, in view of the needs of our boys in Vietnam, if we can justify turning nearly $15 million over to the banks.

The American Bankers Association is one of the local leaders seeking cuts in government spending but while the American Bankers Association wants other areas of government spending reduced, they want to make certain that nothing is done to touch the bank subsidies and that every effort is made to see that new subsidies are uncovered for the banks.

The action by the American Bankers Association and Dr. Walker, in advising member banks to make college loans because the fee would be retroactive, is not only a bold attempt by the bankers to run Congress, but at the same time completely negates an attempt to assess the early effectiveness of the guaranteed loan program. Because Dr. Walker has preempted the rights of Congress, we do not know whether or not the 6 percent rate is enough to attract money into the program or whether banks are making the loans solely because Dr. Walker has promised them that he would lobby the $35 placement fee through Congress. Thus, Dr. Walker's bold statement has completely ruined an attempt to gauge the effectiveness of this program and is a shocking display of how the banker's lobby will place their own fortunes ahead of the needs of the people of this country.

A great deal has been said regarding the cost to the banks in making these student loans. Secretary Barr and Dr. Walker have presented figures that purport to show the cost to the banks. Both Dr. Walker and Secretary Barr, in obtaining their figures, completely ignored the fact that banks obtain roughly one-half of their funds at no cost, as in the form of demand deposits. Nor does Dr. Walker or Secretary Barr mention the millions of dollars that banks receive every year interest free in the form of Federal, State and local government deposits. Nor do they mention any of the other subsidies that banks receive.

Recently, the General Accounting Office completed a study concerning the bank profit margin on the student loans. The General Accounting Office, which has no ax to grind nor any members to pacify, reported that rather than losing money on the loans, as contended by Dr. Walker and Mr. Barr, banks were making a tidy profit on these loans. Of course, the ABA contends that the GAO figures are naive and unrealistic, but after seeing Dr. Walker's performance in the student loan matter, perhaps it is he that is unrealistic. I think this Subcommittee would be interested in hearing from the GAO auditors who examined the American Bankers Association's figures. Dr. Walker would have you believe that the ABA's figures were obtained through a carefully conducted study of member banks. However, when the GAO auditors interviewed ABA officials, they found out that the figures for the study were obtained in a slipshod manner consisting mainly of quick phone calls to a few banks. The GAO investigators said they had a great deal of difficulty obtaining any worthwhile information from the ABA.

I was highly interested in the rebuttal of my statement that Dr. Walker has filed with your committee. I think it is extremely interesting to note that out of a 10-page statement, Dr. Walker attempts to rebut only one small point and tries to accomplish that rebuttal through the typical ABA tactic of sleight of hand semantics. Not once does Dr. Walker deny that the banks will receive a huge windfall from passage of this legislation. Nor does he deny that he is on the hook with his members for advising them to make the loans because a retroactive feature would be contained in the legislation. Not only does Dr. Walker fail to support his position with his rebuttal, but he also shows that while he is employed by the banking industry, his knowledge of banking is faulty. He contends, for instance, that banks can make more money on business loans than they can on installment loans. In short, Dr. Walker is saying that a bank can make more money by making a business loan at 6 percent simple interest than it can at making an installment loan at 12 percent. And, of course, a business loan is normally a term affair with no principal payments made until the end of the loan. On an installment loan, the principal is being partially repaid each month so that the bank's exposure is not as great as it would be on term loan.

Also, I cannot understand if banks are making loans that are classified as costing the banks more, why the profit picture of the banks does not reflect these losses. In 1966, bank earnings topped the three billion dollar mark for the first time in history and indications are that in 1967, bank profits increased by 8 percent over the previous year. Perhaps Dr. Walker or Mr. Barr would be willing to explain to your Subcommittee why bank profits have soared if they are making so many loss loans.

Mr. Barr's lack of candor is in keeping with the philosophy of some Treasury officials.

During the 89th Congress, the Banking and Currency Committee attempted to obtain some information from the Treasury Department concerning interest rates on various types of debt and savings instruments. It was information the Treasury was reluctant to supply. After much delay, the Committee was finally given what appeared to be the requested information. By mistake, however, the persons submitting the information had overprinted an inter-office memo onto the Committee's copy that clearly was not meant for our eyes. The inter-office memo read:

"Attached is a review of developments in the certificates of deposit market which may temporarily answer the question raised by the Patman Committee as to the influence of certificates of deposit on our Treasury bill rates. As you note, we have purposefully not answered the question except in a very indirect way."

It would appear the Treasury is continuing its indirect answering methods in its testimony before this Subcommittee.

I am certain you will recall last summer that Dr. Walker and Mr. Barr testified in the House that the banks were losing money on student loans and a rather loose set of figures that purportedly justified the American Bankers Association's position was presented to the Committee. I suggested that these figures were perhaps not on the up-and-up but rather were obtained to prove a specific point rather than to lay the full truth before your Committee. According to my calculations at the time, the banks were not losing money as claimed by the American Bankers Association but rather were making money on these loans. I am, indeed, gratified that the General Accounting Office study strongly questions the accuracy of the American Bankers Association's figures and makes it clear that the banks are making a tidy profit on these loans.

In closing, let me point out that Commissioner on Education, Harold Howe, has suggested that consideration should be given to using pension funds as a student loan pool. I personally favor such an idea and feel that if these funds were offered an earning asset of 5 percent a year, they would jump at the opportunity to provide money for the loans. Or as an alternative, as I suggested earlier, consideration should be given to an educational bond that could be sold to the general public with an attractive interest rate. These bonds could carry a longer maturity so that they would not compete with savings bonds. Not only would this make millions, if not billions, of dollars available for student loans, but would greatly aid this country's banking industry so that it would not have to continue making loss loans.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that when your Committee has worked its final will on this legislation that it will drop the placement fee section and give the student loan program an opportunity to function in an atmosphere free of panic button pushers. In short, the program is just beginning to reach its potential. Let us not take any hasty action while this program is in a period of forward movement. We need a much stronger experience factor before making any drastic alterations.

In closing, I would like to point out that if the placement fee of $35 is adopted, and a year or six months from now the American Bankers Association decides that it is not enough money for its banks, it will be a simple task for that Association to instruct its members not to make additional loans until the fee is raised. Then we can look for Dr. Walker to put on his mask and strap on his gun and hold up Congress again in the name of higher education. Can we afford to treat our students in this manner?

Thank you very much.

ALTON AREA FINANCES OWN BEAUTIFICATION PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a truly remarkable community improvement organization known as Pride, Inc., has been developed in the Alton Lake area of Madison County, Ill. Led by Alton physician Dr. Gordon F. Moore, and armed with an eight-point beautification program, Pride is seeking to stimulate beautification efforts in 16 communities, and is focusing in particular on reviving the memorial area dedicated to the free press martyr, Elijah Parrish Lovejoy, who died a brutal death at the hands of a mob because he would not be intimidated from his courageous anti-slavery stand.

It was my pleasure to meet recently with officers and members of the board of directors of the 1-year-old organization. Because I was so impressed by their dedication and sincerity, I want to share with my colleagues the following brief outline about Pride:

PRIDE, INCORPORATED, OF ALTON, ILL.—PEOPLE WORKING FOR THEMSELVES TO HELP THEIR COMMUNITIES IN BEAUTIFICATION

Community improvement through the involvement of its citizens, businesses, industries, clubs, organizations and the communities to work together in making the Alton Lake Area in Illinois a nicer place in which to live and work is the positive approach of Pride, Incorporated. Pride, a non-profit organization dedicated to beautification, came about after several imaginative people realized that our problem of helter-skelter development and untidy habits have been the product of many years of neglect. Pride raises its own funds and does not use tax money.

With this idea in mind, the thinking and actions have now turned toward the positive approach to the improvement of the Pride area. This area includes the communities of Grafton, Elsah, Godfrey, Alton, Brighton, Fosterburg, East Alton, Cottage Hills, Bethalto, Moro, Wood River, Roxana, Rosewood Heights, South Roxana, Hartford and Edwardsville.

Although Pride has been in operation a little over a year, its main eight-point program of beautification stimulation in this area has received outstanding acceptance and the impact continues to grow each day.

The eight-point program approach to aid in the beautification of this area includes:

Home Owners and Renters—the mobilization of every block in the sixteen Pride communities into a block captain system which stresses the message of keeping homes and yards in neat, attractive condition. This includes the giving of Home Beautification Awards to those who have done good jobs on their property.

Commerce and Industry—to encourage the businesses and industries of the Pride area to develop beautification plans around their property to help improve their environment.

Education—to motivate and encourage the school children into becoming more alert against the reckless littering of the school yards and public thoroughfares and to participate in special beautification programs geared to them.

Great River Road—to preserve and protect the natural beauty of this 13-mile stretch of road from the city limits of Alton to Grafton and also to encourage beautification by various industries, businesses and institutions along the way.

Highway Beautification—to stimulate the State of Illinois Highway Department to beautify existing highways and to mobilize private resources to aid in the beautification of highways between our communities.

Lovejoy Area.—Citizens and newspapermen are reviving the memory of Elijah Parrish Lovejoy, America's martyr to freedom of the press, with a campaign to establish an International Journalism Hall of Fame here in Alton at his grave.

Lovejoy's murder at the hands of a mob in Alton November 7, 1837, was protested because of his courageous stand against slavery in his newspaper, the Alton Observer. His fourth printing press was smashed to pieces and thrown in the nearby Mississippi River by the mob. The body of the free press martyr was carried out of the warehouse where Lovejoy was mobbed and shot, and buried by his friends under a roadway in a secret spot.

In 1864, Lovejoy was reinterred in Alton City Cemetery with a simple scroll marking the site. In 1897, the State of Illinois and people of Alton erected a 90-foot tall monument to his memory. The Lovejoy Memorial Association of Alton kept the memory alive with scholarships and annual pilgrimages to the gravesite. Classes of school children visited the grave.

But gradually the community and state let the Lovejoy site fade from prominence. Weeds began to grow around the monument entrance and the fence sagged. Monument Street, the main tourist entrance leading upward to the monument on a hilltop, grew wild with trees, hiding the site.

Supported by Pride, Incorporated, the Alton area's new beautification action organization, the city, citizens and newspapermen are reviving the spirit of Lovejoy with the promotion of a facelifting in the monument neighborhood and cemetery. Short-term projects include refurbishing and lighting. The long-range goal of the citizen-newspapermen's project is an International Journalism Hall of Fame.

Service Organizations—To encourage and enlist the support of the various service organizations in our communities in developing beautification plans for public grounds in our respective communities in order to improve the appearance of their communities.

Alton Lake—to encourage, through an educational program, the discouraging of the litter of the water by the users of the lake. The Alton Lake, a 26-mile long body of water, was created by the building of Lock and Dam #26 across the Mississippi River at Alton. This lake, which is also the Mississippi River, is one of the most heavily used bodies of water in use today. The program is developed to work with the thousands of boat owners and many marinas in attacking the problem of littering of public waterways.

These are the main programs of Pride but there are many more now in operation that are doing a great deal in stimulating the people of the area into an allout positive approach to beautification and the improvement of our environment.

U.S. MILITARY CREDIT UNIONS IN GERMANY CONTINUE FANTASTIC GROWTH

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, each month for the past several months I have addressed the House concerning the operation of U.S. military credit unions in the Republic of West Germany.

These credit unions, which were set up to provide U.S. military personnel with a low cost, highly reliable source of credit, have been met with great enthusiasm by our troops in Germany and as each of the six credit unions scattered throughout Europe opens its doors, it achieves almost instantaneous success.

Every Member of the House of Representatives can take pride in the outstanding job that is being done by these credit unions, particularly the members of the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, both of which I am privileged to chair.

It was much through the work of the members of the Domestic Finance Subcommittee that these credit unions were established. The members of the subcommittee are: JOSEPH G. MINISH, Democrat, of New Jersey; RICHARD T. HANNA, Democrat, of California; TOM S. GETTYS, Democrat, of South Carolina; FRANK ANNUNZIO, Democrat, of Illinois; THOMAS M. REES, Democrat, of California; NICK GALIFIANAKIS, Democrat, of North Carolina; WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey; W. E. (BILL) BROCK, Republican, of Tennessee; J. WILLIAM STANTON, Republican, of Ohio; SHERMAN P. LLOYD, Republican, of Utah; BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN, Republican, of Georgia.

I am including in my remarks the latest report on the operation of the U.S. credit unions in Germany. I am particularly pleased with the excellent job that these credit unions are doing in being of financial assistance to our lower grade enlisted men. These men have long been without adequate sources of credit but now that problem is being solved by the credit unions.

DEFENSE CREDIT UNION COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1968.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The following progress report concerning the operation of credit union sub-offices in Germany is submitted for your information.

Ft. Belvoir Federal Credit Union located at Fort Belvoir, Virginia opened its sub-office at Wurzburg, Germany on 1 February. During the month of February 1968 this credit union signed 119 members and disbursed 92 loans. The amount of loans outstanding as of February 29 was $46,306.49. Shares equaled $5,455.54.

Andrews Federal Credit Union located at Andrews Air Force Base, Washington, D.C., did not begin operations until 11 March 1968. A report concerning their operations will not be available until April.

Pease AFB Federal Credit Union located at Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire began operations at Ramstein, Germany, on 15 January 1968. During the month of February this credit union acquired 762 new members and loaned $402,447.92.

To date this suboffice has signed up 1,230 members, loaned $546,265.31. Share deposits to date total $84,613.54. Loans were made to pay grades as follows:

E–2	2
E–3	97
E–4	206
E–5	128
E–6	73
E–7	18
E–8	1
E–9	4
O–1	8
O–2	10
O–3	9
O–4	4
O–5	6

Finance Center Federal Credit Union located at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana began operations at Furth, Germany on 15 February. During the month of February this sub-office acquired 68 new members and loaned $24,929.90. Shares amounted to $2,471.75. Loans were made to pay grades as follows:

E–4	6
E–5	11
E–6	6
E–7	1
O–1	4
O–2	1
O–4	1
W–1	1
GS–5	1
GS–12	1

Lackland Federal Credit Union located at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas began operations in West Berlin, Germany on 26 December. During the month of February this sub-office acquired 157 new members and loaned $102,484.00. Shares totaled $17,227.81. Accumulative loans in this sub-office to date amount to $205,491.37 and share deposits amount to $26,059.62. Loans were made to pay grades as follows:

E–3	11
E–4	22
E–5	50
E–6	36
E–7	8
E–8	1
W–O	1
O–1	3
O–2	2
O–3	1
GS–12	1

Redstone Federal Credit Union located at Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, began operations on 15 February. During the month of February this sub-office acquired 120 new members, loaned $41,554.04 and received share deposits in the amount of $9,508.23. Loans were made to pay grades as follows:

E–3	2
E–4	18
E–5	26
E–6	14
E–7	12
E–8	8
O–1	8
O–2	2
O–3	2
O–4	2

As of 29 February the sub-offices in Germany have loaned $864,547.11 and have received share deposits in the amount of $128,108.68. Loans made in the month of February totaled $617,722.35.

Respectfully,

EVERT S. THOMAS, Jr.,
Brigadier General, U.S.A., (Ret.), Executive Secretary.

INCOME AND ASSETS OF TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS SOAR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently transmitted to Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Small Business Committee the sixth installment of the impact of tax-exempt foundations and charitable trusts on the Nation's economy.

This report covers, among other things, the receipts and disbursements of 596 foundations during the 2-year period, 1965 through 1966, as well as their assets, accumulation of income, liabilities, and net worth at the close of 1966. Our earlier studies deal with the years 1951–64.

In 1965 and 1966, the total receipts of the 596 foundations were $1.4 billion and $1.3 billion respectively, which as a measure of growth compares significantly to the total receipts of $559.7 million recorded by the foundations during the first accounting period for which they submitted data to the subcommittee—usually 1951.

The assets of the 596 foundations were valued at $15.1 billion at the close of 1966 compared with $10.2 billion at the end of 1960, a 50-percent increase in 6 years.

A thought-provoking editorial on this subject which appeared in the Washington Post of March 29, 1968, follows:

TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

Rep. Wright Patman, the most indefatigable of the populist gadflies on Capitol Hill, isn't likely to go far with his recommendation that the larger tax-exempt foundations turn over their annual income, now estimated at $1.3 billion, to the Treasury for the duration of the Vietnam War. But to write off a policy proposal as implausible is not to deny that Mr. Patman and the Small Business Subcommittee staff pointed up some very real problems in their sixth report on the economic impact of tax-exempt foundations.

Two of the arguments against self-perpetuating, tax-exempt foundations are perfectly straightforward, touching upon questions of equity and competition. Foundations permit the avoidance or deferral of income and estate taxes, and in some instances become "the playthings of rich men" rather than vehicles of philanthropy. Foundations are also used to circumvent the antitrust laws by permitting family or other interest groups to hold controlling interests in a number of corporate enterprises. As a consequence of the foregoing abuses, the morale of ordinary taxpayers, those not sheltered by foundations, is undermined and competition is weakened.

The abuses uncovered by Mr. Patman's staff are widely condemned, but a totally uncritical view is taken of the large, tax-exempt foundations that are engaged in genuine philanthropy. When their resources are used to finance medical and other research in the physical sciences, there can be few quarrels about the wisdom of exempting them from taxation. But problems arise when the tax-exempt incomes are used to finance research and other activities that impinge upon issues of current public policy. If the foundation is "liberal" in orientation, "conservatives" are in effect being taxed, compelled to pay more taxes than they otherwise would in order to finance the dissemination of ideas they abhor. A similarly unfair tax is leveled on the liberal who supports the conservative foundation. Problems are also created when pressures are exerted by foundations that make grants to universities, the principal thrust of which appears to be a denial of support for ideas or doctrines that are not in the mainstream of what is deemed proper by the conventional standards of the ruling establishments.

In 1960, the 596 foundations investigated by the Small Business Subcommittee valued their assets at $10.2 billion, in 1966 at $15.1 billion. That is a large aggregation of wealth, and wealth is power. If Congress continues to confer the privilege of tax exemption, it should subject the foundations to far greater scrutiny.

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL SHOULD BE APPROVED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include my statements before the Committee on Rules on March 28 and April 2, urging approval of House Resolution 1100 so that the Members of the House may approve the pending civil rights bill, H.R. 2516, as amended by the Senate. My statements follow:

REMARKS OF HON. EMANUEL CELLER ON MARCH 28, 1968, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. Chairman, I appear this morning to urge the Committee on Rules to report favorably House Resolution 1100 so that the House may work its will and adopt H.R. 2516, together with the Senate amendment thereto.

