happy to say that the State of Hawaii has risen to the challenges of this program as evidenced by its sister city affiliations and student and businessmen exchange programs. The little-people-to-little-people program would be an appropriate corollary to the adult program. It has great merit and is certainly deserving of all encouragement.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 12: 2: *Behold God is my salvation; I will trust and not be afraid.*

Eternal God, whose divine love always responds to those who truly seek Thee, we are again entering into fellowship with Thee through the gateway of prayer which is never closed to those who come unto Thee with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

May each new day be one of unclouded vision for our President, our Speaker, and all the chosen representatives of our Republic as they take counsel together and courageously seek to deliver suffering and struggling humanity from the evil forces of aggression and aggrandizement.

Purge us from everything which dwarfs and deadens our capacities for noble service and may we discharge all our duties and responsibilities with a pure and steadfast devotion.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York, Mr. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Chair makes the following appointments, which the Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-42, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Ottawa, Canada, from February 28 to March 4, 1962, the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], to fill the existing vacancies thereon.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 553) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That HAROLD M. RYAN, of Michigan, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Banking and Currency.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1961

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8399) relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 8399, with Mr. MAHON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] had 16 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] had 25 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, during the course of yesterday's debate a number of questions arose with regard to the fashion in which this bill, if enacted into law, would operate. In particular, there were questions with regard to an alleged conflict of responsibility between the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with regard to the effect of enactment of this legislation upon existing vocational education and on-the-job training programs. I will direct myself to those questions.

In practical operation the manpower retraining program would work something like this: First, the Secretary of Labor would, through the facilities of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the U.S. Employment Service and other divisions of the Department of Labor determine occupational——

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

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman going to be able to support the amendment that will be offered?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I wish to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I think the proposed amendment has a number of very good features and I support both the amendment and the bill.

Mr. KEARNS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the first step involves the selection through testing, interviewing and counseling of persons who are able and qualified to take training and want such training for new jobs. The jobs for which they will be trained would depend upon determinations by the Department of Labor and by the various State employment agencies. They would determine what the job needs and the training needs of their area were and they would select the occupations for which trainees would be trained.

Second, the States, under the provisions of their agreements with the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, would provide suitable training programs to equip selected trainees with the desired skills. They would use existing public and private vocational training schools and agencies and on-the-job training programs.

Mr. Chairman, during the debate yesterday, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM], raised a question with regard to the operation of other vocational training programs if this program were to be enacted into law. I think it should be made very clear at this point that, as far as trainees under this program go, they must be selected and referred to training by the State employment agencies; but this would in no way affect the operation of other vocational education programs and in particular it would not require a referral by the Secretary of Labor before taking part in existing programs such as the area vocational institute programs under the National Defense Education Act. They would continue as before.

The Federal Government would pay the cost of training under the act for unemployed trainees and up to 50 percent of the cost for trainees who have jobs of one sort or another and who are engaged in training for upgrading purposes.

During the course of the training program the Secretary would pay trainees a training allowance roughly equivalent to unemployment compensation benefits.

Persons being trained on on-the-job training programs would, of course, be receiving some payment from their employers and their training allowance would be reduced accordingly.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to this matter of training allowances, the com-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

mittee believes that training allowances are essential if this program is to work. Under the employment compensation laws of about two-thirds of the States, an unemployed person eligible for unemployment compensation and drawing unemployment compensation will lose his rights to those benefits if he undertakes a training program. When he undertakes a training program, he is considered no longer available for work and he is cut off from unemployment compensation. This feature of State unemployment compensation systems has been an important factor in inhibiting the use of training programs by unemployed persons. A man with a wife and two or three or four children can ill afford to give up his unemployment benefits, which he needs to pay the rent and to buy the groceries, to take a program of training. The proposal for training allowances is designed to make it possible for unemployed persons to take this training program and equip themselves for new employment without suffering a complete loss of income. They will receive an amount roughly equivalent to their unemployment compensation benefits while they are training.