The House approved the bill, H.R. 2516, on August 16 of last year. The bill adopted and sent to the Senate specified certain kinds of rights to be protected by Federal law and provided criminal penalties for the forcible interference with the exercise of those rights. The Committee will recall that the bill was overwhelmingly approved by a vote of 326 yeas to 93 nays.

In the Senate, H.R. 2516 was considered in public hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee and was reported favorably to the Senate floor on November 7, 1967. It was the subject of seven weeks of extensive debate in the other body and was amended by the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute which contained many provisions not contained in the bill which the House adopted. In my statement this morning, I wish to outline in general terms the meaning and intent of the Senate amendment in order to promote an understanding of this Committee and to help assure prompt and favorable action.

Before turning to the bill, however, I believe the words of President Johnson two years ago describing the challenge which we confront are more pertinent today. The President said:

"The task is to give 20 million Negroes the same chance as every other American to learn and grow, to work and share in society, to develop their abilities—physical, mental, and spiritual—and to pursue their individual happiness."

I believe that H.R. 2516, as amended by the Senate, meets that challenge. I am convinced it would significantly promote the causes of social, political and economic progress through the rule of law to which this nation is firmly committed.

In the first place, in general terms, the provisions of sections 101 through 103 of Title I parallel the coverage of H.R. 2516, as passed by the House. The Senate amendment sets forth provisions designed to protect against violent interference with the exer-

cise of a variety of benefits and activities. Each area of protected activity is specifically described. They include: voting, public accommodations, public education, public services and facilities, employment, jury service, use of common carriers and travel in interstate commerce, and participation in federally-assisted programs. The proposed statute would also protect citizens who lawfully aid or encourage participation in these activities as well as those who engage in speech or peaceful assembly opposing denial of the opportunity to participate in such activities. Persons who have duties to perform with respect to the protected activities—such as public school officials, restaurant owners and employers—would also be covered. The bill prescribes penalties graduated in accordance with the seriousness of those results of violations, ranging from misdemeanor penalties to life imprisonment.

The bill, as amended by the Senate, does differ, however, in the following three respects: *First*, to assure that dual State-Federal jurisdiction is carefully exercised by the Federal Government, the bill requires *advance certification* of prosecutorial authority by the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General; *Second*, the Senate bill exempts proprietors of "Mrs. Murphy" public accommodations from the prohibitions of the Act; and *Third*, the bill expressly states that police shall not be considered in violation of the new law for lawfully carrying out the duties of their office or for enforcing Federal or State law.

Title I also establishes penalties for incitement to riot. These provisions penalize interstate travel or the use of interstate facilities, including the mail, to incite, organize, or promote a riot. Violations of the Act are punishable by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than five years, or both. To commit a punishable offense under this section, one must not only use interstate facilities with the intent to incite a riot but must also commit an overt act in furtherance of that intent.

"Riot" is defined as acts or threats of violence by one or more persons in an assembly of three or more resulting in or damage to or greatly endangering the person or property of others. Actions which are the mere expression of ideas or beliefs are specifically exempted from the definition of riot. The statute makes clear that State and local law enforcement is not to be preempted by the new Federal law. A judgment of conviction or acquittal on the merits under the law of any State would operate as a bar to any Federal prosecution for the same act or acts.

These provisions closely parallel the provisions of H.R. 421, the so-called Anti-Riot Bill, which was favorably reported by the Committee on the Judiciary and adopted by the House on July 19, 1967.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Titles II through VII of the Senate amendment to H. R. 2516 concern protecting the rights of American Indians. In general terms, these titles establish a bill of rights for American Indians and provides for assumption by States of civil and criminal jurisdiction over Indian country with the consent of the Indian tribes affected.

Title II creates a "bill of rights" for Indians in relation to their tribes similar to the Bill of Rights in the Constitution that applies to other citizens' relation to their government. Among other features, the title retains the present maximum penalty of a $500 fine or imprisonment for a term of six months which may be imposed by an Indian tribe, and assures a person in criminal proceedings of the assistance of counsel for defense at his own expense. The title also provides that the writ of habeas corpus shall be available in any United States Court to test the legality of detention by order of a tribal court. The provisions of Title II would go into effect one year following the date of enactment in order to facilitate compliance with its terms by Indian tribes.

Title III authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to draft a Model Code to govern the Courts of Indian Offenses, to assure due process in the administration of justice by such courts and to implement the rights specified in Title II. It is anticipated that this Model Code would supplement the present code of offenses and procedures regulating the administration of justice now contained in Title 25, Code of Federal Regulations, which was established more than thirty years ago. In preparing this code, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to consult with Indians, Indian tribes and interested agencies of the United States.

Title IV amends Public Law 83–280 (67 Stat. 588) which conferred to certain States (California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin) civil and criminal jurisdiction over Indian country. Title IV provides for United States consent to the assumption by any State of criminal and civil jurisdiction over Indian tribes, with the consent of the tribes affected. Thus, Public Law 280 is modified by requiring tribal consent as a precondition to a State's assumption of jurisdiction.

Title V amends the "Major Crimes Act" (18 U.S.C. 1153) by adding "assault resulting in serious bodily injury" to the list of Federal offenses. At present, Federal courts have jurisdiction over the crimes of murder, manslaughter, rape, incest, assault with intent to kill, assault with a dangerous weapon, assault with intent to commit rape, carnal knowledge, arson, burglary, robbery, embezzlement, and larceny committed by an Indian against another Indian or another person. This amendment will make possible Federal prosecution for such aggravated assault committed in Indian country.

Title VI establishes a new rule governing approval by the Secretary of the Interior or the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the employment of legal counsel for Indian tribes and other Indian groups. It provides that applications relating to the employment of legal counsel made by Indian tribes or Indian groups shall be deem approved if neither approved nor denied within ninety days from the date of filing such application with the Secretary or the Commissioner.

Title VII authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to revise, compile and republish materials relating to Indian constitutional rights and Indian laws and treaties.

Title VIII, entitled "fair housing", is designed to assure all persons an equal opportunity to buy or rent housing without discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin. The goal of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family" proclaimed in the National Housing Act of 1949 has not been achieved. The late President Kennedy, in November 1962, issued Executive Order No. 11063, which established a Committee on Equal Housing Opportunity and forbade discrimination in recent FHA or VA insured housing. In recent years there has been considerable State and municipal reaction against discrimination in housing and today some 22 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and a large number of municipalities have enacted fair housing laws prohibiting discrimination in private housing transactions, but nevertheless it is plain that the combined efforts of State and local laws, executive orders, as well as actions by private volunteer groups is just not enough. Court decisions are not enough. Federal legislation to eliminate the blight of segregated housing and the pale of the ghetto is demanded.

While discrimination in housing is a fact which needs no proof, the consequences for both the individual and his community are not always so apparent. Segregated housing isolates racial minorities from the public life of the community. It means inferior public education, recreation, health, sanitation and transportation services and facilities, and often means denial of access to training and employment and business opportunities. Too often it prevents the ghetto inhabitants of liberating themselves. It is deeply corrosive both for the individual and for his community. Much of the urban crises that we witness today is a product of Negro segregation in the city ghettos and the flight of whites from the Negro and from these ghettos. To the extent that residential segregation prevents States and municipalities from carrying out their obligations to promote equal access and equal opportunity in all public aspects of community life, the Fourteenth Amendment authorizes the removal of this blight.

Title VIII bans discrimination on grounds of race, color, religion or national origin in the rental, sale or financing of residential housing subject to certain specific limited exceptions. I shall briefly outline the coverage of these provisions:

1. *Upon enactment*, the bill would cover by statute the types of housing now subject to prohibition on discrimination under Executive Order No. 11063. This includes (i) housing owned or operated by the Federal Government; (ii) provided in whole or in part with the aid of loans, advances, grants, or contributions made by the Federal Government; (iii) provided in whole or in part by loans insured or guaranteed by the Federal Government, and (iv) urban renewal redevelopment housing receiving Federal financial assistance. (Among other types of housing these provisions cover housing provided with FHA or VA mortgage insurance or guarantees, housing in urban renewal areas, senior citizens' housing, and low rent public housing.)

2. *After December 31, 1968*, the bill would cover other housing subject, however, to three exemptions:

(a) any single family house sold or rented by a private owner who owns no more than three such single family houses; (in the case of the sale of a single family house by an owner who is not the resident nor the most recent resident therein, this exemption applies only with respect to one such sale within a 24 month period).

(b) rooms or units in dwellings of four or fewer family units where the owner actually occupies one of the units as his living quarters;

(c) housing, operated for other than commercial purposes, furnished to members of religious organizations, associations, or societies or members of private clubs.

3. *After December 31, 1969*, the single-family house sale or rental exemption would continue *only* if the sale or rental is made without the use of the facilities of a real estate broker or other person in the business of selling or renting dwellings, and, without the publication or posting of any notice or advertisement indicating an intention to discriminate. Thus, the bill prohibits the use of a professional real estate dealer or similar person to help accomplish the owner's discriminatory purpose. The bill assumes that when an individual uses the public mechanisms of the real estate industry to effect a sale he should not be permitted to require that industry to carry out his discriminatory purpose. Such sales are to be regarded as "public" offerings.

Mr. Chairman. The bill, H.R. 14765, the Civil Rights Act of 1966, which passed the House on August 9, 1966, prohibited almost the exact same type of conduct with respect to housing discrimination as would be prohibited by H.R. 2516, as amended by the Senate. One difference is that the 1966 bill banned discrimination by real estate brokers and other persons in the business of selling or renting dwellings, while H.R. 2516 applies to prohibitions, with certain exceptions, to sales by any person. However, since the definition of a "person in the business of building, developing, selling, renting or leasing dwellings" contained in the 1966 bill was broad, the difference in the reach of the prohibitions of the two bills is more apparent

than real. Multiple sale or multiple rental transactions were covered by the 1966 bill and would also be covered by H.R. 2516. H.R. 2516 achieves essentially the same results as the 1966 bill by prohibiting discrimination in the sale of most types of housing *whether or not* the seller is "in the business", but at the same time exempts sales or rentals by single-family home owners.

Enforcement. H.R. 2516 provides three methods of obtaining compliance: administration conciliation, private suits, and suits by the Attorney General for a pattern or practice of discrimination.

Administrative conciliation. The Department of Housing and Urban Development would have conciliation authority to resolve complaints alleging discriminatory housing practices. A person aggrieved files his complaint within 180 days after the alleged acts of discrimination. The Secretary of HUD would have 30 days after filing of the complaint to investigate the matter and give notice to the person aggrieved whether he intended to resolve it. If the Secretary decides to resolve a complaint, he would engage in informal conference and conciliation with the person alleged to have committed the discriminatory housing practice, and attempt to bring an end to such practice by that means. If conciliation failed, or if the Secretary declined to resolve the charge or otherwise did not act within the 30 day period, the aggrieved person would have 30 days in which to file a civil action in either a State or Federal court.

If the complaint alleges acts constituting a violation of State or local law, and that law provides rights and remedies substantially equivalent to the rights and remedies provided in the bill, the Secretary would be required to refer the matter to the appropriate State or local agency, who would have at least 30 days to act on the matter before the Secretary could begin conciliation proceedings. In States with substantially equivalent rights and remedies any suit filed following failure of conciliation efforts would have to be brought in the State or local court.

Both the Secretary and the party charged have power to subpoena records, documents, individuals and other evidence or possible sources of evidence.

In addition to his conciliation function, the Secretary would be required to make studies and to publish reports with respect to the nature and extent of discriminatory housing practices in the United States. He would also be directed to cooperate with and to render technical assistance to Federal, State, local and private agencies which were carrying on programs to prevent or eliminate discriminatory housing practices, and to administer HUD programs and activities in a matter affirmatively to further the policies of the bill.

Private civil actions. In addition to administrative remedies, the bill authorizes immediate civil suits by private persons within 180 days after the alleged discriminatory housing practice occurred in any appropriate United States district court or appropriate State or local court of general jurisdiction. The bill further provides that any sale, encumbrance, or rental consummated prior to a court order issued under this Act and involving a bona fide purchaser, encumbrance, or tenant, shall not be affected. In such circumstances as the court deems just, the bill authorizes the appointment of an attorney for the plaintiff and the commencement of a civil action without the payment of fees, costs, or security. The court is authorized to issue a permanent or temporary injunction, or other appropriate orders and may award actual damages and not more than $1,000 in punitive damages, together with court costs and reasonable attorney fees.

Suits by the Attorney General. The third enforcement method under H.R. 2516 authorizes the Attorney General to institute civil actions for preventive relief whenever he has reasonable cause to believe that any person or group of persons is engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance to the full enjoyment of any of the rights granted by this bill, or whenever he has reasonable cause to believe that any group of persons has been denied such rights in a case of general public importance.

Finally, Title VIII specifically provides that it shall not be construed to invalidate or limit any State or local law that grants or protects the same rights. The Secretary of HUD is authorized to cooperate with State and local fair housing agencies and, with their consent, can utilize the services of such agencies.

Title IX (prevention of intimidation in fair housing cases). Title IX, using language similar to that found in Title I of the bill, protects persons from forcible interference or injury because of race, color, religion, or national origin, and because they were seeking to sell or acquire housing, to finance or occupy a dwelling, or to exercise other rights connected with housing. The title also prohibits forcible interference with those who would aid or encourage others to exercise these rights or lawfully speak or assemble to protest denials of these rights. The criminal offenses described and the graduated penalties provided in Title IX are similar to those stated in Title I of the bill.

Title X establishes three new Federal offenses and provides a penalty of a fine of $10,000, imprisonment up to five years, or both. The three new offenses are:

1. teaching or demonstrating the use or making of any firearm or explosive or incendiary device, knowing or having reason to know, or intending that it will be unlawfully employed for use in or in furtherance of a civil disorder which may in any way or degree obstruct, delay or adversely affect commerce, or the conduct or performance of any federally-protected function;

2. transporting or manufacturing for transportation in commerce a firearm or explosive or incendiary device, knowing or having reason to know, or intending that it will be used unlawfully in furtherance of a civil disorder;

3. committing or attempting to commit any act to obstruct, impede, or interfere with any firearm or law enforcement officer lawfully engaged in the lawful performance of his duties incident to and during the commission of a civil disorder which in any way or degree obstructs, delays, or adversely affects commerce for the conduct or performance of any federally-protected function. "Civil disorder" is defined as "any public disturbance involving acts of violence by assemblages of three or more persons, which causes an immediate danger of or results in damage or injury to the property or person of any other individual."

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman. Let me emphasize with all the strength that I can command that this bill embodies essential and fundamental first principles—principles basic to the human rights and dignity of every American.

As I stated at the outset, residential segregation of Negroes in this country is a fact which needs no proof. The objective dimensions of urban American ghettos include over-crowded and deteriorated housing, crime, disease, and alarmingly high infant mortality. The subjective dimensions are no less alarming. They include resentment, hostility, despair, apathy, and self-depreciation.

While studies exist that show that desegregated housing does not depress real estate values, many in the real estate and building business fear to take a chance. They feel trapped by custom and the possibility of competitive disadvantage. The fact is, however, that their policies and their practices perpetuate segregated housing. The analogy of this bill to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, particularly the public accommodations title, is plain. There, hotel and motel owners and restaurateurs, for example, also fear to set out independently to serve all customers without discrimination. Those of us who supported that legislation urged that by enacting a rule of fair treatment, a universal law against discrimination, all would be in a position to serve without discriminating. None would be doing so at his economic peril.

Experience under Title II of the 1964 Civil Rights Act has proved the correctness of that contention. Nondiscrimination in hotels, in motels and restaurants has been accomplished without disrupting business. Indeed, it has improved business. And so, too, will the open housing title of this bill *promote* expansion in the housing industry. I believe it a mistake to consider the sanctions contained in Title VIII as the most significant aspect of a Federal fair housing law. What is more significant is that this law can be used as a *shield* to protect those in the housing business when they do what is right. Of course, the same protection will be afforded the individual home owner who wants to do right.

Mr. Chairman, the time is long overdue for us to make good the promise of the National Housing Act of 1949: "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."

I urge the Committee to favorably report House Resolution 1100 so that the House can work its will on this historic legislation.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS OF HON. EMANUEL CELLER ON APRIL 2, 1968, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. Chairman. I have had time to reflect on the testimony which I submitted to this Committee on Thursday urging prompt approval of House Resolution 1100 and I believe that I may not have made my observations concerning the scope and effect of Title VIII, the open occupancy title of H.R. 2516, entirely clear. Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, with your permission and the indulgence of the Committee, I wish to amplify my remarks and compare the essential features of the open occupancy title of H.R. 2516 with the bill approved by the House in 1966.

First, the 1966 bill prohibited almost the identical conduct that will be prohibited by H.R. 2516, except that the 1966 bill focused its ban on discriminatory practices by *real estate brokers and others in the business* of selling or renting dwellings. H.R. 2516 applies its prohibitions, with certain exceptions, to sales by any person. Now, let me make clear what are the exemptions from coverage from the ban on housing discrimination in the present bill.

First (a) *Religious and private club exemption.* Both the 1966 bill and H.R. 2516 exempt religious and charitable institutions and bona fide private clubs, and do so in substantially the same terms.

Second (b) *"Mrs. Murphy" exemptions.* Both the 1966 bill and H.R. 2516 contain "Mrs. Murphy's boarding house" exemptions, and again the language is quite similar.

One difference is that the 1966 bill contained two clauses stating such exemptions: One applied to *"portions of buildings . . . containing living quarters . . . intended to be occupied by no more than four families"* if the owner *actually occupied* a part of the building as his residence. A second exemption in the 1966 bill stated that nothing in the bill should be construed "to prohibit or affect the right of an owner to refuse to rent a room or rooms in his home for any reason."

In H.R. 2516, as amended by the Senate, these two provisions have been combined into one so that *rooms or units in an owner-occupied dwellings are exempted from coverage* where the dwelling is occupied by *no more than four families.*

Third (c) *Exemption of single-family houses sold by owner.* The 1966 bill permitted

real estate brokers, agents, or salesmen to discriminate with respect to the sale, rental, or lease of a dwelling whenever *instructions in writing* were received from the owner of such a dwelling specifying that the broker, agent, or salesman do so.

In contrast, the present bill *expressly exempts* single-family houses *sold or rented by a private owner,* if such person is the owner of three or fewer dwellings. Such an owner is not covered by the prohibitions against discrimination (a) as to the sale or rental of *his own home,* or (b) as to the sale or rental of *other single-family homes owned by him* (in which he is not the resident, nor the most recent resident therein), *provided* that he sells not more than one of such homes in any two year period. In 1970, the single-family home exemption remains effective *only where the home is sold or rented without the assistance of a broker or a person in the business of selling or renting dwellings.*

(d) *Effect of the single-family house exemption in H.R. 2516.* The exemption of single-family houses in H.R. 2516 preserves to the individual home owner a significant amount of discretion to discriminate, if he chooses, in selling or renting his personal dwelling. However, by restricting the exemption to individuals, and by prohibiting discrimination by brokers in all cases except the "Mrs. Murphy" situation, several real advantages are obtained.