Approximately one-third of the amount authorized to be appropriated will be allocated to teachers' salaries, equipment and rental of buildings which are aspects of vocational training traditionally supported by Federal funds. Approximately two-thirds of the total authorized to be appropriated would be expended for the payment of training allowances.

Finally, the bill provides for counseling and placement services through the State employment agencies for trainees who have successfully completed their courses.

Additional matter in the Holland bill sets forth the formula for the apportionment of Federal funds among the States, and provides safeguards to insure that the training offered is adequate to the purposes for which it is given, and to prevent States and other governmental units from substituting Federal programs under the act for existing local programs.

I think this last, Mr. Chairman, is a very important point because it is not our intention to merely subsidize existing vocational training programs. Funds under this act would be available only for additional training programs, over and above those presently being conducted. No State or locality could receive Federal funds for a training program under this act, if it were using those funds to reduce its local effort. They must maintain their level of local effort.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize that throughout this bill the utmost care has been taken to provide economical and efficient operation of the training program through maximum utilization of existing Federal and State agencies and avoiding duplication and overlapping of Federal and State efforts.

One of the ways we do this, Mr. Chairman, is through maintaining the traditional lines of authority of the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Throughout the history of such programs, the Secretary of Labor has been responsible for determining manpower needs and the referral and placement of jobseekers. We keep that function in the Department of Labor. We do not attempt to set up a new bureau within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to perform the same task.

We likewise keep on-the-job training under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Labor. That is where it has been and we do not want to make a change.

Similarly we bring in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who has responsibility for Federal vocational education programs. We retain his role of leadership of those programs. There is no change in the existing lines of Federal authority contrary to what some of the speakers yesterday might have indicated. But, nevertheless, this is the explanation for the fact that both the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are involved in the operation of this act.

Mr. Chairman, we do not pretend that the enactment of this bill is going to solve the Nation's unemployment problem. Indeed, under the 2-year operation of the act, only about 410,000 persons could receive training. The number of unemployed exceeds four million. But, we do believe we have a responsibility to make progress toward assisting those displaced from their jobs by technological change. That is what this bill does and I urge its enactment.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Fifty-six 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. 25]

Bennett, Mich.	Hagan Ga.	Passman
Bonner	Harrison, Va.	Peterson
Broyhill	Hébert	Saund
Burke, Ky.	Henderson	Scherer
Cooley	Hoffman, Mich.	Shelley
Corman	Holifield	Smith Miss.
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Ala.	Steed
Denton	King, Calif.	Thompson, N.J.
Downing	Kitchin	Weaver
Fallon	McDonough	Willis
Gray	MacGregor	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MAHON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 8399 and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 398 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 Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I understand the Holland substitute is to be offered very shortly. I have prepared an amendment to the Holland amendment, which would take care of a rather serious situation that has been caused by the Presidential order of embargo against Cuban imports. I agree with the purpose of the Presidential order, which in part is to cut off Havana tobacco coming in from Cuba pursuant to the embargo order of the President of February 3 of this year and which generally is to deny any dollar support to Communist Cuba.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a unique opportunity to start a pilot program under this bill to see immediately just exactly what it can accomplish. I think the Congress of the United States has the responsibility, I might add, to the some 6,000 people who are employed now in the Havana cigar leaf industry in Tampa, Fla., many of whom are going to be put out of jobs, and nearly 500 who have lost their jobs already as a result of the Presidential embargo order of August 3 stopping Havana tobacco, the raw material, coming into this country. Let me say that I agree with the Presidential order, at least to the extent of the purpose the President intended to accomplish, and that is cutting off American dollars to Communist Fidel Castro in Cuba.

Unfortunately, I might point out as an aside, I think it is important for you to realize that this embargo is full of gaping loopholes. The result is going to be—and I have in my hand an article by Leslie Gould of the New York Journal American, dated February 22, 1962—and I have called this matter to the attention of the President, to the attention of the Secretary of State, pointing out that the embargo itself contains gaping loopholes allowing foreign countries to ship into the United States cigars made of Havana tobacco and even "processed" tobacco because, and I read here:

> The Foreign Assets Control Division of the United States has just ruled including cigars made from imports from Cuba may be imported into the United States from the Canary Islands. It has also been decided they can be imported from Canada. It has further been decided—

And I quote:

> that leaf—

That is, the raw material—

> that has been processed likewise can be imported.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. KEARNS. Does the gentleman mean to state that the embargo which is supposed to be against Cuba will not prove to be effective?

Mr. CRAMER. I am saying that the effect of the embargo is not going to be

to cut off dollars to Cuba, because the tobacco will be coming in by the back door through other countries by permitting imports of Havana tobacco, either as the finished product or semifinished product coming from other countries.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. KEARNS. They are practicing back-door spending like we are.

Mr. CRAMER. The result of the embargo order and the result of the loophole opened up by the order of the Foreign Assets Control Division is that Havana tobacco will come in as part of a finished product or processed leaf. So Castro is going to get dollars or other spendable currency from these other countries while our people are being put out of business. Thus, foreign countries will gobble up the $55 million industry in "Havana" cigars built largely by Tampa manufacturers over many decades.

As I say, I support the purpose of the President in placing the embargo, but the fact of the matter is that the purpose has been completely subverted by this ruling that permits the importation of cigars that have Havana tobacco in them, and it even goes so far as to permit processed leaf to come into this country even though it is not in a cigar.

So it does accomplish its objective. That is the point I am making. The effect eventually will be to put 6,000 people out of work.

I think there is a lot of merit to this program for retraining. This amendment would give an opportunity to the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to initiate a program in this field where the U.S. Government itself is responsible through its foreign policy for putting these people out of work.

I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment would be considered on its merits. I understand there is generally an understanding or agreement that most amendments are going to be objected to by the ranking people on both sides of the aisle as a matter of course.

I recognize that there are serious problems with regard to a general broad amendment that would have the effect of changing this entire program, but this amendment does no violence to the bill before us—instead it implements it.

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

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Florida 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment, I submit, will do no violence whatsoever to this substitute but, as a matter of fact, will strengthen it because it will give the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in this specific case where the Federal Government has a clear responsibility because the hardship results from Government action, I submit, to go into the Tampa district and conduct the studies, as well as the surveys, and to come up with a program for unemployment training or on-the-job training.

We have also the automation problem to some extent in the industry. And to put into effect in this specific instance programs that are intended to be accomplished by the general legislation. This does not do any violence whatsoever. It adds section 502 relating to unemployment resulting from an embargo:

SEC. 502. In carrying out his responsibilities under this Act with respect to the testing, counseling, and selecting for occupational training of individuals, the Secretary of Labor shall give particular attention to individuals whose unemployment is attributable to the embargo on trade with Cuba proclaimed by the President on February 3, 1962. In apportioning Federal expenditures as provided in section 501, the Secretary of Labor shall give special consideration to unemployment resulting from such embargo.

I say, Mr. Chairman, if there is any situation in the United States of America that justifies this House of Representatives giving consideration to that and using it as a pilot plant program or project to see how effective this bill before us is going to be now, not next year or the year after, but this year, it is the situation in my district. This bill before us really will not become effective until next year because it will take this long to make the studies. This gives the Secretary of Labor and the HEW an opportunity now to see how effective the program is going to be in an area where the U.S. Government and the Congress has a responsibility, because otherwise the result of this embargo is going to be that 6,000 people will be put out of work.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with the very eloquent statement made by the gentleman from Florida. The committee as a whole recognizes this problem. The training program will certainly be designed to focus on such problems as are created by this peculiar Cuban embargo situation. I, myself, would make the statement to the gentleman, and I believe it will be concurred in by the other members of the committee, that we will put the Departments on notice that we want this to have a high priority and that the program provided in this bill shall be focused as quickly as possible on this problem.