First, I believe the proposed statute will be *more easily enforced* since the lines between exempt housing and covered housing are made more clear. In our 1966 bill, discrimination might or might not be "authorized" by a seller, so that even in the case of sales by real estate agents a potential buyer or lessee could not know whether or not a refusal to deal with him was covered by the statute.

Second, H.R. 2516 "authorizes" no discrimination; all it does, is *exempt* certain types of dwellings. In this respect it resembles State fair housing statutes *far more* than did the 1966 bill. This bill prohibits discrimination by real estate dealers in 1970 in virtually all cases because it is believed that when an individual uses the real estate industry to effect a sale, the transaction has assumed a "public" character.

Third, the 1966 bill might have had the effect of encouraging real estate dealers to continue discriminating and to seek "authorization" to discriminate from their clients. Although the 1966 bill did prohibit soliciting such written authorizations, there can be no doubt that covert communication, for example, a "raised eyebrow" and other indirect means, would be *encouraged* by such a provision. In other words, the 1966 bill created a loophole.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. In speaking about open occupancy on Thursday last, perhaps I did not make it entirely clear that this measure would benefit *all* segments of our nation. Of course, its enactment would:

(1) Help more than 20 million American Negroes and other minorities with the same freedom of opportunity to choose a home in which they wish to live as is available to any other American;

(2) Make available to Negroes and other minorities the only major commodity which today is not available to all Americans on the basis of ability to pay;

(3) Enormously simplify housing relocation processes in all Federal and local government programs by making more sale and rental housing available (this has been and continues to be a severe problem among the families of our military personnel).

But, additionally, the enactment of a Federal open housing law will help to—

Stabilize our neighborhoods and eliminate panic selling;

Free builders, investors, lending institutions, real estate brokers and agents of the fear of economic loss if they are the first to support open occupancy in their own localities, and

Open a new housing market for the urban, non-white middle class which, in increasing numbers, has the income needed to pay for good housing.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Committee has heard testimony concerning criticism of Title X of H.R. 2516 and suggesting that it may be violative of rights protected by the Second Amendment to the Constitution. I should like at this time to amplify my earlier remarks and describe in somewhat greater detail the provisions of Title X.

This Title prescribes a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than five years, or both, for whoever teaches or demonstrates to another person the use, application, or making of any firearm or explosive or incendiary device capable of causing injury or death, knowing that the same will be unlawfully used in furtherance of civil disorders which may adversely affect commerce or the conduct of any federally-protected function, such as the United States mails.

Similar penalties are prescribed with respect to transportation in commerce of firearms or incendiary devices knowing that they will be used unlawfully in furtherance of civil disorder. The term "civil disorder" is defined as "any public disturbance involving acts of violence by assemblages which cause an immediate danger of or results in damage or injury to the property or person of any other individual."

In proposing this Title, Senator Long of Louisiana stated he was desirous of avoiding the problems of proof attendant upon establishing the intent of persons who crossed State lines. He illustrated his point with the anti-riot legislation before the Congress. As a result of his concern, Title X is drafted so that the offender need not cross States lines at all to violate its prohibitions. If he teaches or demonstrates the use or making of a firearm, explosive, incendiary device or technique capable of causing injury or death, he will be in violation of the prohibition if he knows or intends that the weapon or technique will be unlawfully used in a riot which would adversely affect commerce or the conduct of a federally-protected function.

Mr. Chairman, this Title should in no way be considered as a substitute for essential gun legislation for the following reasons:

1. It is limited to riot situations;

2. It operates after fact rather than before;

3. It in no way deals with the every day, general distribution of guns either by mail order or over the counter;

4. It does not afford the Treasury Department necessary discretion in licensing manufacturers, dealers or importers of firearms; and

5. It does not protect the integrity of the borders of the States so that the States may enact and enforce their own firearms laws as they deem appropriate.

Mr. Chairman. I further understand that it has been charged that Title X is incompatible with the Second Amendment to the Constitution. The Second Amendment provides:

"A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

I believe that an examination of the relevant Federal and State cases, commentaries on constitutional law, as well as the legislative history of existing Federal firearms enactments, emphatically establish the inapplicability of the Second Amendment to this legislation. I do not intend to take the Committee's time to explore this matter in great detail, however, the citation of one historic decision will make this conclusion clear.

The Supreme Court has held (*United States* v. *Miller,* 307 U.S. 174 (1939)) that the purpose of the Second Amendment was to assure the continuation and render possible the effectiveness of the militia subject to call and organization by Congress under Article 1, section 8, clauses 15 and 16 of the Constitution. The Court recognized that at the time the Constitution was drafted the militia was considered to be a "Body of citizens enrolled for military discipline" and that "ordinarily when called for service these men were expected to appear bearing arms supplied by themselves and of the kind in common use at the time." The Supreme Court upheld the conviction of two men who transported in interstate commerce a shotgun which came within the definition of a firearm under the National Firearms Act and was not registered in accordance with that Act. The Court found that *the Second Amendment did not guarantee the right to keep and bear any weapon not having a "reasonable relationship to the preservation or efficiency of a well regulated militia."*

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The modern tendency among judges and legal scholars is to regard the right to bear arms as existing in narrowly limited circumstances. The present state of the law concedes *at the most that the Second Amendment only forbids Congress so to disarm citizens as to prevent them from functioning as State militiamen.* If this statement accurately reflects the prevailing law, it follows that any Act of Congress which does not in fact prevent an eligible citizen from functioning as a State militiaman is not proscribed by the Second Amendment.

Manifestly, Mr. Chairman, nothing in the Constitution prevents the enactment of Title X.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I hope that the discussion by members of the Judiciary Committee of H.R. 2516, as amended by the Senate, has been helpful to this Committee. One of the merits of H.R. 2516 is that it meets national, rather than regional or sectional, needs. I am hopeful that the Committee on Rules will favorably report House Resolution 1100 so that the Members of the House may work their will and approve this landmark legislation.

UNIFORM EMERGENCY TELEPHONE NUMBER

Mr. ROUSH. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, as many of the Members of the House know I have been endeavoring to encourage the adoption nationwide of the single, emergency number "911."

My own hometown of Huntington, Ind., took the necessary preliminary steps 1 month ago and now we can dial quickly, easily—without resort to phone books—a number that will respond rapidly, knowing it is an emergency.

A.T. & T. has indicated that they are willing to analyze and advise cities all over the United States on the fastest and most efficient way in which they, too, can adopt this improved emergency telephone facility.

Yet there are many Americans who know nothing about "911"; some who believe such improvement would be too costly and difficult.

I believe it is my responsibility, and I hope you will join me in this, to alert the American people to the importance

of the "911"; to the urgency of its adoption.

Accordingly I have written the Governors of all the States in the United States, asking that they inform their cities and communities on this matter. I would like to include herein some of the answers I have received:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, March 13, 1968.

Hon. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROUSH: This will acknowledge your letter of February 23 in which you discuss a uniform emergency telephone number of expedite citizen contacts with police.

Our Connecticut State Police, in cooperation with the telephone company, have been exploring such a system here. In Connecticut, there are 169 towns and thirty-nine telephone exchanges.

The telephone exchange boundaries, however, do not follow town boundaries. This, plus overlapping jurisdictions and number of local police departments, not to mention State Police areas, make a system using one common number a very difficult matter to work out.

I am advised, however, that the telephone company is studying the problem and we hope that they may, in the near future, devise some workable system which is economically feasible.

I thank you for your interest in bringing this matter to my attention.

Sincerely,

JOHN DEMPSEY,
Governor.

STATE OF IOWA,
Des Moines, March 4, 1968.

Hon. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROUSH: This will acknowledge receipt of your February 28, 1968, correspondence concerning the uniform nationwide emergency phone number.

I appreciate your bringing this information to my attention. I will take steps to see when the emergency number program can be implemented in Iowa.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD E. HUGHES.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
Trenton, March 14, 1968.

Hon. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROUSH: Thank you for your letter of February 23rd concerning the proposed uniform, nationwide emergency telephone number.

I have been assured by Attorney General Arthur J. Sills that he will work diligently with public safety and communication agencies in this State to devise the best possible communications arrangements including the adoption, where practical, of the proposed single, emergency number.

Sincerely,

RICHARD J. HUGHES, *Governor.*

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Harrisburg, March 19, 1968.

Hon. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROUSH: Thank you for your recent letter concerning the need for urgent action on telephone number "911" as a single, uniform nationwide emergency police number.

Pennsylvania shares your deep concern for wide-spread implementation of this emergency number project. As early as June of 1967, Attorney General William C. Sennett was negotiating with the Bell Telephone Company of Pennsylvania concerning establishing an emergency number here in Pennsylvania.

You may be assured that we will give the message to local communities throughout Pennsylvania urging the adoption of the national emergency number "911".

Thank you for your interest and enthusiasm in this worthy cause.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND P. SHAFER.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Phoenix, Ariz., March 5, 1968.

Hon. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROUSH: Many thanks for your letter of February 23 relating to the three digit telephone number "911" which has been proposed as a single, uniform, nationwide emergency number for use by citizens in need of police or other emergency help.

Such a facility strikes me as being a step in the right direction not only with respect to the fight against crime but also as a means of speeding up emergency service in other areas such as fires and accidents.

I am advised that some of the municipalities in Arizona are presently looking into the plan. I am hopeful that it may eventually be adopted by all communities in the state and I shall recommend that it be given every consideration by the officials directly involved.

Sincerely yours,

JACK WILLIAMS.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
Concord, March 21, 1968.

Hon. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROUSH: Thank you for your letter of February 23, 1968 relative to the program providing for a single emergency telephone number.

I am advised by our Public Utilities Commission that facilities to inaugurate this program can be made available in New Hampshire very soon in certain exchanges, depending on equipment adaptability; and later in other areas as necessary modification of equipment can be effected.

As the facilities become available, we certainly will urge that the program be adopted.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. KING.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Baltimore, Md., March 18, 1968.

Hon. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROUSH: Governor Agnew has requested me to acknowledge your recent letter wherein you advised that officials of the American Telephone and Telegraph announced that they would be able to provide the three digit number "911" as a single, uniform, nationwide emergency number beginning in 1969.

Please be advised that the Maryland Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice is investigating the possibility of obtaining a special emergency number as suggested both by you and the President's Commission.

Your courtesy in bringing your observations to the attention of the Governor is most appreciated.

Sincerely,

EDWARD J. MCCABE,
Program Executive.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Olympia, March 18, 1968.

Hon. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROUSH: The State of Washington is indeed interested in the "911" program, and steps have already been taken toward its implementation.

I have discussed this with Chief Will Bachofner, of the Washington State Patrol, and am advised that representatives of that organization and the Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Company have already had a preliminary meeting. Plans are in the offing to appoint a coordinator and/or a committee on the state level to work closely with members of the telephone company.

Your support and interest in this worthwhile project is very much appreciated. I am pleased to give the backing of this office to help establish "911" as the single uniform telephone number to be called in the State of Washington for the report of emergencies.

Sincerely,

DANIEL J. EVANS,
Governor.

STATE OF INDIANA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Indianapolis, March 4, 1968.

Hon. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ED: I thank you for the information about the uniform, nationwide emergency telephone number and its inauguration on March 1 at Huntington.

The "911" number, I am certain, will enable the public to report more adequately and quickly its needs for emergency police and fire department assistance. It should help our law enforcement authorities do a more effective job in combating crime and in enforcing the public safety.

The telephone industry, I can see, will have a long-range job to do in converting its equipment and advising local governments about their requirements in organizing central staffs to receive such calls. I am sure the industry will move toward this objective as quickly as it can.

I compliment you on this achievement. The recognition contained in the report of the President's Crime Commission also should be a cause for pride. Indiana is organizing a Law Enforcement Training Academy and its courses will help local police improve their communications techniques, no doubt including the use of the uniform emergency telephone number.

Sincerely,

ROGER D. BRANIGIN,
Governor of Indiana.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
St. Paul, Minn., March 18, 1968.

Hon. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROUSH: Governor LeVander has referred to us your letter of February 23, 1968. Our Governor's Crime Commission has already had extensive contact with the people from the Bell Telephone System relative to the feasibility of early initiation of the "911" number in the Twin City Metropolitan Area. The preliminary report of the Law Enforcement Task Force of the Commission, the recommendations of which are contained in the attached blue material, covers this important subject in Number 37. The Advisory Committee to work with the Bell people on this program will be formed shortly, and it is our hope that progress can be made swiftly towards the implementation of this excellent plan.

Governor LeVander and Attorney General Head are pleased with your interest in this

most important matter, and particularly appreciate your taking time from your very busy schedule to contact the Governor in this regard.

Very truly yours,

ARNE SCHOELLER,
Assistant Attorney General.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY,
March 25, 1968.

Hon. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROUSH: The Honorable Otto Kerner, Governor of the State of Illinois, has asked this office to acknowledge, with his thanks, receipt of your letter posted in Washington on 23 February 1968.

We are delighted to learn of your interest in and support of the universal adoption of a simple uniform emergency telephone number that could be utilized by anyone needing emergency assistance. Before this facet of the current anti-crime program received publicity nationwide by the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, a representative of the Illinois Bell Telephone Company made a number of contacts with officials in this State and announced the nationwide emergency number "911."

Governor Otto Kerner, the Illinois Department of Public Safety, and I am sure everyone is in favor of this single three digit emergency number which, when implemented, would evoke immediate response to any emergency. We believe, as you do, that this is a great step forward in the improvement of law enforcement.

Governor Otto Kerner appreciates hearing from you and having your expression of support.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR V. HUFFMAN,
State Criminologist.

STATE OF IDAHO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Boise, March 27, 1968.

Hon. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROUSH: Your letter of February 23, 1968, has stimulated a great deal of interest within my staff.

I consider that a nationwide emergency number as suggested in your letter warrants detailed consideration. Because of this, I have directed the Administrator of the Division of Communications to make a study of costs, feasibility of implementation, and statewide cooperation in such a project.

This study is to be presented to me in the near future and I will then be in a position to give you a detailed answer concerning Idaho's participation in this system for emergency telephoning.

Sincerely,

DON SAMUELSON,
Governor.

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Oklahoma City, March 11, 1968.

Hon. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROUSH: I have received your letter of February 23 concerning your suggestions for the use of a single, uniform, nationwide emergency number. I will give every consideration to our local law enforcement and other public agencies in their implementation of the plan to provide the three-digit number "911" as an emergency number.

I appreciate very much your calling this to my attention.

Sincerely,

DEWEY F. BARTLETT,
Governor.

WYOMING EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Cheyenne, March 8, 1968.

Hon. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROUSH: I appreciated very much receiving your letter relative to the adoption of telephone number 911 as a single, uniform, nationwide emergency number beginning in 1969. I think this is an excellent idea and I salute you in your effort.

You may be assured that we will do everything possible to see that the State of Wyoming adopts the uniform number.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY K. HATHAWAY,
Governor.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND,
PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,
Providence, March 13, 1968.

Hon. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROUSH: Thank you very much for your letter regarding the use of one telephone number for emergency assistance.

I have discussed this arrangement with officials of the New England Telephone Company who now are working with Lieutenant Governor Joseph H. O'Donnell, Jr. Lieutenant Governor O'Donnell has been designated as this administration's liaison person who is working with local communities and he and the telephone company officials hope to work out, at least on an experimental basis, the "911" system in this state.

Again, thank you for taking the time and effort to write. I am glad to know of the interest of the State of Indiana in this field.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. CHAFFEE,
Governor.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE ON
LAW AND ORDER,
Raleigh, March 11, 1968.

Hon. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROUSH: Governor Dan Moore has requested that I reply to your letter of February 23, concerning the uniform, nationwide emergency telephone number that has been proposed by American Telephone and Telegraph Company.

I have discussed the matter with the officials of Southern Bell Telephone Company here in North Carolina and have been informed that similar plans are underway in our State. At the suggestion of the Governor, I am writing to the Director of the North Carolina Independent Telephone Association to determine what progress, if any, is being made by them in this regard.

Thanking you for your interest in law enforcement, I remain.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES E. CLEMENT,
Executive Director.

WORTHINGTON, MASS., 200TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CONTE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is a rare occasion when we are able to honor a community for 200 years of service to its citizens and to the Nation.

The town of Worthington, Mass., is such a community. In its long history it has continued to grow and prosper while supporting its Nation's effort in six different wars.

Very few towns in America can claim such a record.

In this light I would like to mention the celebration which will take place in Worthington from June 30 to July 7. This weeklong bicentennial is the culmination of the collective efforts of many people in the community who have been working for many months to make the occasion worthy of its cause.

It is with great pride that I ask my colleagues to join me in extending congratulations to the people of Worthington in this time of celebration.

The chairmen of the Worthington Bicentennial Historical Committee, Carl S. Joslyn and Mrs. Lois Ashe Brown, have provided us with an interesting background on the history of the community and have presented a splendid insight into the historical events which have helped to develop the character of Worthington.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the historical sketch written by Mr. Joslyn and Mrs. Brown:

A SHORT HISTORY OF WORTHINGTON

(By Lois Ashe Brown and Carl S. Joslyn)

The land that now comprises the Town of Worthington was originally known as Plantation Number 3 and was purchased from the Massachusetts Bay Province by Aaron Willard, Jr. of Lancaster at a public auction held in Boston on June 2, 1762. The purchase price was 1860 pounds. Toward this amount, Willard paid in earnest money at the time of sale and, for the balance, gave bonds to the treasurer of the Province signed by Josiah Dwight of Springfield, John Worthington of Springfield, Timothy Dwight, Jr., of Northampton, Salah Barnard of Deerfield, and himself. These five men were the original proprietors of Worthington and it was from them that the first settlers in the township bought their land. It was also from one of them—Colonel John Worthington of Springfield—that the town derived its name.

One condition of the sale of Plantation Number 3 was that, within five years, not less than sixty settlers must have established their residence in the township by building houses at least twenty-four by eighteen feet in size, surrounded by seven acres of land, cleared and fenced. Each settler was to be responsible for a proportionate share, depending on his holdings, of the cost of building a meeting house and getting a minister.

The settlement of the township must have proceeded apace inasmuch as on October 16, 1765 the proprietors sent a petition to the General Court asking "that the inhabitants of the said new plantation may be by act of assembly incorporated into a town." It appears that the General Court took its time in acting on the petition since it was not until nearly three years later, on June 30, 1768, that the act of incorporation was passed and the Town of Worthington began its corporate career.