The difficulty of writing this kind of amendment into the bill, I think, is clear. I hesitate to get into these specialized amendments and the setting of priorities in basic legislation.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I think the gentleman will agree, will he not, that there is only one situation in the United States that is serious because of this particular embargo, and that this amendment does not do violence in any way to the substitute but merely pinpoints a specific instance that could be used as a pilot project for this entire matter.

Does not the gentleman think under those circumstances, in that it fits right into the concept of what we are trying to accomplish, the committee should accept and welcome this amendment rather than oppose it?

Mr. GOODELL. There are other special circumstances that will apply to one area in the whole country. I do not think we ought to get into writing that kind of legislation. I agree that the Cuban embargo applies only to the gentleman's area. I respect the gentleman for fighting for this kind of amendment. I have a high esteem for the gentleman and his amendment.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, the most outstanding feature of the legislation under discussion today is its early denial of the existence of information upon which to wisely legislate in this field of unemployment retraining. The same situation abounds as pointed out earlier by Chairman POWELL who noted almost 20 agencies were granting some forms of aid to education.

While concurring completely with the belief that the Secretary of Labor should pursue the program of factual studies required of the Secretary in section 104 of this bill, and the manpower reports required of the Secretary in section 105, and the information and research required of the Secretary in section 106, these very stipulations are mute testimony to the lack of concrete information upon which the further titles of this bill are based.

In addition to this lack of specific information, it should be understood clearly by the Congress that this legislation would further extend a proliferation of Federal programs already beyond the comprehension of many Members of Congress. To illustrate this, I could introduce some 20 budgeted items for programs now being financed by the Federal Government in the Department of Justice, in the Departments of Labor, Interior, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare, which have immediate relevance to the training of manpower and suggest the existence of facilities as well as personnel almost completely uncoordinated because of the limitations of the special interests of the executive agencies of the Federal Government.

Now we are asked to consider one further step in the dark toward the retraining of men whose aptitudes are unknown for jobs as yet unidentified and that may not exist. The lack of coordination of the programs will thus be further compounded by this program now before us and others that are soon to be presented, for it is well known that in proposing to assist that portion of our unemployed, who are defined as youth, legislation may come before us to devise special programs for men under 25, or under 21, or some other particular age level.

Similarly, in the trade agreements legislation that may come before us, provisions for retraining of those segments of labor presumed to be threatened by tariff changes may be said to justify still another program of retraining.

Let me call your attention to the startling fact that this proliferation and probable duplication of Federal efforts of training and retraining are most dis-

tasteful, not merely to people who would seek for more efficiency in the Federal Government, but to the entire educational profession, the national organizations of which have repeatedly indicated that such Federal programs should be under the direction of educational agencies.

Early this year, representatives of five major organizations, the AASA, the NSBA, the PTA, the NEA, and the Council of Chief State School Officers, concurred in the statement that—

> Legislation which would specify Federal participation in special educational programs for urban youth should be under the auspices of regularly established educational agencies.

It was clear in the testimony of such groups last year that they did not favor the further compounding of the disorganized approach of the Federal Government to training and retraining for the multiplicity of special purposes found to be in the differing divisions of differing departments of the Federal Government, but today we consider doing just that.

Adding new training and skill development programs, new on-the-job training programs, the development of broad and diversified training programs, new programs of testing, counseling and selecting for occupational training those persons who are presumed to be unable to secure appropriate full-time employment without some unknown and unspecified type of training—these are open-end proposals in which neither the purposes nor the methods are specific; hence it might be assumed that the initiation of the programs authorized in such legislation would be delayed at least until the lack of information recognized in title I were corrected.

But this is not the case, for the Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter in agreements with the States at once to make arrangements to develop and encourage the development of broad and diversified training programs and to make such arrangements as he deems necessary to insure adherence to appropriate training standards and policies—and all of this is to be done without information about the availability of jobs for the persons being trained or even about the current programs of the States and the business community to do whatever training is appropriate in terms of job opportunities.

It should be noted that the securing of the information and the undertaking of the research requested in title I of this measure is already within the purview and the authority placed in the Department of Labor, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and hence that no legislation is required or even justifiable at this time. The various research and statistical agencies of the executive departments already have it in their power to provide us with such research and information and should do so, for unemployment is, indeed, a serious and continuing problem that needs better definition and analysis. But until such information is available, let me indicate that there are many other courses of action open to the Administration to resolve the unemployment situations, especially for young Americans.

Once more we are telling the American people that we have a solution to a knotty problem when, in fact, we do not.

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

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. The gentleman from Ohio has made two points in his remarks, it seems to me: One is that the bill now under consideration does not adequately provide for coordination of the program. If I may, I would like to refer the gentleman to the remarks of his colleague on his side of the aisle, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], yesterday at page 3012 in the RECORD, at which point the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] took particular care to commend the Holland subcommittee for its fine work in coordinating the various areas that this legislation touches upon.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri, a Republican, went ahead to suggest, if my colleague from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] will recall, that the committee had done a particularly outstanding job in resolving what is often a difficult problem in such legislation—that of deciding which area the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will administer; namely, the vocational educational programs contemplated in the proposal; and the area to be administered by the Department of Labor, namely, the matter of employment service functions.

Mr. Chairman, another argument, which my colleague from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] attempts to make, is that this legislation will mean a duplication of existing efforts. I would like, if I may, to refer my colleague to my own remarks of yesterday, beginning at page 3018 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where I endeavored to outline some of the various vocational educational programs which are now law, such as the veterans program, which pertains to veterans only; the program for rehabilitation of disabled workers, which applies to disabled workers only; the programs for occupational training under the George-Barden and Smith-Hughes Acts which apply to those categories of occupations only; and the programs of the Indian Bureau, which pertains only to Indians.

Mr. Chairman, it should be clear that all of these vocational educational programs which I have cited respond to a particular need and to the problems of a particular category of persons, not one of these programs responds to the overall problem encountered by some 4.5 million unemployed men and women in the United States today. The fact that we have a continuing high level of unemployment in our country is clear evidence that in spite of the existence of all the vocational education programs to which the gentleman from Ohio has made reference, we still need a program to meet the general need to retrain unemployed workers who do not fall within the categories of existing vocational education programs.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] that of all the budgeted items that I have seen regarding training programs, of which I have 20 here, in this year's budget, as near as I can see in this bill there is no effort made to in any way tie these programs together in order to avoid duplication and to prevent a proliferation of agencies in this area.

Mr. Chairman, as all of us know, our chairman said he wanted to blow the whistle in the area of aid to education until we could know just what was going on. I think it would be a good idea to blow the whistle in this area so we could make a better approach to this problem which would not further add to the bureaucratic monstrosity we now have in Washington which, through exorbitant taxation, is causing many of the problems of unemployment we here say we are attacking.

Bureaucracy is the key to unnecessary spending, unnecessary spending is the key to excessive taxation and excessive taxation, in my opinion, is stifling our free enterprise system and causing unemployment. Here was a chance to do something about bureaucracy but we merely added to the problem. Deficit spending, mushrooming bureaucracy, excessive taxation and a subsequent loss of our constitutional freedoms did not come about in a day but rather vote by vote, bill by bill. Today we are adding one more.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOOLEY].

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before the House at this time, H.R. 10363, which has to do with the retraining of workers so as to diminish the total of unemployed, merits my wholehearted support.

While it is a fact that funds are presently available in several areas, as in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department and the Labor Department, to help retrain workers in new technical skills, the fact is evident that in view of the disastrous impact of automation on hundreds of thousands of workers more money and more effort are need if a dent is to be made in this critical situation.