PHYSICAL FEATURES

The township of Worthington, situated at the western border of Hampshire County in Massachusetts, comprises an area of thirty-three and one half square miles criss-crossed by sixty-five miles of maintained roads and numerous small streams. Considered one of the 'hill towns,' it is a region of mountain ranges and valleys. Its center is characterized by a high plateau area approximately 1500 feet above sea level. The town is about half

wooded hills and half broad cultivated fields bordered with stone walls and hedgerows.

Bordered on the north by Cummington, Worthington is adjoined on the east by Chesterfield, while the Huntington town line meets Worthington on the southeast corner, with Chester forming the southern boundary; the middle branch of the Westfield River forms the boundary on the southwest, with the Berkshire County line separating Worthington from Peru to the northwest.

Bashan Hill rises 2,033 feet in the northwest corner of town as Worthington's highest point. A mile to the southeast Knoll's Hill stands nearly 2,011 feet. The lowest points in town average about one thousand feet above sea level and are located along parts of the Bronson Brook and the middle branch of the Westfield River. Magnificent views are to be enjoyed from many locations in Worthington. Parts of five states may be seen from either Bashan or Knoll's hills.

Bronson Brook and Steven's Brook join along Capen Street to form the west branch of the Westfield River, just above Stevensville. Watt's Stream and Ward's Stream rise from springs in the Worthington State Forest and flow more or less parallel through town to join at Ringville and become Little River. The Kinne Brook rises in the hills in the southwestern part of town and flows on through Chester and into the middle branch of the Westfield River at Dayville.

At nearly opposite ends of Worthington are spectacular waterfalls. West Worthington Falls, located in the middle branch of the Westfield River, falls about 50 feet into a rocky gorge near River Road. Bradley Falls, in the Little River just below the bridge in South Worthington, follows a rocky path for about 500 feet, cascading into a right angle drop to a rock-bound gorge 50 feet below.

CHURCH HISTORY

The church has been an important factor in the lives of its people from the time of Worthington's founding. All were assessed for a proportionate share of the expenses of raising and maintaining a meeting house and hiring a minister. Nearly, if not all, of the early settlers in Worthington were descendants of the English families who had settled around Massachusetts Bay seeking religious freedom for themselves and for those who shared their beliefs—in many cases to the exclusion of all others.

Only two denominations have built churches in Worthington: Congregational and Methodist. The first Congregational Society was organized in 1771 and for nearly a century continued to be the "established" church in the town. Its expenses were met out of taxes, its business was transacted under a town warrant, and its services were held in the same "meeting house" where the citizens assembled for town meetings. Not until 1865, when the parish was organized as a distinct entity, did church and state become separate in Worthington.

The first meeting house was erected in 1769 near the corner of West Street and Sam Hill Road, with a cemetery adjoining. It was a primative sort of building, inside and out, and could not have been too comfortable as a place of worship for the thirty original church members. Near-by, the first Congregational minister, the Reverend Jonathan Huntington, built his own parsonage which still stands on West Street. This early meeting house was used by the church for some twenty years until the growth of membership and an eastward shift in the town's population rendered it obsolete.

On May 23, 1888, the present Congregational Church was dedicated with the appropriate exercises under the leadership of the Rev. Frederick Sargent Huntington, pastor at the time. The new building was copied from an English church by architect Walter Owen of Albany.

Today the Congregational Church has a membership of 177. At a special meeting in April 1961, the members voted approval to unite with the United Church of Christ. Under the leadership of Rev. Jerome H. Wood the church continues to play an important role in the life of the town.

About two dozen families comprise the Roman Catholic congregation in Worthington. Their numbers swell with the summer colony. Mass has been said in town during the summer months since 1932 by a priest from St. Thomas' Church in Huntington. Services were first held in Lyceum Hall, and, since 1952, have been held in the Town Hall.

Directly opposite the Congregational Church stands the Town Hall, built in 1885, and a few rods to the north is the Russell H. Conwell School, built in 1941 to replace eleven district schools. These three buildings together make an attractive group and constitute the center of the town's religious, civic, educational, and social activities.

SCHOOLS

For nearly two hundred years, provisions for education have comprised the major item of Worthington's annual budget, and since 1962 the figure exceeded $60,000. Earliest records of school expenses in Worthington date from March 18, 1771, when the town voted to raise £10 silver money for the support of the common schools. In 1772 the town was split into five districts with the £10 appropriation split accordingly. The first schoolhouse was built in 1773 about a mile south of Worthington Center, near the junction of Route 112 and Radiker Road.

The town's rapid growth in the early years made redistricting necessary. By 1833 eleven school districts were formed and in 1837 a student enrollment of 326 pupils was recorded. During the next century, the population steadily declined and one by one the district schools were closed. When Russell H. Conwell School was opened at Worthington Center in 1941, it replaced the two-room school in the Lyceum Building at Worthington Corners, the one-room school at West Worthington, and the one-room school at South Worthington.

Russell H. Conwell School was built at a cost of approximately $23,000. It accommodated grades one through eight in three well-lighted and ventilated classrooms with a central heating system. A kitchen and lunchroom were equipped in the basement in 1946. An addition which provided a fourth classroom, a large recreation room and generally expanded facilities, was completed in 1954 at the cost of nearly $44,000.

Prior to 1963, Worthington high school pupils attended schools in neighboring towns and cities and the town paid both the tuition and transportation costs. In earlier times, high school classes were held in the Town Hall, in Lyceum Hall, and in private homes.

Mountain Seminary was established on the common at Worthington Corners in 1837 and flourished for several years, supported by tuition fees from an enrollment of 143 students drawn from this and surrounding towns. When this was beset by economic difficulties, it closed and the building was moved to Cummington where it stands today on main street as a private home.

Dr. Russell H. Conwell, Worthington's most famous son, founder of Baptist Temple, Temple University, and Temple University Hospital in Philadelphia, opened Conwell Academy in 1894 in South Worthington. It continued for three or four years for the benefit of those studying on the secondary level, and then closed for economic reasons.

Educational facilities for Worthington pupils are today finer than ever. With the opening of the Gateway Regional School in 1963, of which Worthington is part-owner, and the subsequent removal of the seventh and eighth grades from the local to the new school, the future seems promising.

MILITARY HISTORY

Worthington has contributed its full share of men, money, and supplies to the nation's wars. It was one of the earliest towns in Western Massachusetts to answer the call to service during the Revolutionary War. Only a few days after the Battle of Lexington, 71 men from Worthington and Ashfield marched to Cambridge headed by Captain Ebenezer Webber of Worthington. From that time until the end of the war, the records show a steady flow of men and resources from the war's battlefields. Each man enlisting for six months received a bounty of £200 from the town, in addition to his army pay of £3 a month. Payment of bounties on this scale to the 40-odd men who served in the war must have been a serious drain on the town's meager resources.

Sentiment in Worthington strongly opposed the War of 1812. On July 7 of that year, it was voted in town meeting "that we consider the late act of Congress declaring war to exist between this country and the United Kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland in the present situation of our country to be in expedient and unnecessary." In view of this sentiment, it is not surprising that Worthington's participation in the war was limited to sending 24 men to the defense of Boston.

Upon the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861, the bounty system of enducing enlistments was revived. Early in the war, the amount paid was $50 per volunteer, but this was later increased to $125. In addition to the bounties, aid granted was $8,860, of which $4,398 was later refunded by the State. These were generous provisions by any standard since the number of men from Worthington who served in the Civil War was certainly not more than 102 and may have been as low as 86. Of the men who served, 21 either died or were killed in action.

The names of the Worthington men who served in the two World Wars are listed on a bronze plaque mounted on a native boulder which was placed on the town common in 1946. On this honor roll appear the names of 26 men who served in World War I and 55 who served in World War II. At the foot of the boulder, four white crosses have been erected in memory of the men who lost their lives in these two wars: William J. Coffey, Norman C. Eddy, Donald W. Mollinson, and Russell B. Shaw.

MEDICAL HISTORY

From the time of its founding until the middle of the twentieth century, Worthington's medical needs were taken care of by resident physicians. Getting a doctor to serve the town presented no great problem. The population was large enough to support a full-time physician and the supply of general practitioners adequate.

It was not until 1948, when Dr. Mary P. Snook discontinued her Worthington practice, that the townspeople came to realize how small the number of general practitioners had become and how much smaller was the number of those willing to take up practice in a rural community. For a time, the expedient was tried of having young doctors in training at Northampton's Cooley Dickinson Hospital come to town for a few hours each week. This makeshift arrangement was far from satisfactory. The doctors lacked adequate facilities, their terms of service was limited to one year, and they were not able to give the people full-time medical coverage. It became clear that something more substantial would have to be done to induce a doctor to take up practice in Worthington.

Two alternatives presented themselves: Government action or private enterprise. The easier way would have been for the town to subsidize the doctor's practice by paying an annual salary and providing him with free housing. This was rejected for various reasons, principal among them being that the kind of doctor the town wanted would not be attracted by such a proposal. Thus the hard way of private enterprise was chosen.

In February of 1950, following adjournment of town meeting, a citizens' meeting

was held to consider the problem. At this meeting Mrs. Harry (Florence) Bates, a registered nurse who had long served the town, asked for volunteers to serve with her on a committee to investigate the ways and means of securing adequate medical service. Six persons responded: two farmers, two businessmen, a retired college professor, and a housewife. It was the work done by this committee, investigating what had been done elsewhere, getting the services of a physician, and raising the necessary money, that made possible the inauguration of the Worthington Health Center on December 10, 1950.

The people using the facilities of the Health Center are drawn from Worthington, Cummington, Chesterfield, Ashfield, Peru, Plainfield, and Huntington. Financial support is provided by the annual dues paid by its members and by the gifts of friends. No salaries are paid to the doctors, their income is derived from fees paid by their patients. Each doctor has complete freedom in the conduct of his practice. His relationship to the organization that runs the Health Center, the Worthington Health Association, Inc., is that of lessee rather than employee. The town of Worthington, as such, makes no contribution to the support of the Health Center and plays no part in the management of its affairs. It is strictly a private enterprise.

ECONOMIC HISTORY

When the first settlers came in 1762 to Worthington, a virgin land from which Indians had but recently taken their leave, every man among them was essentially a farmer. Those who preached the gospel, taught school, kept stores and taverns, and those who operated shops and mills were farmers as well. This held true for more than a century, and long after the overtures of the industrial revolution were felt in the hill towns.

People were attracted to the Worthington township from towns in eastern Massachusetts and Connecticut with promises of fertile farm land, rich grazing lands, plenty of water power, virgin forests, plus untold opportunities for hunting, fishing and trapping. Their numbers increased steadily from the time of first settlement in 1762 until the census reached a peak of 1,395 in 1810. Westward migrations and moves to near-by urban communities reduced the population through the years until, in 1962, the census showed approximately 600 citizens—about the same population as nearly two centuries earlier when the town was ten years old.

In spite of the great number of small farms in town, dairy farming was not emphasized until about 1900, when farmers began to increase their herds to supply a growing urban market. Even so, there were no large farms by today's standards. In the mid-1800's, large flocks of merino sheep were pastured in Worthington to supply the needs of the booming woolen mills. Sheep farming dwindled in time as a low tariff on imported wool created unfavorable competition for domestic wool. Dairy farming as well on the wane prior to World War II and has since faded until in 1962 there are but four farms in town with milking herds, and four with beef animals.

However, while dairy farming has decreased in Worthington, potato growers have reclaimed run-out farm land and today approximately 1,000 acres are producing record crops of potatoes and giving employment to thirty or more local people plus many migrant workers. There are also four large acreages of cultivated blueberries; which offer seasonal employment.

The whole township was laid out in small farms by 1810 and even folks in the villages held farms. There were also sawmills, gristmills, tanneries, basket shops, blacksmith shops, tin shops, brickyards and general stores doing business in every part of town. Lack of fast transportation prohibited residing in Worthington and earning a living elsewhere; this was unthinkable for another hundred years.

At various times through the nineteenth century, numerous small factories and mills were operating in Worthington. These were a boon to the economy and afforded much local employment aside from the farm. There was hope that the town would eventually be served directly by railroad and efforts were exerted in that direction but to no avail. Meanwhile, raw and finished goods were hauled by team to and from the railroad in Williamsburg and Huntington.

In addition to lumber and grist, products included baskets, children's sleds; and carriages, window shades, bedsteads, tool handles, whipsockets, cider, essential oils, cheese and butter, leather, room fixtures and factory supplies, harnesses, penholders, emery stones, and hoops for banjos, drums, tambourines, and embroidery.

Maple sugaring is an important crop in Worthington and offers seasonal employment to thirty or more persons. There were six major sugar camps active in 1962 with some of them producing as many as 600 gallons of syrup a season, in addition to lesser amounts of maple sugar.

Whereas Worthington business directory a century ago showed every wage-earner to be earning his living in town, an economic survey conducted in 1962 showed that 135 out of a total 198 local wage-earners were working out of town and commuting each day. Of the 135, 114 were working for others, and 21 in business for themselves. There were 31 persons self-employed in town and 32 employed by others in Worthington. A total of 119 retired wage-earners were counted. Of the approximately 600 Worthington residents in 1962, the balance may be accounted for by those under eighteen, nonworking wives, and elderly women. This survey reflects the changing times.

DISCLOSURE OF EXPENSE FUNDS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for the fine work they did in reporting a code of ethics and disclosure to the House of Representatives. I was particularly pleased to note that the committee did not regard its recommendations as completing its task.

I have more than a passing interest in this issue. When I first came to the House last year, I introduced a bill requesting the establishment of a Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. I believe that the work done by the committee is an excellent start in the right direction. It is important that we erase any doubt that exists about our financial conduct.

There is one important area, considered by the committee—but in which the committee made no recommendation—namely the use of outside funds to cover a Congressman's travel in excess of his granted allowance, the cost of staff travel, the cost of newsletter expense and other miscellaneous expenses.

This is a controversial area. My own view is that there is absolutely nothing wrong with raising such funds, so long as they are not diverted in any way to a Congressman's personal use.

The Senate, in reviewing its own ethics code, came to grips with this issue when it overwhelmingly passed on a rollcall vote the following:

Nothing in this Rule shall preclude the use of contributions to defray expenses for travel to and from each Senator's home State, for printing and other expenses in connection with the mailing of speeches, newsletters and reports to a Senator's constituents; for expenses of radio, television and news media methods of reporting to a Senator's constituents; and for telephone, telegraph, postage and stationery expenses in excess of allowance, newspaper subscriptions from his home State.

I do not believe that Members of this body should have to pay from their pockets expenses necessary to do the best job they know how. I believe that an integral part of my job as the Representative of the Seventh District of Texas is knowing what my constituents are thinking and how they feel about the issues upon which I will be asked to vote and I want to keep them informed of my votes. I want to know what their gripes are and how I can help them. This requires constant contact with them. Last year I made 24 trips to my district. Members of my staff made 12 trips. I also put out several newsletters and a comprehensive questionnaire. This all takes money.

There are various ways in which these extraordinary expenses can be covered. In my case a close friend of mine sent out one letter of solicitation to people who had already helped in my campaign. The fund is administered by a businessman in Houston. I cannot issue checks on the fund, all expenses are vouchered, and an annual report of expenditures is available for each donor. We are having an independent audit of the fund.

There is no provision under the law for reporting such funds—I am not required under any law on standard to report such a fund. The Senate has made it clear by a large majority that there is, in the opinion of that body, good, and legitimate reason to have such resources available to Members; nevertheless, this is an area of confusion and question and I think it is altogether proper that my constituents be informed of my views on this matter.

Last year the total amount donated was $20,280.

There were also reimbursements for travel expenses of $754.11.

I checked with one of the major accounting firms in the United States and they advised me that since no funds went to my personal use, these moneys should not be taken through my personal books as personal income with offsetting expenditures:

1966 campaign deficit	$3,491.10
Travel by Congressman and staff between date of election and date sworn in	1,578.37
Travel by Congressman and staff between Washington and Houston after date sworn in	4,351.53
Staff salary	650.00
Newsletter	4,172.56
Office supplies and postage	207.00
Public relations—Houston	230.90
Repay overdraft in district office account—this checking account was established to receive and disburse the allowance for my district office paid by the House of Representatives	300.00

Replenish district office account	500.00
Total disbursements	15,481.46
Balance year end	5,552.65

Early last year, after introducing my own ethics bill, I elected to make full disclosure of my own assets and liabilities. I was not happy about this, but it seemed to me that disclosure is a good thing—it is in keeping with the "let the people decide" philosophy that this country believes in.

In the same spirit, I will publicize annually the receipts and expenditures of this supplementary expense fund. Neither the proposed House rules nor the Senate ethics bill require this reporting.

My basic view is that a Congressman should not be expected to dig into his own pocket for the type of expenses I have outlined above. The question then comes—"Well should not the Government pay for them so that no special interest can buy an inside track to a Congressman's office by supporting his campaign or by making other donations?"

I see many advantages in higher allowances for the running of one's office and for the type of expenses outlined above; but this is no time for the Congress to appropriate more moneys for its own operations, in my opinion.

I also am opposed to the Federal Government financing campaigns. I recognize the shortcoming of the existing system; but I keep coming back to the fact that disclosure is the key. Disclosure does not make everything all right, but it does lay the facts on the table, so the people can see them and interpret them.

I am very lucky in that I can afford the excessive expenses of the office of Congressman. It is no understatement to say that I must spend each year a good deal of my own personal income above my salary as Congressman.

If our budgetary problems were not so acute I would want to immediately consider a real revision of the system to correct this situation—not for myself, because, as stated above, I am lucky enough to be able to absorb some of these extra expenses out of other income and to be able to raise funds for others of these expenses; but the country is not well served by imposing excessive financial obligations on Members of Congress.

In conclusion, I hope the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct will, in the light of the Senate action on special funds, now take this matter up. The Senate was right in sanctioning outside help for the type of expense discussed above, but they stopped short by not calling for disclosure.

I hope the House committee will take affirmative action by officially sanctioning the use of funds as the Senate did, but by calling for some form of disclosure. The matter should be clearly defined so all Members of Congress will have some clearly defined guidelines on how to handle this subject, which has always been sensitive, and which if left undiscussed and undisclosed will always be a source of possible misunderstanding and political liability.

In discussing my own use of outside money to help defray certain expenses directly related to my job, I recognize that there are political risks, but if this helps remove the cloud of confusion and criticism that hangs over this controversial subject, then the risk will be worth it.

SETTLEMENT OF THE COPPER STRIKE

Mr. LLOYD. 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 Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the strike in the copper industry has ended after more than 8 months. In recent weeks, the negotiations have been taking place in the Executive Offices adjacent to the White House, at the personal request of President Johnson.

On March 30, President Johnson characterized the economic settlement as excessive and inflationary.

Arthur M. Okun, new Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers has stated:

> The unions received larger wage increases than the public interest justified.

He further stated:

> Price increases already announced by one company go far beyond the added costs of the wage increases.

Here is a picture of the damage wrought by this labor-management warfare in Utah and the Nation:

As of Friday, March 29, impact of the strike on Utah's economy was estimated at $96.6 million.

Wages lost by each striking employee in Utah averaged $5,091. Based on the proposed settlement of 54 cents per hour in wages, it will take the average worker at Kennecott a little more than 8 years to make up the loss.

Kennecott estimates its own copper loss during the strike at 390,000 tons. Overall production loss by the entire industry is estimated between 960,000 and 980,000 tons. Based on prestrike price of 38 cents per pound, the loss to the Nation's economy totals between $750 and $800 million, not counting losses in production of byproduct metals.

Effects of the strike on our balance-of-payments deficit have been estimated by the Department of Commerce at a net of nearly $400 million caused by the necessity to import copper during the 8½-month-old strike.

This strike illustrates again our incredible lack of public means with which to protect the public interest when labor-management negotiations break down.

We do have the Taft-Hartley law. In my opinion, the President should have invoked this established law of the land on January 1, when he sent to the Congress his message on balance of payments in which he pleaded for action to correct our balance-of-payments deficits. Taft-Hartley can be invoked only when the national health or safety is sufficiently adversely affected.

The balance-of-payments deficit, the fact that our Nation is at war, and the fact that even with greatly accelerated imports we were forced to draw down upon our strategic stockpile, appear to me to be ample evidence that the national safety was deeply involved, and this argument does not even take into consideration the grievous damage which our economy—local, State, and National—suffered.

Labor unions were against the invocation of Taft-Hartley. I believe this is a major reason that this established law was not invoked. I think it is wrong if organized labor did have this type of influence on our pevailing majority party to prevent this law from being invoked when the national interest was so seriously impaired in time of national crisis. Furthermore, a fair reading of Taft-Hartley does not support the contention that it is antilabor. It calls for continuing negotiations during a cooling-off period. It calls for a factfinding body to report to the public. It provides for secret ballot by the striking workers on the final offer of management at the end of the cooling-off period, but then it does not demand settlement. Was it this chance at a secret ballot by the striking workers to which the unions objected?

This law may not be adequate, but at least it is something. Aside from our emergency economic crisis, I believe the greatest domestic challenge which Members of the Congress of the United States have is to make progress through this jungle of darkness into which prolonged labor-management disputes lead us, to the great detriment of the worker, of management, and that forgotten man, the innocent citizen bystander.

HON. RICHARD G. LUGAR, MAYOR OF INDIANAPOLIS, SHOWS HOW TO SOLVE URBAN PROBLEMS

Mr. BRAY. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Richard G. Lugar, mayor of Indianapolis, has initiated a bold and ambitious program for his city that shows great promise in not only preventing the violence and racial turmoil that have marked so many cities of the United States, but also in being a model of what can be done when all a city's resources are mobilized behind vigorous, active, and capable leadership.

Mayor Lugar earlier this year had attended three conferences in Washington for mayors of major U.S. cities and met with officials who, like him, carried heavy responsibilities and duties in administering urban areas. Mayor Lugar and his fellow officials were told flatly by no less a person than the Vice President of the United States that there were, and I quote from Mayor Lugar's remarks, "no fresh sources of Federal funds available to cities in the near future."

A few mayors of large cities—all of which, incidentally, have suffered racial violence—went on nationwide television to bemoan their plight and plead for more money, even though they had just been told there was none to be had.

Mayor Lugar went home to Indianapolis and addressed his city on television, giving them the hard, cold facts of the situation and proposing a new program called the volunteer adviser corps. Under this plan, 2,000 active citizens were asked to volunteer to serve. Each one who responded would be given the name of someone who needed help finding a job. The volunteers would be given all possible assistance in placing this jobless individual.

Mayor Lugar said:

Beginning now on March 1, we can move rapidly toward a full employment economy, a rapid reduction in unemployment compensation payments and welfare payments, a rapid acceleration in citizen participation in strengthening the economic and social health of this community and a good start on the most useful year of education, employment and recreation which we have ever enjoyed. Indianapolis will be stronger because we simply were determined to do all of the things which our consciences dictated and to do them now because we love this city and because each one of us has a genuine feeling of compassion for his fellow man.

Mayor Lugar got no nationwide television coverage. Mayor Lugar's remarks did not get front-page treatment in the Nation's newspapers. But let us ask ourselves: Which mayors of which cities will face the coming summer with foreboding as they wring their hands for the money that is not available? And which mayor in which city will know his city, his people, are moving ahead to build a better life for all the city's inhabitants?

Following is Mayor Richard G. Lugar's speech of March 1, 1968, and a series of stories and editorials from the Indianapolis Star and News that describe what has been done. Mayor Lugar and the many hard-working, public-spirited citizens and organizations who have joined with him not only deserve the thanks of the country for showing how to do it, but also the nationwide recognition that is so rightfully theirs.

The material referred to follows:

A REPORT TO INDIANAPOLIS BY RICHARD G. LUGAR, MAYOR, MARCH 1, 1968

Ladies and gentlemen, during the first two months of this year, I have been privileged to attend three conferences in our nation's capital and to meet with officials bearing heavy responsibility at Federal, State, and local levels of government. A common theme has emerged from each session. In many ways and with many voices, the theme of crisis in the cities is discussed with a mixture of hope and despair. The President of the United States and the Vice-President recognize that the problems of great American cities rank neck and neck with warfare abroad as issues which pre-occupy the American voter. Equally evident is the oft-stated hope that large city mayors will be adequate to the tasks immediately before them.

After many reports of crisis and potential difficulty, it was refreshing to hear the Vice-President of the United States tell me that when he was Mayor of Minneapolis twenty years ago, no one summoned him to Washington for the purpose of offering counsel or money. Hubert Humphrey stated simply that he was on his own, in the field, making do with what he had in Minneapolis and that he lighted the playgrounds, joined hands with the youth of the community, and got on with the job of making Minneapolis a first-class city. In short, Federal officials would feel more comfortable if so much did not depend upon local leadership but they have come to recognize that each city will rise and fall essentially on its own merits and that cities with unimaginative and indecisive leadership are unlikely to do very well. Furthermore, the Vice-President has informed us that no fresh sources of Federal funds will be available to cities in the near future although an enormous number of proposals have been made to the Congress for spending in the future.

If there be those individuals in our community who are certain that substantial Federal resources lie in Washington waiting for the asking, I would say simply that such pools of cash do not exist and the present mood of Congress given a large Federal budget deficit is unlikely to create them regardless of Presidential reports or pleadings. Vice-President Humphrey has told us that we will have to look to our own community resources to cure our own community problems with the Federal government as a willing and helpful ally on occasion.

Long before these Washington conferences, I had reported to you the current Federal financial plight. Likewise, we have discussed before, the unfortunate position which our city suffers without the local home rule which only the Indiana Legislature can give to us. We are ready to do a great job in building Indianapolis but we need the authority to use much of our own money which is now being bled from us not only by Federal taxation but by very unfair Indiana taxation distributions.

And yet with all of our problems, we are a fortunate city. We live in the middle of a seven-county metropolitan area which has a work force of 450,000 people. 9,800 are currently unemployed. There is new life and new bounce in the economy of our city which is reflected in new investment and new jobs. Even more important, there is a new sense of recognition that our economy must grow rapidly to employ many newcomers and to employ those who have remained unemployed for long periods of time. We are a city with a healthy degree of dissatisfaction with things as they are. We are dissatisfied with the thought that any man who wants to work should be unemployed. We are dissatisfied with the thought that any family which wants decent housing should be unable to find it. We are dissatisfied with the thought that many of our youth are not able to read well and are not preparing themselves for good jobs of the present or the future. We are dissatisfied that racial discrimination should still remain such an insidious force in our community which saps strength and vitality at a time when we need more unity and understanding.

Some cities apparently take the view that conditions are rather hopeless and that startling change is simply not in the cards. When such a sense of hopelessness is coupled with genuine racial fear, various self-styled leaders in those communities talk about a long-hot summer and alternately hope for trouble and then fear its consequences without having any good idea of what will come from a hot or cool summer except more hopelessness and dead-center thinking and the same racial fear.

This type of lazy and sloppy thinking is of absolutely no value and I am weary of listening to a lot of sheer rubbish from persons of national repute who ought to know better. The summer is not an isolated sector of life. Men and women and children in our community can be as miserable in winter as in summer. A summer riot is no better or worse than a winter riot and no more productive. Each community which has suffered burning, pillaging, and death in the past four years is simply a great deal poorer and less competitive than cities which have retained some semblance of common sense. Psychologists have long probed the depths of thinking in America and come to the conclusion that we are, on the basis of past record, a more violent people than the English, but somewhat less addicted to shooting each other than our Latin American allies. At least 144 citizens have been killed in rioting during the past four years in America, a horrible human toll, but this is a tiny percentage of the number of murders and accidental shootings reported annually for all sorts of reasons and only a small fraction of the number of persons killed in only one of our countries' worst episodes, a New York riot in 1863 which erupted during the attempts of many to evade military service in the Civil War.

In perspective, I think we need to recognize that several individuals in our own community might wish to cause harm to others on almost any given day of the year and that still others might take advantage of the turmoil to steal or to even up a few old scores. Some persons might choose to romanticize murder and arson and looting and contend that such activities change community attitudes in the sense that self-respect is nurtured, a so-called power structure is weakened and that jobs, houses, and educational opportunities and a greater degree of mutual respect result after the fire while a community is weak and on its knees. If my conversations with officials in Newark and Detroit are an indication, I can report that despite well-meaning flurries of activity on the surface, a more solid core of hard-hearted repression resulted from the spectacular riots of 1967. Now much of the nation is gripped by an obsession with law and order which freely translated in some cities often means a strategy of arming to the teeth ready to fight a civil war.

Unlike other cities, we are not going to prepare for the purchase and deployment of tanks and machine guns. It is regrettable that we do have some folks in our city who thoroughly enjoy the thought of conflict and work diligently to frighten each other with talk of black power take-overs or vigilante retaliation. Some folks in our community simply do not like each other and some never will, but I am not prepared to allow all of their personal problems to be acted out in pitched battle. Men and women who are not able to live without trying to harm others will be arrested and tried according to due process of law. We are doing our best to train our police officers to be more skillful and more humane in doing a thorough job of law enforcement.

Much of my time in the past two months has been spent learning all that I could about law enforcement and court procedures, in making certain that our progress toward equal justice for all is closer to becoming a reality each day. I have found that many of our best citizens seem to take pride in their attempts to fix traffic tickets or to obstruct justice on behalf of friends or clients while at the same time they trumpet the call for law and order when it pertains to others. This will not do.

Some of our citizens claim racial discrimination after each vice arrest or parking ticket. This becomes a tired refrain and this attitude is not very helpful to obtaining equality of justice.

Police Chief Churchill and Deputy Chief for Investigations Davenport have been asked to investigate every complaint which indicates any degree of racial discrimination or harassment. We will deal with each and every offense swiftly and fairly. I want to make clear in deeds as well as words that Indianapolis means to end any undercurrents of disunity between law enforcement officers and minority groups in our city.

I have concluded after watching criminal activity in this city and elsewhere during the past two months that we are witnessing something which is much less a problem of race than of age. Crime is more and more a social sickness growing out of neglect and corruption of certain of the youth of our city ages 16–24 who account for a staggering number of crimes against property and persons. When I say youth, I mean white and black

youth alike, a very unhappy bi-racial problem.

Several factors could have helped us in the past and could help us in the present. First of all, many children were born in this community unwanted by parents who have abandoned, mistreated, or neglected them. Our community must offer assistance in family planning to all who volunteer for such assistance. I have seen far too much cruelty and suffering involving children to remain silent on this issue.

Secondly, a great number of our families have come partially unstuck by the demands placed upon mothers who have taken second jobs in order to finance family material needs seen as more important than the needs of children for supervision and attention.

Thirdly, we are sorely deficient in the provision of day care centers for mothers and fathers who must work or ought to work of necessity to support families and must have proper care for children during working hours.

A fourth and equally insidious problem in our city is the fact that we have discriminated against many Negro men for so long that they not only have given up hope of employment for themselves, but abandoned their families in order not to jeopardize welfare payments for mothers and children and failed to give any model of success to their children. Some of our children have never known an employed adult who was very successful by any standard. Good motivation needs a good model.

Our churches have moved into these dilemmas with considerable vigor, but too many of us are still operating on the basis that our ministers should stick to comforting our troubled spirits each Sunday morning and leave the poor and the discouraged to those in political life on Monday morning. The poor and discouraged have frequently lost sight of the church altogether and church attendance by the youth of our community is low.

Let me say something which is at the heart of the matter of our present discomfort. We are a society which is willing to spend billions upon drugs and alcoholic beverages to dull sensitivity, but we are now going to be called to give something far more precious to obtain peace of mind. We are going to have to give billions of hours of our own time. To become involved in the lives of others is a risky experience because it means potential hurt and disappointment and misunderstanding, particularly if the "others" are very different in background and not immediately friendly or appreciative.

We are reminded that Jesus of Nazareth wandered up and down the dusty roads of Judea becoming involved in the lives of others. He was loved by some, spat upon by others, misunderstood, worshipped, and finally crucified by a large majority vote after only three years of active ministry. Some of us believe that His was the perfect life but none of us can really feel the grit of the dusty streets, the thirst of summer, the jeers of our neighbors, or the pain of betrayal by our closest friends without knowing that even the perfect life is filled with heartbreak among the deep satisfactions.

I am proceeding on the assumption, tonight, that each of us really wants to do the right thing at the right time in this city but that most of us really do not know how to get our teeth into the problem. Worse still, those who have proceeded to perform good works are often unaware of what others are doing and we do not have the manpower or the money in this city to duplicate effort.

In order to establish a strong base of operations, I have invited to the Mayor's office a large number of community leaders for immediate action to bridge some glaring gaps of misunderstanding.

First of all, let us recognize the good things we have going for us. Whatever might be said about the criminal tendencies of a few youth, the overwhelming majority of our youth are more talented, more tolerant, and more optimistic than any youth who have preceded them. On May 7 and May 8, the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce will work with all secondary schools in our community to afford interviews for high school seniors who wish to obtain permanent jobs in our economy. We want to make certain that each senior who does not have college plans at present is given an excellent opportunity to find stable employment.

Prior to this, our Chamber of Commerce plans to visit neighborhoods in Indianapolis which may have a number of unemployed men and women, black and white, who need employment. For example, in mid-March, representatives of over 20 companies will be prepared to interview men and women of all ages who are seeking employment in the Martindale Avenue neighborhood. The dates and precise location will be announced soon but the principle is an important one. Many employers are eager to come directly to neighborhood facilities to make the interviewing process easier. We do not want transportation problems or fear of a potential closed door policy to stand in the way of someone seeking a job.

Youth who are not seeking permanent employment but only summer work should indicate this now by visiting the Youth Employment Service office on the 6th floor of 145 West Washington Street. Please do not wait until June. Please register now. This morning, I met with the top officers of our 25 largest employers in Indianapolis and have explained our needs for summer and permanent employment in Indianapolis.

I am pleased to report that Mr. Alfred Stokely, President of Stokely-Van Camp Company, has assumed chairmanship of the Indianapolis Business Alliance which will work with Mr. Henry Ford and the National Business Alliance to provide thousands of new jobs for the hard-core unemployed. I am deeply grateful to Mr. Stokely for his willingness to perform a dedicated and resourceful service for Indianapolis.

Enthusiastic support has been pledged, but we need to know as soon as possible how many jobs are needed and to begin matching applicants with jobs. Last summer, representatives of the Urban League made a heroic last-minute effort to aid youth in this community, but our common sense should tell us that now is the time to explore all sectors of our community for job potential.

Adults seeking permanent employment should continue to contact the Indiana Employment Security Division Office at 145 West Washington to indicate availability for employment.

I want to emphasize a new program which is an exciting and important step in our community, the Volunteer Adviser Corps. A great many of you who want to serve this community have a remarkable opportunity available now. We need 2,000 capable active citizens to serve as a Volunteer Adviser Corps. Each of you who responds to this request for his service will receive an assignment. Each of you will be given the name of a man or woman who needs your help in finding a job. You will be given every assistance in interviewing techniques, in mastering job application forms, in overcoming barriers of employer resistance, but you will succeed by working with another citizen until he or she is permanently employed and settled in that employment.

Each of you who has ever asked the question, "What can I do now to make Indianapolis a better community in which to live and work" can answer that question immediately and with a great degree of satisfaction by calling or writing the Volunteer Adviser Corps, 320 North Meridian Street, Telephone 635–6423 and enlisting in one of the most important endeavors our city has ever attempted. On a trial basis, over 200 citizens have already been assisted to find jobs by the Corps and over 93% of these new applicants held their jobs three months after placement. We know that the concept is sound because it is a man-to-man relationship of practical common sense with a generous dose of good will.

Correspondingly, all clergymen, social workers, teachers, counsellors, and other concerned citizens should refer men and women who want job assistance to the Volunteer Adviser Corps, 320 North Meridan, Telephone 635–6423 at the earliest in order that we may get on with the vital task of moving as closely as possible to full employment in our community.

Sometimes, the task of the Volunteer Corps member is difficult. It may mean tens of calls to potential employers, provision of transportation to interviews, assistance in filling out difficult application forms and a great measure of assurance and patience. But each of you who succeeds in finding employment for another citizen will never forget the satisfaction of really doing something which may be the turning point in a life of a human being and a significant turning point in the total life of this city.

Meanwhile, my office will do all in its power to point out to employers legislation introduced by Representative Robert Jones in the 1967 General Assembly. This legislation provides tax credit incentives for industry to hire and train unemployed persons.

Nor have we forgotten that many jobs stand open in Indianapolis at this moment because potential job holders need more training to fill them. Flanner House at 333 West 16th Street and its four neighborhood centers stand prepared to interview and train as many as 2,000 citizens of all ages at no cost to those involved and to work closely with local industry to place successfully the trainees.

The Indianapolis Public Schools are geared to accept all students this summer who can be encouraged to enroll in courses which will bridge reading deficiencies or other basic skill difficulties or lead to enrichment programs and better college potentialities. Teachers and parents and fellow students must do all in their power to encourage summer school enrollment. We have some glaring educational weaknesses in Indianapolis which can be bridged only in the summer. We need to forge ahead of other cities and offer to competing industry a more skilled population which is ready to fill more technical and higher paying jobs. The Mallory Technical Center offers a great array of vocational courses which make possible immediate job placement in a host of opportunities. Adult high school completion courses during the day are now available at Mallory and should be taken by hundreds of our youth who want and need high school diplomas.