Automation in the long run may create jobs and I think that fact has been clearly demonstrated, but there is a timelag during which workers who are displaced from their jobs must learn new skills in order to be useful in this highly mechanical and technical age.

If our economy is to remain dynamic we must make a herculean effort to retrain thousands of workers and prepare them for new positions entirely different from those which they once filled. Labor and industry have both had programs directed toward this objective, but the task is so tremendous that Government aid is necessary.

Today, with an unemployment of several million—not all of which was caused by automation, of course—it is incumbent on the Government to endeavor to cut down on this figure. The want ads in the press are replete each day with jobs which cannot be filled because new skills have been introduced with which only comparatively few people are familiar.

The passage of this legislation will go a long way toward helping rectify a very grave situation which confronts our country.

Participants in the program will be counseled and tested through State employment offices. Under the proposed bill, the unemployed will receive priority, but others may also qualify under certain circumstances.

I think it is wise to limit the courses to no longer than 52 weeks, and in many cases the courses will be shorter.

The plan to have the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare cooperate with the Department of Labor and work through the various State departments of education in setting up training programs is a meritorious one. So, too, is the plan to have vocational school facilities utilized wherever possible for the training courses, and where necessary private vocational schools may also be brought into the picture.

While the cost is theoretically $263 million for the training of 300,000 persons, this expense will be quickly offset if the unemployed quota is reduced substantially.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to join with the many others of my colleagues who have paid tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND], chairman of the Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], as well as the other members of that subcommittee for their courageous hearings and hard work that have brought this bill to the floor of the House for action.

The cooperation of the members in accepting amendments in the original bill and Mr. HOLLAND's offering the substitute that has been carefully worked out is, in my opinion, one of the finest examples of bipartisanship effort to attack a real knotty problem that I have seen in a long time. I sincerely urge other committees and members to examine it and be guided by its example.

It is universally agreed that automation is a continuation of our growing manufacturing machines and methods, to supply our exploding population with more and better products and services to keep pace with our demands for a better living for all our people.

This change is no different than others that have taken place in the history of the world. However, these changes are more rapid and people have the effects thrust upon them with little on no warning.

This is due, in a large part, to the failure of business, labor, and government to recognize the early signs of change and to make early corresponding changes in procedure. Rather, we wait until the situation becomes critical and then severe methods are necessary to correct the resultant ills.

There is no doubt that the faster we make technological changes, the greater the immediate resultant unemployment. In other words, the greater the automation, the greater the unemployment and displacement.

If these problems are recognized early, then the men and women employed can be prepared for the new jobs created by the technological advancement. This is a corollary that when new machines displace workers—jobs that were never dreamed of are created. What we must do is prepare our people for these new jobs.

The legislation before us is the first genuine attack on this problem. It consolidates the Federal effort, and it coordinates the State and industrial effort.

This approach will prepare our citizens for jobs requiring higher skills and train already unemployed for these same skills where necessary.

I consider this legislation to be most vital and important to our country today. I am sure it was legislation like this that our Founding Fathers had in mind when they formed our Constitution and stated that among its purposes was to "promote the general welfare and to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

It combines heart and economy. What higher tribute could be asked?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN].

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, I witnessed yesterday and today something that I had not seen in the entire first session of this Congress, and that is both sides of the aisle really doing a job in working out their problems, and coming up with good legislation that will benefit the country.

A word of warning and something that we should watch in other legislation pending before Congress. Today we are considering this bill H.R. 8399 as amended by the Goodell substitute H.R. 10363. But in the agriculture bill presently before that committee there is a retraining provision for people who might be forced off the farm. There is also such a provision in the tariff proposal presented by the President. He recognizes that some people are going to be forced out of business and workers are going to lose their jobs. The net result will be that we are going to have to retrain workers should the tariff bill pass.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTIN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The proposal that came from the Department of Agriculture did not contain a retraining program. It was talked about, but it did not include it.