Currently, one of our Indianapolis Board of Works members, Mr. Wendell Vandiver of the Carpenters Union is available each day on the 3rd floor of Mallory Technical Center to enroll qualified youth who wish to earn pay during a six-week preliminary apprenticeship program and after passing reasonable tests are then guaranteed $3.60 per hour on construction jobs during the completion of their course. Progress is being made at Mallory Technical Center with the bricklayers union and I am confident that we will report more successes in this field of building trades.

I have advised adults who wish to serve our community to enlist immediately in the volunteer Adviser Corps. I wish to ask college students who can afford to give voluntarily of their time this summer to enlist as superintendents of elementary school playgrounds on a full-time basis. We need to open all of our school playgrounds and maintain full-time supervision by qualified personnel who will be given proper training by the Park Department. We need volunteers who will

not only supervise a good program of recreation but who will do much to advise and counsel youth who need models for success and good solid friends to rely upon. I will be indebted to each college student who can give of his time in this important role and I ask each to call the Mayor's Office, 633–3714 to volunteer.

During the coming months, the Mayor's office will survey our community to determine the most important projects of civic beauty which will require employment of youth dedicated to the improvement of Indianapolis and we will search for the funds required to employ youth and complete some badly needed civic projects.

Beginning now on March 1, we can move rapidly toward a full employment economy, a rapid reduction in unemployment compensation payments and welfare payments, a rapid acceleration in citizen participation in strengthening the economic and social health of this community and a good start on the most useful year of education, employment, and recreation which we have ever enjoyed. Indianapolis will be stronger because we simply were determined to do all of the things which our consciences dictated and to do them now because we love this city and because each one of us has a genuine feeling of compassion for his fellow men.

In the meanwhile, we are going to have to progress rapidly on some other fronts. Our housing shortage is severe, and I am working on a great number of projects to try to bring together our need for houses with the needs of citizens to be employed in building houses or rehabilitating and improving existing structures.

We need to have more businesses owned and operated by Negroes in this community. This is not racial prejudice in reverse. This is just straightforward economic thought, and I am pleased to report that substantial progress is being made by our banks in providing loans to Negro owned businesses which should expand and employ more persons immediately.

All of these quests involve risks and expenses, but I have outlined no program which will not bring rich returns on the time and funds invested, and I have outlined nothing which cannot be done by citizens in Indianapolis using their own time and money.

I appreciate the fact that we have those among us who have no faith in this community or in any individual leaders, for that matter, to fight for justice. From the beginning of my administration, I have heard from citizens who were certain that the idealism I expressed would wear off, who were certain that "sinister" advisers would control my actions, or who were alarmed at the rapid pace of our administration and certain that we would collapse from sheer exhaustion after a relatively brief flurry of excitement and promise. The doubters and the prophets of gloom are less numerous these days, and I am pleased that the press pays so little attention to them.

City government is a perpetually frantic business. My staff works 60-hour weeks not because I have asked for sacrifice but because they know we are on the threshold of some great breakthroughs in this city and no one wants to miss out on any part of the action.

I shall always be grateful to the people of Indianapolis for giving me this opportunity to serve as Mayor at this particular time. Surely no man has ever had so many wonderful surprises as citizens stepped forward each day to accept responsibilities because they loved Indianapolis and all that life in this city can become if we really set our sights high enough.

Less than 100 days ago, many were certain that the open dumps would not be closed. Even more were certain that a 13-inch snowfall could not be cleared to permit normal traffic flow. Still more were certain that governmental services would be disrupted by a change of administrations and that many months would be required to appoint new boards, new officials, and obtain efficiency of operation. The pessimists were wrong.

And now as we attack the problems of employment, we need visible successes and we need them promptly. The same could be said for housing and for human relations in Indianapolis.

But while we are doing all of these important tasks and from time to time have a moment of mild discouragement, let us remember that those of us who are privileged to enjoy these moments in the sun in Indianapolis do so while thousands of our young men are engaged in a grim struggle abroad. Death knows no color barrier in Viet Nam and if any citizen in Indianapolis feels that he is being asked to do too much for his city now, his sense of values needs sizable adjustment. Those young men who return from military service deserve a better city than the one they left behind. They deserve cleaner air, safer streets, a chance to work productively, the privilege of buying property, goods, and services whenever and wherever they wish to buy, and a government which is constructive and strong in its encouragement of compassion and justice.

This is a time when patriotism can be best expressed by helping another man to find and hold a job, by giving a helping hand to a teen-ager who needs more school, employment, recreation, and some one who really cares about his individual needs, by supporting the action of good law enforcement officers who can be effective only in a society which truly believes in equal justice for all men and special privileges for no men.

I believe in the ideas I have presented to you tonight. I believe in them with such strength that I plan to devote all of my energy to making these dreams for Indianapolis come true. I know that many of you will want to do the same. And many years from now, we will look back upon this night and upon this year and be very grateful that sincere and dedicated action made all the difference.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, Mar. 2, 1968]

LUGAR SEEKS 2,000 VOLUNTEERS TO SOLVE UNEMPLOYMENT ISSUES

(By Michael J. Quinn)

Mayor Richard G. Lugar last night issued a call for 2,000 Indianapolis residents to serve as volunteers in a major effort to solve unemployment problems.

Citizens wishing personally to take part in fighting the problems of the chronically unemployed should join the Voluntary Adviser Corps, Lugar said.

The mayor in a 30-minute televised speech said the new program is "exciting and important in our community."

Lugar declared, "A great many of you who want to serve this community have a remarkable opportunity available now."

He explained:

"Each person who responds will be given the name of a man or woman who needs help in finding a job. It would be the volunteer's responsibility to work with the unemployed person until he is employed and settled in his job."

He added, "Each of you who has ever asked the question, 'What can I do now to make Indianapolis a better community in which to live and work?' can answer that question with a great degree of satisfaction by contacting the Adviser Corps."

The Committee for Employment Opportunities' Voluntary Adviser Corps is a project of the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce and will be the co-ordinating agency for the Mayor's job program.

Lugar said persons wishing to volunteer should telephone 635–6423.

He revealed that Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey recently told him at Washington, D.C., that despite promises of increased Federal money for programs to halt civil unrest "no fresh sources of Federal funds would be available to cities in the near future."

Lugar said he was informed by Humphrey that:

"We (in Indianapolis) will have to look to our own community resources to cure our own community problems, with the Federal government as a willing and helpful ally on occasion."

Lugar asserted Indianapolis is not burdened with civil unrest but has "healthy dissatisfaction."

Lugar said that on May 7 and 8 Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce representatives will be at all high schools conducting interviews among high school seniors seeking permanent jobs.

"We want to make certain that each senior who does not have college plans at present is given an excellent opportunity to find stable employment," Lugar said.

Another job-placement project will be underway in about two weeks when representatives of 20 major firms will interview job-seeking men and women of all ages in the Martindale Avenue neighborhood. The dates and locations of these interviews will be announced soon, the Mayor said.

The project will be co-ordinated by Martindale Area Citizens Service Inc. (MACS).

Lugar stressed that his program is not only for summer jobs, but for year-round employment.

He also discussed problems in the areas of family planning, welfare payments, and the need for Negro-owned businesses.

"Our community must offer assistance in family planning to all who volunteer for such assistance," Lugar said. "I have seen far too much cruelty and suffering involving children to remain silent on this issue."

He added that "an insidious problem" in our city results from the fact we have discriminated against many Negro men for so long "they not only have given up hope of employment for themselves but have abandoned their families in order not to jeopardize welfare payments for mothers and children."

These men, he said, "have failed to give any model of success to their children."

Lugar said he disagreed with those who contend ministers "should stick to comforting our troubled spirits each Sunday morning and leave the poor and discouraged to those in political life on Monday morning.

"The poor and the discouraged have frequently lost sight of the church altogether," he added. "And church attendance by the youth of our community is low."

Lugar said there is a need for more businesses to be owned and operated by Negroes.

He added, "This is not racial prejudice in reverse . . . just straightforward economic thought."

The mayor yesterday morning met with representatives of the community's largest 25 industries.

Most of the executives voiced enthusiasm for the Mayor's job program and expressed a willingness to help.

The Voluntary Adviser Corps last year had about 465 volunteers working with 695 "unemployables." It is headed by Sylvester Rowe.

Lugar has been working with executives of major industries for the last two weeks to complete the plans for the total job program.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News, Mar. 2, 1968]

NO POOLS OF CASH: LUGAR ASKS WAR ON RACE INJUSTICE, UNEMPLOYMENT

A "useful year" program calling on residents of Indianapolis to wage their own war against the city's problems of racial inequalities and unemployment was outlined last night by Mayor Richard G. Lugar.

Bluntly, Lugar said, "There are no fresh

sources for funds available. Pools of cash do not exist and Congress is not likely to create them."

He then threw the hope for a quiet summer in the laps of the people.

Lugar challenged Indianapolis to learn how to get its "teeth into the problems" and asked for 2,000 volunteers to find jobs for the city's youth and the unemployed.

Making his appeal on television, he asked residents to join the Volunteer Adviser Corps.

JOB PLACEMENT TECHNIQUE OFFERED

"We need people who will give up their time and spend it trying to locate another person in a job. If you are interested in helping, we will provide you with all the techniques of job placement, give you an assignment in placing one of your fellow residents in work opportunity."

Lugar's outline for finding employment and employes:

1. All youths interested in finding summer jobs and permanent employment, contact the Youth Employment Center, 145 W. Washington.

2. All adults interested in permanent employment, contact the Employment Center, 145 W. Washington.

3. Employers interested in hiring youth for summer work or permanent employes, contact Employer Headquarters, Flanner House, 333 W. 16th.

4. Persons wishing to help an unemployed person or youth with job placement, contact Volunteer Adviser Corps, 320 N. Meridian, Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce project.

5. College students wishing to help with playground supervision and city schools this summer should call the mayor's office.

6. Indianapolis public schools will accept all pupils who desire further education this summer and urge everyone to encourage dropouts to return to school.

7. High school seniors not planning on attending college, but seeking permanent jobs, should attend job interviews May 7 and 8 at Indianapolis high schools.

Lugar this week returned from Washington, where he met with mayors of large American cities and attended a briefing on the Kerner civil disorders report.

He said he was convinced Indianapolis could solve its problems and become a stronger community.

TROUBLEMAKERS GET STERN WARNING

"My administration, and I hope all Indianapolis, is determined to do all things our conscience dictates in making this a stronger city."

Lugar also warned the small minority that feeds on crime and disorder.

"Self-styled leaders have talked about a long, hot summer. This is dead center thinking, lazy and sloppy thinking, and I'm tired of listening to it.

"They would like to cause harm at any time of year while others wait, ready to take advantage of the breakdown of law and order. Others would like to romanticize about the downfall of the power structure and how the community is down on its knees."

He told how the nation is presently obsessed with law and order in its arming itself to the teeth.

"But there will be no tanks or machine guns in Indianapolis. These people who are intent on causing trouble and like it, simply do not like other persons and probably never will."

STOKELY WILL COORDINATE PLAN

He predicted swift arrest and trial according to due process of law for troublemakers.

Lugar said Alfred Stokely of Stokely-Van Camp will coordinate the local program in conjunction with a national plan headed by Henry Ford.

The mayor was accompanied to the television studio by his wife for the live broadcast. A receptionist at the studio, 10 minutes after the 9:30 to 10 p.m. broadcast, said at least four people called to compliment the mayor on his "Report to the People."

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News, Mar. 5, 1968]

LUGAR NAMES JOBFINDING TASK FORCE

Mayor Richard G. Lugar yesterday announced the formation of a Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee task force to direct his war against unemployment.

Juan C. Solomon, a personnel representative for Eli Lilly & Co., has been loaned to the GIPC to serve as chairman of the new jobfinding group, Lugar said at a press conference.

Others named by Lugar to the special committee are:

Alfred Stokely, president of Stokely-Van-Camp Inc.

Dr. Harold Wisely, vice-president of industrial relations for the Lilly firms.

Jack Reich, president of the GIPC.

H. Prentice Browning, president of the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce.

Ron Johnson, associate director of the Indianapolis Urban League.

The mayor also said Stokely will serve as director of the Indianapolis Metropolitan Alliance of Business, a local group formed as part of a national plan to urge businesses to make more jobs available.

Lugar announced details of his plan to aid the hard-core unemployed and appealed for citizen support and assistance in a speech Friday night.

As a result of his appeal for volunteers to help people find jobs, several hundred persons have offered their services in calls to the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce office, according to a representative of the Chamber.

In other action Lugar accepted a distinguished achievement award won by the city in the 1967 National Cleanup contest. The plaque was presented to the mayor by Mrs. Alex Clark, chairman of the Indianapolis Yard Parks Beautification Committee.

Lugar also announced that he will hold his second citizens day Thursday between 4 and 6 p.m. to give Indianapolis residents a chance to bring their problems directly to the mayor.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, Mar. 5, 1968]

JOBLESS AID PLEA BRINGS BIG VOLUNTEER RESPONSE

"Overwhelming response" to Mayor Richard G. Lugar's call for volunteers to assist unemployed persons was reported yesterday.

Sylvester E. Rowe, director of the Voluntary Advisers Corps, said he received about 250 inquiries concerning the program yesterday.

Sixty-five persons made additional pledges of assistance and countless others have expressed keen interest, Rowe said.

Business firms, civic organizations and individuals have responded "in a gratifying fashion," Rowe added.

The Notre Dame Club of Indianapolis is considering VAC as a club project, Rowe said, adding that several businesses are soliciting membership in VAC among employes.

Rowe said several church groups told him they planned to include the job program as part of their civic work.

Friday, Mayor Lugar issued a plea for citizen assistance in dealing with hard-core unemployed persons—those who have difficulty in finding and keeping a job.

Lugar suggested persons interested in aiding their community should join the VAC and work with unemployed persons.

The corps, a project of the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, assigns volunteers—men and women—to unemployed persons who are called candidates.

In 1967, VAC received 695 candidates and placed 359 in jobs.

Persons needing jobs or wishing to volunteer or firms who want to hire persons referred to VAC may notify the corps, 320 North Meridian Street, or telephone 635-6423.

"Now that we have the workers we need to hear from those who need the jobs," Rowe said.

Rowe said he also has had offers of volunteer office help in the corps offices in response to Lugar's plea.

Employment information also may be obtained at the Employment Center, 145 West Washington Street.

In other job news yesterday, Mayor Lugar named Juan C. Solomon, a personnel representative for Eli Lilly & Co., chairman of a newly formed unemployment task force of the Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee.

Others named to the new task force include: Alfred J. Stokely, president of Stokely-Van Camp Inc.; Dr. Harold M. Wisely, vice-president of industrial relations for the Lilly firm; Jack E. Reich, president of the GIPC; H. Prentice Browning, president of the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, and Ronald E. Johnson, associate director of the Indianapolis Urban League.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, Mar. 6, 1968]

WHO'S THAT HOOSIER?

Mayor Richard G. Lugar will surely be chastised or worse the next time he gets together with his fellow United States mayors at one of those posh municipal conventions.

Last week, while many executives of major U.S. urban centers were begging Congress for more Federal money to help solve burgeoning urban-racial problems, Mayor Lugar was proposing a "let's do it ourselves" program.

Blasphemy! Sacrilege! Whoever heard of solving unemployment, housing, transportation and other problems without advice and money from the land of the Great White Father?

No one can end racial discrimination except the Washington bureaucrats!

Lugar really should know better. Even the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders calls for the delivery of freight cars filled with money to the cities or else we will become two nations—one black and one white.

Now comes the relatively inexperienced mayor from Hoosierland saying that while the cities are waiting for the fairy godmother of money in Washington to wave her magic wand, they should be doing something themselves to aid the victims of blight and intolerant ignorance.

Lugar's plea for citizen participation in easing local unemployment problems was almost simultaneous with the hopelessness-weighted pleas of the six so-called big-city mayors.

They are probably mumbling right now in Washington, "Who is this dumb Hoosier in Indianapolis who dares to contradict such successful mayors as John V. Lindsay of New York City; Hugh Addonizio of Newark, N.J., and Jerome P. Cavanagh of Detroit?"

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News, Mar. 15, 1968]

JOBS-FOR-ALL CAMPAIGN IS PUSHED

(By Skip Hess)

The eight-county metropolitan Indianapolis area is dotted with 13,100 unemployed persons and the Indiana Employment Service lists slightly more than 1,000 available job openings, but the situation is not as critical as it might appear.

The IES is quick to explain that two-thirds of the unemployed are looking for unskilled and service-type jobs, and, that there is a projection of 6,000 new jobs this year with the greatest need in the fields of clerical and sales.

This, of course, leaves a need for 7,000 more jobs, but the IES explains further that

jobless construction workers are "coming into their work season" and that a small amount of the unemployed will be picking up pay checks in landscaping and outside work.

And, the IES says there is only 3 per cent unemployment in the metropolitan area.

Add to the strong, diversified economy of Indianapolis, the new trend in employer hiring, and Mayor Richard G. Lugar possibly may be well on his way to cooling a long, hot summer in 1968.

In his March 1 speech to Indianapolis, Lugar said the "hot summer" views of some cities are "lazy and sloppy thinking" and of no "absolute value." He also stated he is "weary of listening to a lot of sheer rubbish from persons of national repute who ought to know better."

The mayor vowed to "help another man to find and hold a job by giving a helping hand" and began to plan projects virtually to eliminate unemployment for persons wanting to work.

He appointed Juan C. Soloman as chairman of the Mayor's Employment Task Force, and set a goal of "unifying and co-ordinating existing services carried out by business, community and governmental agencies toward the training and employment of the economically deprived."

Yesterday, representatives of 20 companies took the first big step toward the "new hiring trend" by interviewing men and women of all ages who are seeking employment in the Martindale Avenue neighborhood.

Lugar said "Many employers are eager to come directly to neighborhood facilities to make the interviewing process easier. We do not want transportation problems or fear of a potential closed door policy to stand in the way of someone seeking a job."

Employers also are considering a change in methods of hiring unskilled persons. Instead of requiring a worker to have a high school or college education, for example, the employer will test the applicant and evaluate the man's skills.

Should the man qualify for a job, he need not worry about being passed over because of not having experience or education requirements, which have been demanded in the past.

The employer, therefore, is taking a realistic look at hiring unskilled labor.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News, Mar. 23, 1968]

VAC MAY HAVE TO HIRE HELP

(By Skip Hess)

The Voluntary Adviser Corps has worked itself into a position where it may have to hire jobless persons to carry out its program.

Requests by the VAC for unemployed persons to contact its office have resulted in an overwhelming response by job seekers. The staff of five for the Chamber of Commerce program admits the response is more than it can handle at this time.

Co-ordinators are working from 12 to 16 hours a day, but insists that even a 25-hour work day wouldn't solve their immediate problem.

And the problem is that the number of persons seeking jobs is more than double the volunteers available to meet the "one-volunteer-for-one-job seeker" program.

Lawrence Carroll, associate director of the Committee for Employment Opportunity, which directs the VAC, said yesterday about 400 persons has requested assistance in finding, and keeping jobs, but that the VAC is at a standstill until more volunteers can be found and trained.

MAIN REQUIREMENT IS RESPONSIBILITY

Carroll stressed "a volunteer can be anybody who sincerely wants to help. I don't think a lot of people understand that we aren't looking for persons only in executive positions. We simply want responsible people."

Sylvester E. Rowe, a director at the VAC said anyone interested in becoming a volunteer should contact the office at 320 N. Meridian (635–6423).

According to VAC, said ideal volunteers are "persons who are willing to assist job seekers who may be discouraged or slow in learning and persons who are willing to guide job seekers through the steps leading to steady employment."

The duties of a volunteer are:

1. Interview a candidate at his home.
2. Uncover his employment problems.
3. Refer him, through the VAC, to professionals who solve these problems.
4. Train a candidate to take job interviews.
5. Help him adjust to his new job.

The VAC offers individual volunteers a two-session training course conducted by members of the corps' professional staff. The voluntary adviser then spends an average of two hours per week for six to eight weeks helping the candidate.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News, Mar. 27, 1968]

LUGAR ASKS HELP OF SUBURBAN TOWNS IN JOB WAR

Indianapolis Mayor Richard G. Lugar's war on unemployment, aimed largely at the city's disadvantaged youths and hard core unemployed, reached into the suburbs.

Lugar played host to the mayors of four suburban cities and a town board president and explained the metropolitan aspects of the unemployment war, the fingers of which soon will be touching counties adjacent to Marion County.

Lugar said some of the agencies seeking out employers to pledge jobs for the hard core unemployed will in the near future begin making forays into the surrounding counties.

The suburban chief executives who spoke indicated they did not have any hard core unemployment problems, but pledged co-operation in any way possible in a metropolitan program.

Lugar asked them to keep their fingers on the employment picture in their cities and to co-operate in providing information on when and where jobs open that might be filled by hard core unemployed persons.

The term hard core unemployed is applied to persons 16 to 24 years old or over 45 who are school dropouts, members of minority groups or handicapped, and for numerous reasons ranging from illiteracy to criminal records, have histories of not being able to hold jobs.

The suburban officials who attended included: Mayor Joe Butler, Noblesville; Mayor Ralph VanNatta, Shelbyville; Mayor Berry S. Hurley, Greenfield; Mayor James D. Gardner, Martinsville; Walter Land, Danville Town Board president.

The immediate goal of 20 agencies involved in the unemployment war is to have 600 hard core unemployed persons on the job by June, 1969, and to provide 2,500 jobs this summer for disadvantaged youths who may need employment to be able to remain in school.

It is believed the bulk of the estimated 3,000 to 5,000 hard core unemployed live in Center Township. Lugar pointed out no one yet knows exactly how many of these people there are because many of them do not seek help.

Many of them, however, can be found on the welfare rolls.

The idea said Jaun C. Solomon, an Eli Lilly & Co. executive on loan to the city as co-chairman of the employment task force, is to make these people "taxpaying instead of tax eating citizens."

Yesterday's session was held at the behest also of Alfred J. Stokely, who is metropolitan chairman for the National Alliance of Businessmen. The formation of a national NAB committee to combat unemployment in the nation was announced recently by President Johnson.

Indianapolis is one of the NAB's 50 target cities.

Stokely promised the suburban mayors they would be kept abreast of all the activities in the metropolitan area. He is a co-chairman of the task force.

Other groups involved in the unemployment war, which was begun here early this month, include: The Volunteer Advisers Corps of the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce; the On The Job Training Center of Community Action Against Poverty, Inc.; the Indianapolis Board For Fundamental Education.

WARNER-SWASEY CO.—A PRIVATE ENTERPRISE PLAN TO PROVIDE LOW-COST HOUSING

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, recently, President Johnson sent a special message to the Congress outlining the dramatic need for a new and expanded housing program in the Nation's cities. In addition, the report issued recently by the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders underlined the need for expanded efforts to provide decent housing to all our citizens. As the primary sponsor of the bill which established the Department of Housing and Urban Development, I, too, have long been interested in the housing problem.

The housing problem affects all citizens. In larger cities, employees of business and industry are no longer able to live near the stores or industrial plants where they work. The inner cities, once the neighborhoods of responsible middle-class workers, have today deteriorated into slums. Men and women, because of the high increase of crime, are increasingly reluctant to live or work in these areas. The cost of plant security is going up, and welfare costs of the cities are going up. All of these things have a direct impact on inner city industry and on employment opportunities for those who live in the inner city.

Much has already been said about the need for business involvement in the problems of our cities, particularly with reference to the problem of adequate and decent housing. Many imaginative proposals have been introduced in both Houses of Congress to promote and encourage such participation.

One of the first firm commitments, on a large scale, of such help from industry and business is by the Warner Swasey Co. of Cleveland, Ohio. This company deliberately involved itself in the problems of the slum area immediately adjacent to one of the company's factories. The benefits both to the company and to the surrounding community have been very substantial. Warner Swasey's achievements can well serve as a model for other companies anxious to contribute to the solutions of the problems of their own cities.

The Warner Swasey Co. has had a long

record of stressing the need for private enterprise to take a stand in matters that affect our national well-being. Through advertisements and other means, the company has made clear its belief, which I share, that private business cannot completely abandon to Government the responsibility for healthy communities.

Warner Swasey management studied the problem and found that Cleveland's slum problem centers around Hough, an inner city area of neglected and dilapidated buildings, many vacant and vandalized. It is an area of staggering social problems—poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, overpopulation, and racial tension. It is a large area spreading slowly into the rest of prosperous, booming Cleveland. Hough is an area riddled with landlord neglect and tenant abuse. Urban renewal, so far, has had only limited success in solving Hough's housing problem. Warner Swasey's main plant and general offices are on the edge of Hough.

Warner Swasey's president is a strong and outspoken believer in the free enterprise system as well as a member of several civic committees. He decided that the time had come for industry to participate directly in Cleveland's housing problem, for the corporate citizen to shoulder the responsibilities of citizenship.

With this objective in mind, a representative of Warner Swasey went into the Hough area in search of an apartment building. The company planned to renovate this building and to make it a profitable, useful part of the community. This building was to be an experimental project designed to prove that rehabilitation could be done at reasonable costs when done under business management; and that this renovation could be accomplished in less time than those projects undertaken directly by the Government. If this project proved successful, it would act as a yardstick for other interested companies and encourage them to begin their own projects to solve some of the cities' problems.

The project of Warner Swasey had a formula:

First. The financing would be company funds, not those of the Government.

Second. Renovation would be suited to FHA specifications.

Third. The project would be accomplished, from start to finish, as though Warner Swasey were a nonprofit organization applying for a loan. This was done to enable the apartment to be taken over by a nonprofit organization upon completion of the project.

Although dilapidated apartment buildings were plentiful, selecting and buying one was another matter. First, the company decided that the building should be located on a street or a block which offered the renovated building some chance of success, where there were enough responsible citizens to offer effective support. Second, the building had to be acquired at a low per-unit price that would leave maximum funds for rehabilitation.

As the first step in launching the project, Warner Swasey asked for and obtained the assistance and cooperation of Negro leaders in the area. Together they found a building which seemed to meet all requirements. It was a structurally sound, 18-unit, four-floor brick building over 40 years old. It was badly abused, clothed in filth and decay, with scores of code violations against it. It was, by anyone's standards, not fit for human habitation.

The building was in a declared urban renewal area. Across the street, the city owned the vacant land where garden apartments and townhouses would someday be built. A block away was a metropolitan housing project; a few short blocks to the south, the site of the city's planned multipurpose center for recreation, health, and social services. The company believed that this area provided the opportunity to prove that a neighborhood could be brought back to a healthy, useful status through cooperation between local government, private industry, and the citizens of the area.

The building was obtained by direct purchase without options, go-betweens, or Government writedown.

After the building was acquired, Warner Swasey sat down with several Negro leaders, outlined their plans, and requested the leaders' support. The company proposed restoration of the building to its original 13 apartments. In this way, each apartment would have three bedrooms to take care of larger families. The building would be renovated by sections in order that the tenants might remain and not add to the relocation problem. For those required to move, the company relocated them in the immediate neighborhood.

All of the tenants originally residing in the building were given priority in obtaining suites in the renovated building, providing, of course, that the size of their families was right for the three-bedroom suites.

The next step was to establish "believeability." There was and still is a set pattern in Hough, as in many other cities, generated by past experience with urban renewal. Point the finger of urban renewal at a specific building and the tenants depart. Almost overnight, vandals move in to leave the building an empty shell. There are buildings in the area without a light fixture, plumbing fixtures, radiators or boiler. Electrical wiring and sewer piping have been ripped out to be sold as junk metal. This fate was avoided by the Warner Swasey Co. because of the cooperation of the Negro leaders.

By spreading the word of the company's intentions to tenants and close neighbors before the project was announced publically in the newspapers, the needed "believability" was established. No tenant left and no vandalism occurred.

The company deliberately selected a Negro contractor. There are no large Negro contractors in Cleveland and, therefore, the one chosen was a small one. He had no experience in rehabilitation previously, nor did he have a trained staff. Consequently, organization of the work, planning, scheduling, and supervision suffered and the job took longer than initially planned. The Warner Swasey Co. feels that this situation will be eliminated with its next project.

Overall, the costs, as recorded with the FHA last December 15, were $114,000 plus $15,000 acquisition for a total of $129,000. These costs are recoverable.

It is fallacious to compare rehabilitation projects on a unit basis, that is, a one-bedroom unit compared with a three-bedroom unit. Units in the Warner Swasey project were three-bedroom with over 1,000 square feet each. It seems preferable to compare this housing on a per livable room basis. The total cost on this basis breaks down as:

Number units	13
Number rooms	71.5
Cost per room rehabilitation	$1,605
Total cost per room	$1,800

It should be noted that some rehabilitation projects have run as high as $2,500 per room. The Warner Swasey project costs were reasonably low due mainly to the added factor of effective and efficient business management techniques.

Another challenge to the sponsor of a rehabilitation project is maintenance. Often the people living in renovated apartments are not accustomed or acclimated to urban living at the level that standard modern living units require. Without some form of guidance and counseling, these buildings have soon deteriorated again into substandard housing.

Recognizing this problem, Warner Swasey took steps to avoid it. The company turned over the completed building immediately to those persons who could handle the maintenance problem. The new owner was the St. John-St. James Housing Corp., a nonprofit corporation formed by two of the largest AME churches in Cleveland. This gave the housing project the unique status of being Negro-owned, Negro-operated, and Negro-occupied. Working in conjunction with this organization was the Urban League of Cleveland which agreed to support the project by providing counseling and training service to the tenants. The result to date—the first tenants having moved in the last of June—has been the very satisfactory maintenance of the building.

It must be noted that rent subsidy was the key to the feasibility of the Warner Swasey project. The nonprofit corporation now operating this building also has rent subsidy and by this medium is able to provide housing for the low-income group. Incidentally, the occupants of the building have a rather wide range of rents. There are people who are paying full economic rent for the building, currently $133, as well as those who pay only $65.

The Warner Swasey project has been so successful that they are now engaged in planning and developing a new project, the rehabilitation of single family dwellings for resale to low-income purchasers. This will be under FHA's 221(h) program and will be aimed at making taxpaying, homeowning citizens out of tenants, to give them added incentive and pride in building and maintaining a good neighborhood.

A second area of involvement by the company is the Cleveland Revolving Fund, Inc. formed by Warner Swasey

and five other concerned companies: Clevite Corp., E. F. Hauserman Co., Midland-Ross Corp., Republic Steel Corp., and the East Ohio Gas Co. This plan is aimed at the Mount Pleasant area of Cleveland.

Mount Pleasant is a good residential area on the decline. It is not a slum, as is Hough, but it soon will be if preventive measures are not taken. It has not yet been declared an urban renewal area, and, therefore, many forms of Government assistance are not yet available.

The revolving fund serves as a focal point for knowledgeable businessmen to bring their strength, talent and know-how to bear on city problems. The venture is financed through a fund provided by a $25,000 commitment per company. The revolving fund is not a contribution. The funds will be recovered when the need for them is reasonably past. Control is exercised by a board made up of one representative from each participating company. The fund assists in financing projects which might otherwise be delayed; making advances to small nonprofit organizations seeking FHA loans; guaranteeing loans for low-income borrowers; and supporting the formation of nonprofit cooperatives or condominiums.

While some 19 projects are underway or completed, maximum use of the fund's capabilities has not been made. Nonetheless, it has been reported that the Cleveland revolving fund has made more progress in the housing field in its brief existence than any other local organization.

Realizing that the Mount Pleasant program will be a slow process, dependent upon community participation and community leadership, neither of which contributes to rapid action, the board has sought other plans for actively assisting in the housing problem. A proposal is now being studied to expand the Cleveland revolving fund into a development corporation through which business and industry, with the assistance of Government-insured loans, can undertake large-scale neighborhood renewal. This could well be a major contribution toward reviving the inner city as a healthy and worthwhile community.

The housing problems of the inner city are tremendous. They will not be solved by miracles. In Cleveland alone, the problem is so great that there are simply not enough contractors or enough skilled workers to do the job. This should not stop business and industry from participating in the solving of city problems. To get on with the job, however, Warner Swasey felt that many major roadblocks must be removed:

First. Both business and Government must come to grips with the practical realities of housing problems.

Second. There is an urgent need for local and State tax abatement for low-income housing projects.

Third. The construction industry must develop new techniques and better coordination among subcontractors; advantage must be taken more fully of prefabrication and preassembly and newly available materials; and provisions for crossing trade lines in rehabilitation work must be made.

Fourth. The FHA should overhaul its requirements and come up with realistic ones for rehabilitation, not insisting initially upon strict adherence to new house standards. The fundamental requirement should be that rehabilitated units be clean, sanitary, decent, and in keeping with their level of housing.

Fifth. The FHA should heed the advice of its Commissioner who said that the FHA should go looking for applications, should eliminate the negativism and the tortuous slowness of its processing of multifamily applications.

A healthy surrounding community is the best safeguard a business can have to insure its own long-range success. The investment in time and money made by the Warner Swasey Co. of Cleveland, Ohio, was not merely an exercise in social reform, it was an investment in community preservation. I salute the fine work of the Warner Swasey Co. I offer their achievements as an example well deserving of recognition and imitation by business and industry in all cities of America. I am hopeful that this champion of industry and social reform will be able to lead other segments of private enterprise into the crusade for suitable and pleasant housing for all our citizens.

Warney Swasey has shown that it can be done. The company's achievement is remarkable and substantial. I am urging industry and civic groups in my congressional district to use this project as a basis for action in our community.

I am sure my colleagues in the House are equally interested. A nationwide program could have phenomenal impact and benefit.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of our colleagues a recent editorial in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin concerning the civil rights bill, which I include at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with the editorial's position that "national politics as well as national need militate for a strong bill" and the Senate-passed bill must be accepted by the House and sent to the President as soon as possible. While the Senate-passed bill does not go as far as some of us would like to see, nonetheless, it is a great step forward in protecting civil rights and in making housing more readily available to all of our citizens regardless of race, color or creed. We cannot risk having the bill returned to conference and be threatened with another filibuster in the other body. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative next week that the Rules Committee act to permit the Senate-passed bill to be taken up on the House floor and sent to the President without change.

The editorial follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS FLAMENCO

The footwork in the House of Representatives around the civil rights bill would put a Spanish flamenco troupe to shame. But it is time now for the dancing to end and action to begin.

Briefly, what has happened is that the Rules Committee, by an 8–7 vote, acted to hold up until April 9 a House vote on the civil rights package passed by the Senate. The dangerous bind here is that the House begins a ten-day Easter recess two days later and may not have time to vote before leaving.

There seems in the Rules Committee action, then, a strong measure of calculated intent to do in the bill. It might be noted that all five Republican members joined three Democrats to form the majority of eight.

On top of that, Minority Leader Gerald Ford has been urging that the majority circumvent the Rules Committee and send the measure to a conference committee with senators to work something out. The clear intent, which he expressed in the recent past, is to water down the fair housing section, which in the Senate version would bar discrimination in sales and rentals of 80% of the nation's housing.

Mr. Ford has said that if the conferees couldn't reach agreement in ten days, he would go for the full-strength bill. The footwork, however, is too heavy in the heels. If Mr. Ford is genuinely agreeable to a housing bill up to Senate strength, all he has to do is "unleash" one or two GOP members of the Rules Committee and let it come on for a vote.

The most hopeful sign at the moment is the pressure being brought to bear on him and other House Republicans by men like Richard Nixon and Nelson Rockefeller.

National politics as well as national need militate for a strong bill and this may yet result in the equivalent of a "Dirksen flip-flop" in the House.

KUPFERMAN AND CHRISTMAN ON SAVING THE CITIES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal is not merely a barometer of business finance. Among many other things, it is concerned with the hard headed facts of municipal budgets and urban decay and the need for meeting the problems of our cities in the 20th century.

Because of our similar interest, Henry Christman, director of the New York City Record in Mayor John V. Lindsay's cabinet, and I presented to the Wall Street Journal a viable program for the future in aid of metropolitan taxpayers.

Our article appears in the Journal of Monday, April 1, 1968, together with their editorial comment.

I know my colleagues will be interested.

TO THE AID OF METROPOLITAN TAXPAYERS

(By THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN and Henry M. Christman [1])

Will taxes destroy America's metropolitan civilization?

[1] Mr. Kupferman, a Republican Congressman, represents New York's 17th Congressional district. Mr. Christman is director of the City Record of New York and a member of Mayor Lindsay's cabinet. Their article describes several tax reform bills being introduced by Rep. Kupferman. An editorial on this subject appears on this page today.

The question is posed in all seriousness. The metropolitan middle class, the backbone of urban culture, is proportionally the most heavily taxed segment of American society. And it is not simply the welfare and future of the metropolitan middle class that is at stake, but also the very nature and future of American life and culture itself.

The problem has been vastly accelerated by inflation, urban decay, increasing costs of government at all levels and, most especially, overseas military commitments. Suddenly, almost without knowing it, we are at the crossroads.