Mr. BATTIN. I stand corrected, but if the gentleman will read H.R. 10010, he will find that they are going to lease land, and buy land, and force people off the land, or take them off the land, and we will still have the problem of what to do with them once they are taken off.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The problem is there and under this bill retraining can be had to cope with that problem.

Mr. BATTIN. I thank the gentleman. Let us remember the days of World War II. The only fear I have is that they are going to retrain farmers to be factory workers and retrain factory workers to be farmers. I do not think that is what the President meant when he said he wanted to keep America moving.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, today we are again called upon to extend and expand our welfare programs. There have been many of them presented here during recent years, and appealing arguments can always be made for them. More and more, the Federal Government is injecting itself into welfare projects, and here is another example. It has been said that America is gradually becoming a welfare state. Perhaps that is true. A rather substantial portion of our annual budgets is now devoted to welfare in one form or another.

Taking into account the existing programs, those that are authorized and those being projected, financed directly or indirectly, lump them together and you get a rise in welfare spending from $22.1 billion in 1960 to more than $35 billion in 1965. This estimate is based upon an exhaustive and authoritative study conducted by a committee of the Senate last year. That is a lot of money. And let us keep in mind that each of the several ambitious welfare programs which have been initiated during the past year will grow and expand each year. That is the history of such ventures.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was created in 1952, as I recall. Appropriations to finance the varied welfare and other activities of that agency have more than doubled in 10 years. It has been said that last year was the biggest welfare year in American history. And with the approval of the pending bill, and add to it several others now pending, we can be sure this year will eclipse all of them.

A total of 77,000 new Federal employees were added to the rolls last year. Many of them are in offices or in the field, administering the new welfare programs. And it is said more must be added this year.

IS IT NECESSARY?

Mr. Chairman, there can be no question but that problems arise when people become unemployed. The impact of automation is serious. These problems are not new. They have been going on for years. It is said the recession has been licked, that we no longer face an unusual number of unemployed. Conditions in that respect are fairly normal. There is no emergency, we are assured.

Why, then, all this haste? Why this extraordinary measure to cope with a problem that at least at this time is nonexistent? Can it be properly said that in justification for this legislation we are in some degree indebted to the fertility of the imagination of those who sponsor it?

If indeed there is a need for Federal intervention in the area of retraining, then it would seem that need has already been met. In fact, the Federal Government is already up to its neck in this field of vocational training and retraining. We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars every year on this sort

of thing now. If there is need for additional Federal action, then would it not make more sense to expand existing programs rather than undertake a new one that will cost the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars?

There is now, for example, an extensive Federal participation in vocational education and training under the Smith-Hughes Act, in effect since 1946. There is a vocational rehabilitation and vocational education program for veterans. The Labor Department has for years been operating an apprenticeship program. And there is an ambitious retraining program for unemployed under the depressed areas bill enacted last year.

Under this latter program we are told that more than $400,000 is now being expended in a few counties down in Mississippi for the training of tractor drivers. This is typical of the boondoggling that is going on in the waste of taxpayers' money.

Then, there is the Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961, a massive training program just getting underway.

WHAT WILL IT COST?

Mr. Chairman, there has been very little said here by sponsors regarding the cost of this welfare plan, now being debated. Title II calls for the counseling, testing, and placement of 1,200,000 individuals and the payment of relocation allowances to 175,000, at a total cost of $176,460,000. Under title III the on-the-job programs would cost $7,600,000. Added to that is title IV which would provide vocational training for 200,000 unemployed, and 70,000 underemployed, all at a cost of $70,500,000. And this is just the beginning.

The various facets of costs included in the bill are too numerous to discuss. The training program, for example, provides an all-Federal payment to the trainee in the amount of the average unemployment compensation payment in the State.