It would be some consolation, at least, if the crushing tax burdens carried by the metropolitan middle classes were serving to revitalize their own metropolitan areas; not only would there be the moral satisfaction of resolving the problems of their underprivileged fellow citizens, but also the resulting economic prosperity that would be of eventual direct benefit to the middle-class taxpayer.

TEMPORARY PALLIATIVE

Tragically, such is not the case. The small proportion of Federal tax revenue presently allocated to urban problems is ridiculously inadequate; this relative pittance is only a temporary palliative that perpetuates basic problems, not solves them.

The needs of the urban underprivileged can be met, and must be met. But the needs of the urban and suburban middle class also must be met, so that they may have the means to play their historic and vital role in American society. These goals are not contradictory; indeed, they must go hand in hand.

New York City presents the most extreme and most desperate case study. The U.S. Department of Labor recently released statistics indicating that, as of fall 1967, a minimum income of $10,195 was required to provide a basic, "moderate" standard of living for a family of four in New York City. Other statistics reveal that, in only a decade, the cost of living in New York City has almost doubled. What this means, of course, is that any real increases in middle-class income have been virtually wiped out.

Recent studies have shown that it is the individual taxpayer in the $10,000 to $20,000 bracket who is proportionally the most heavily taxed American. It is the metropolitan American in this tax bracket, living in cities and suburbs, who is carrying the heaviest tax burden. It is, in short, the very American upon whom public causes and the arts must depend for their support, indeed their very existence.

One of the major inequities of the present tax structure is that it takes no account whatever of the great variance in the cost of living in different sections of the nation. A metropolitan citizen may have to earn up to several times as much money as a citizen in a rural area simply to have a comparable standard of living. And that metropolitan citizen will pay many times the amount of Federal income tax of his comparable country cousin, plus all his local metropolitan taxes. So it is the metropolitan taxpayer who carries the real burden of national taxes.

The answer is "Metro-Aid."

CREDITING LOCAL TAXES

Present tax regulations provide that, if a taxpayer itemizes his personal deductions on his Federal income tax return, he is permitted to deduct local taxes from his gross income. Under "Metro-Aid," every taxpayer, whether or not he itemizes, would be permitted to credit all his local taxes directly against the Federal income tax itself, up to 25% of the Federal income tax.

The implications of such a tax reform are sweeping. For instance, the consequence for the heavily taxed residents of New York City would be an immediate tax cut of almost $3 billion annually. For the New York City metropolitan area, the annual total tax cut would amount to perhaps $5 billion.

California also would be a major beneficiary; the Los Angeles metropolitan area alone would receive several billion dollars annually. The Chicago metropolitan area, the Philadelphia metropolitan area and the Detroit metropolitan area would receive perhaps $1 billion apiece every year, with corresponding amounts for other metropolitan areas across the nation.

To say that such a tax cut would greatly assist America's hard-pressed major cities and their adjacent suburbs is an understatement; it would bring them new prosperity immediately.

And the long-range implications are even more important. This reform would mean that America's major cities would be able to retain at home the money needed to meet urgent urban problems, rather than have this much-needed money drained off to Washington. It would eliminate the need for cities to beg Washington and their respective state capitols for essential funds. It would eliminate the costly overhead of present Federal urban and antipoverty programs. And the metropolitan taxpayer would at last carry only a fair tax load, rather than a disproportionately high Federal income tax plus growing local taxes.

Of course, there will be opposition from the fiscal agencies of the Federal Executive, which almost automatically resist and reject any proposal, no matter how worthy, that would decrease Federal revenue.

But a meaningful alternative must be found immediately to the present situation, in which local governments basically have only two ways in which to raise additional operating funds—either increase local taxes or beg the Federal and state governments for more aid. To tell how well this present system works, one need only take a look at the condition of the cities across the nation.

Several other reforms go hand-in-hand with "Metro-Aid."

Tax laws concerning education, culture and the professions must be reformed. Our national policy is supposed to be to encourage everyone to secure as much education as possible. But this encouragement certainly does not extend to present tax laws, which permit the cost of education to be deducted only if it pertains directly to the occupation of the taxpayer. All educational costs and expenses incurred in conjunction with study at any accredited educational institution should be completely tax-deductible.

Again, national policy is supposed to be to encourage creative cultural activities. Many other nations give special tax incentives to creative persons who are devoting their lives to the arts and letters. Our present tax policy, however, does not encourage authors and artists; on the contrary, it discriminates against them. For example, an inventor of some gadget of strictly commercial value receives favorable capital gains tax rates, while the creator of a cultural product, such as an author or artist, whose product may have limited commercial appeal, must pay at much higher income-tax rates.

Professionals and businessmen must be encouraged not only to stay in metropolitan areas, but also to take a direct, pioneering role in local community development. Businessmen should hire and train disadvantaged youths, and the Federal Government should encourage them to do so by offering attractive tax credits. And professionals such as physicians, dentists and attorneys should be given tax write-off privileges for donations of their services.

No survey of present tax inequities would be complete without reference to the problems of the Social Security recipient and of the single taxpayer. And frequently, these are one and the same person. Not all of our senior citizens are in metropolitan areas; but a very high proportion of them are, and that proportion is rapidly increasing. These urban and suburban senior citizens face the additional problem of higher living expenses in metropolitan areas, and therefore deserve special attention.

NOT A CHARITY

Under current laws, a Social Security recipient can receive unlimited amounts of unearned income and still receive Social Security, while if the recipient earns more than a purely nominal amount, his Social Security payments are suspended. Consequently, many middle class citizens are compelled to forego Social Security altogether and continue to work fulltime. Moreover, these persons of moderate means are being denied their own contributions to the Social Security System over the years—for, after all, Social Security is a right toward which they have contributed, not a charity.

Present income restrictions on Social Security recipients should be removed. Moreover, head-of-household tax benefits should be extended to all widows, widowers, legally separated or single individuals 35 years of age or older.

Taken together, the various tax proposals in this article point the way in which American metropolitan areas can be given the means to cope with their overwhelming financial problems. Moreover, this approach does not sacrifice the interests of any group of citizens, urban or suburban, underprivileged or middle class.

Only a few weeks ago, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations of the Federal Government released a report that graphically outlines the problems facing American metropolitan areas. Characterizing the deterioration in American urban life as the greatest Federal crisis since the Civil War, the commission charged that the historic American system of local government is in danger of imminent social and economic collapse.

The time for action is now.

The Wall Street Journal editorial follows:

SAVING THE CITIES

It's no news to anyone that the trouble of America's cities are getting no better fast. The proposed approach to this problem outlined elsewhere on this page is thoughtful—but quite unrealistic.

Rep. Kupferman and Mr. Christman are well aware that Federal fiscal authorities will oppose the idea of allowing taxpayers to credit their local tax payments directly against their Federal income tax. The revenue loss would be enormous; the authors put it at $5 billion a year for the New York metropolitan area alone.

If the revenue loss were at least partly offset by elimination of present Federal urban-aid programs, expected to cost $12 billion in the next fiscal year, the result might be manageable. While Messrs. Kupferman and Christman do indicate that they have such a cutback in mind, it's highly unlikely that it could be made quickly enough to cover the fall of revenue.

Yet if the Federal Government did not sharply cut spending somewhere it might well face a huge rise in its inflationary budget deficit thus tending to raise the costs of cities (along with everything else) without providing for an increase in governmental services. Or else Washington would have to raise taxes, perhaps entirely offsetting any savings that taxpayers gained from the local-tax credit.

At the local level there would be problems too. The assumption is that the tax credit would make it possible for local governments to raise taxes without putting new burdens on the taxpayers. Higher local taxes, however, would mean bigger Federal tax credits, greater revenue loss, and possibly higher Federal levies. The outlook for individual taxpayers, middleclass or otherwise, would not be especially bright.

In any case, the solution to the cities' problems calls for a great deal more than money. By themselves, the glaring failures

of urban renewal should be sufficient proof of that; too often it has merely substituted new slums for old with little regard for the welfare of displaced inhabitants.

In such deteriorating conditions, one virtue of the Kupferman-Christman approach is that, unlike many "revenue-sharing" schemes, it implies that a large part of the fiscal responsibility must rest on local governments.

Many local governments, unfortunately, have been so enmeshed in politics and waste that they have made little effort to grapple with accumulating problems like the heavy in-migration of rural poor. They prefer to pass the buck to the states and, particularly, the Federal Government.

The first requisite, then, is a thorough overhaul of local governments; this has begun in some cities but it needs to go much farther. If conscientiously carried out, it would provide the cities with a good deal of the revenue they claim they need.

Second, there should be a careful reappraisal and reallocation of governmental responsibilities among local, state and Federal governments. The reallocation should not be based on any state or local-rights ideology but strictly on hard decisions as to which level of government can handle each job most efficiently.

Finally, the governmental entity that is to handle the job should be charged with raising the needed revenue. Local and state officials are as human as anyone else; they will inevitably be much more responsible in spending the public's money if they must themselves extract it from the public through taxation.

Though it may be too much to expect sweeping governmental reform any time soon, at least the proposal offers some hope of solving many problems. That's more than can be said, we're afraid, for the Kupferman-Christman tax credit plan.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for April 2 and 3, 1968, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. BIESTER), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DORN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS to follow the remarks of Mr. ALBERT.

Mr. EDMONDSON and to include an address delivered yesterday to the National Association of Broadcasters by the President of the United States.

Mr. MONAGAN.

Mr. KYL to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BIESTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. ERLENBORN.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. SCHWEIKER in two instances.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. KLEPPE.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota.

Mr. WYMAN in three instances.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. BRAY in two instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON in four instances.

Mr. MCCLURE in two instances.

Mr. BETTS.

Mr. SNYDER in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PODELL.

Mr. RESNICK in two instances.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. WILLIS in two instances.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan in two instances.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina in two instances.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. JOELSON.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in six instances.

Mr. DINGELL in four instances.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. ROSENTHAL in two instances.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. POAGE.

Mr. HANLEY.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.

Mr. MONAGAN in two instances.

Mr. WHITENER.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.

Mr. PICKLE in two instances.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTIONS, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills, joint resolutions, and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1000. An act for the relief of Jack Nam Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1069. An act for the relief of Dr. Chung Chick Nahm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1749. An act for the relief of Dr. Enrique Jose Catasus Soto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1960. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Aucar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2165. An act for the relief of Rene E. Montero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2250. An act for the relief of Dr. Hugo Vincente Cartaya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2311. An act for the relief of Dr. Evelio Francisco Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2371. An act for the relief of Dr. Herman J. Lohman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2378. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio P. Amable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2383. An act for the relief of Dr. Francisco J. Menendez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2469. An act for the relief of Dr. Carlos Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2491. An act for the relief of Dr. Antonio Pinera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2501. An act for the relief of Dr. Fernando Rafael Boudet-Esteban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2504. An act for the relief of Dr. Martiniano L. Orta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2506. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Epifanio Morera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2581. An act for the relief of Dr. Edmee Serantes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2585. An act for the relief of Kap Rai Kim and Young Nam Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2720. An act for the relief of Heng Liong Thung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2745. An act to provide for the observance of the centennial of the signing of the 1868 Treaty of Peace between the Navajo Indian Tribe and the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 131. Joint resolution to designate May 20, 1968, as "Charlotte, N.C., Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary

S.J. Res. 142. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

S.J. Res. 143. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Caryl P. Haskins as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration

S.J. Res. 144. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. William A. M. Burden as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings on the establishment of a Commission on Balanced Economic Development and the creation of a Northwest Regional Services Corporation; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution to print, for the use of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, additional copies of its hearings on long-range program and research needs in aging; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to take action to insure the United States will derive maximum benefits from an expanded and intensified effort to increase the accuracy and extend the time range of weather predictions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 7325. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain Federal lands for certain lands owned by Mr. Robert S. Latham, Albany, Oreg.;

H.R. 10599. An act relating to the Tiwa Indians of Texas; and

H.R. 11254. An act for the relief of Jack L. Good.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the

House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 3, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1711. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the President's determination with respect to nuclear powered guided-missile frigates, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 90–22; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1712. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the President to reappoint as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for an additional term of 1 year, the officer serving in that position on April 1, 1968; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1713. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a report on United Nations peacekeeping, pursuant to the provisions of section 304 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (Public Law 90–137); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1714. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the followup review of causes of erroneous payments of military pay and allowances, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1715. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for the fiscal year July 1, 1966, to June 30, 1967; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1716. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved, according certain beneficiaries third preference and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1717. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the orders entered in certain cases of aliens who have been found admissable to the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1718. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d)(6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1719. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1720. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H.R. 16324. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. 24th report on unshackling local government (Rept. No. 1270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FARBSTEIN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report entitled "The Involvement of U.S. Private Enterprise in Developing Countries" (Rept. No. 1271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. Con. Res. 705. Concurrent resolution to assist veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere in obtaining suitable employment (Rept. No. 1272). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. Con. Res. 723. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to take action to insure the United States will derive maximum benefits from an expanded and intensified effort to increase the accuracy and extend the time range of weather predictions (Rept. No. 1273). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10417. A bill for the relief of Remco Industries, Incorporated; with amendment (Rept. No. 1265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8241. A bill for the relief of Victorino Severo Blanco (Rept. No. 1267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12115. A bill for the relief of Dr. Orlando L. Fernandez (Rept. No. 1268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 15462. A bill for the relief of Lennart Gordon Langhorne; with amendment (Rept. No. 1269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 16390. A bill to provide for an equitable sharing of the U.S. market by electronic articles of domestic and of foreign origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 16391. 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.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 16392. A bill to authorize the Army Corps of Engineers to initiate a 3-year appraisal report of our national tidal and Great Lakes shoreline; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 16393. 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. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 16394. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to the application of the labor certification requirement of section 212(a)(14), and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 16395. A bill to provide that Flag Day shall be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 16396. A bill to authorize participation by the United States in the construction of a dual-purpose electrical power generation and desalting plant in Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 16397. A bill to amend section 301(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to assistance to Arab refugees in the Near East through contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 16398. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 16399. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that any unmarried person who maintains his or her own home shall be entitled to be taxed at the rate provided for the head of a household; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 16400. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increased pensions, disability compensation rates, to liberalize income limitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 16401. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to create a U.S.-Flag Active National Reserve Fleet; to establish an Active National Reserve Fleet Revolving Fund; to promote the construction of U.S.-flag vessels; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 16402. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Delaware Nation of Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 337, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 16403. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative stamp marking the centennial of American college football; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 16404. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 16405. A bill to amend section 220(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act to permit motor carriers to file annual reports on the basis of a 13-period accounting year; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 16406. A bill to suspend the requirements of section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934 for the period of the 1968 presidential and vice-presidential campaigns; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 16407. A bill to modify the comprehensive plan for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 16408. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by strengthening and improving the Foreign Service personnel system of the Department of State and of the U.S. Information Agency; through establishment of a Foreign Service Information Officer Corps; through the extension of the Veterans Preference Act of 1944 to the Foreign Service Officer Corps, the Foreign Service Information Officer Corps, and the Foreign Service Staff Officer Corps; and through the establishment of an appeals procedure for Foreign Service officers and Foreign Service information officers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (for himself, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GUDE, Mr. ZWACH, and Mr. STEIGER of Arizona):

H.R. 16409. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teacher's Salary Act of 1955 to provide salary increases for teachers and school officers in the District of Columbia public schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 16410. A bill to provide that Flag Day shall be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 16411. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide that the entire cost of health benefits under such act shall be paid by the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 16412. A bill to provide a comprehensive national manpower policy, to improve the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, to authorize a community service employment program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 16413. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Ohio River National Parkway in the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 16414. A bill to provide for the authority for passenger vessels to operate as trade-fair exhibition ships; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 16415. A bill to amend section 101(a)(27)(D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG (for himself and Mr. ROGERS of Florida):

H.R. 16416. A bill to provide for orderly trade in fresh fruits and vegetables, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 16417. A bill to authorize the sale of military equipment by the United States to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUPPE (for himself and Mr. ESCH):

H.R. 16418. A bill to amend the college library assistance provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965 with respect to the application of such provisions to branch colleges; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 16419. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Washington County National Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona (for himself, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. WINN, Mr. GUDE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. ADAMS, and Mr. FRASER):

H.R. 16420. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to utilize volunteers for active police duty; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 16421. A bill to prohibit mineral exploration and development in certain Outer Continental Shelf lands lying off the coast of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 16422. A bill to amend section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 16423. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase, by providing an additional $600 exemption, the personal income tax exemptions allowable with respect to certain dependents and to disabled taxpayers or spouses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 16424. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the mailing of mail matters by relatives to members of the Armed Forces overseas at no cost to such relatives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 16425. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that payment of monthly benefits thereunder for any month shall be made no later than the first day of the following month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.J. Res. 1214. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the ratification of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.J. Res. 1215. 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. VIGORITO:

H.J. Res. 1216. 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. SCOTT:

H.J. Res. 1217. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the participation in nondenominational prayers in any building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H. Con. Res. 751. Concurrent resolution requiring appropriate committees of the Congress to consider and report whether further congressional action is desirable in respect to U.S. policies in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 752. Concurrent resolution to require France to pay its World War I debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL:

H. Con. Res. 753. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of the State of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 1120. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the right of all nations to free passage through certain international waterways; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 1121. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the establishment of peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

327. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, relative to advance participation payments under the Federal agricultural program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

328. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, relative to delegating power to the U.S. Secretary of Transportation to develop highway safety program standards; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 16426. A bill for the relief of Osvaldo Falanga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16427. A bill for the relief of Ignzio LoPiparo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16428. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Visone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 16429. A bill to provide for the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior of certain lands and interests in lands in Grand and Clear Creek Counties, Colo., in exchange for certain lands within the national forests of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 16430. A bill for the relief of Liza Youhanna, Jouliet Youhanna, Diana Youhanna and Janet Youhanna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 16431. A bill for the relief of Norman Fitz-Herbert Moses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 16432. A bill for the relief of Maria Cazzaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16433. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Galella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16434. A bill for the relief of Cosimo Marchesano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16435. A bill for the relief of Nunzio Occhipinti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 16436. A bill for the relief of Salvatore, Giovanna and Mary Lou Calandra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 16437. A bill for the relief of Emilie Abbochian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 16438. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chhabi Bhushan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16439. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tami Futazuka Haulsee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 16440. A bill for the relief of Maria Salome daCunha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16441. A bill for the relief of Maria Pereira de Medeiros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 16442. A bill for the relief of Pietro Commodaro and his wife, Vittorio Commodaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 16443. A bill for the relief of Carmela Lina Buttice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16444. A bill for the relief of Nandlal Om Kumar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 16445. A bill for the relief of Rosa Bassolino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 16446. A bill for the relief of Lenora Sams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.