Thus we would further inject the Federal Government into the training and education fields. We know that many corporations have their own training programs. That practice should be encouraged. The labor unions of this country profess to be interested in their members and their welfare. They fight and they strike to obtain welfare clauses in contracts, and a hundred other things. If they are so interested in the well-being of their members, then why do they not do more to provide training and retraining for their unemployed members? That could be done more extensively in coordination with management. And leave the Federal Government out of it. No one can say the wealthy unions and the prosperous industries are not more able to pay for this retraining than is the Federal Government. And they know a lot more about how to do it, and do it efficiently and successfully.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced this legislation is unwise, unsound and unnecessary. No need has been shown, and if there is need then there are already scores of training programs in effect on all levels—Federal, State, and local, as well as nongovernmental. It is time we stop, look, and listen before we start billing our hard-pressed taxpayers for additional hundreds of millions of dollars to finance such a dubious venture into the welfare field.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, my very good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND, is to be commended for the very fine job he has done in preparing and presenting H.R. 8399, the Manpower Development and Training Act.

I rise in support of this much-needed legislation because the time has arrived when some positive steps must be taken to return men and women to work and thereby reduce our unemployment rolls.

Mr. Chairman, we have witnessed a tremendous upswing in the national economy under the leadership of our President, but at the same time we are faced with the bare fact that unemployment nationwide has dropped only 1 percent.

We know that automation and technological advancement in the future will increase at a much more rapid rate than in the past and, as a result, we will see more and more workers being displaced because the skills they now possess will be obsolete.

While it is true a great expense will be entailed in carrying out the program, nevertheless the books will balance in the long run due to the fact that our present relief rolls will be greatly reduced. This factor alone will create a more healthy economy and will permit people to again become self-sustaining and will allow them to contribute their share to the national economy.

This program will not only prove effective in large cities like Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Scranton, and Wilkes-Barre in my own State of Pennsylvania, but will also prove beneficial in our rural areas throughout our country. The underemployed farmer will be helped and our unemployed youths between the ages of 16 and 21 will be given the opportunity to learn a skill or secure the additional education they need.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8399 is a sound, workable bill. Its purpose and the end result will strengthen our economy; provide jobs for everyone; reduce our unemployment rolls, and provide our Nation with the full manpower it needs to remain great.

I urge everyone here today to vote in favor of this great bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor [Mr. POWELL] for yielding me enough time to rise in support of H.R. 8399, the Manpower Development and Training Act. Mr. Chairman, this will be a bright day for unemployed Americans who through no fault of their own are suffering undue hardship because of technological changes, automation, and other forms of work displacement. I am able to speak firsthand on this subject because I represent a coal mining district in southern Illinois that has experienced persistent unemployment for the past 15 years. When a coal miner yields his job to a machine he finds that job opportunities are so limited he has two alternatives. One is to stay in his home area and go on relief or travel hundreds and sometimes thousands of miles, leaving his family behind, to seek employment in the same field elsewhere. Generally, he has difficulties in finding a job by leaving home because the area to which he might be attracted generally is experiencing the same problem. Therefore, we find a wasteful dissipation of human resources because a person is trained in coal mining or some other given field and is not in a position to seek employment in another type industry. This legislation will give him an opportunity to retrain and learn a trade in a field that offers more opportunity and security.

Mr. Chairman, this type of a program will work. Let me give you one sterling example. We in southern Illinois were fortunate enough to receive the first area redevelopment loan approved in the United States under the newly created Area Redevelopment Act. We were able to secure a new firm locating a plant expansion in our area working over 500 employees. One of the incentives for locating this plant in our area of high unemployment was the fact that we had a large labor surplus and were willing to implement a retraining program. This, of course, will save the company many thousands of dollars and at the same time will bring new revenues and new hope into the community, the State, and the Federal Treasury. Let me give you a further example. By lending this one community $500,000 to be repaid with interest, the annual payroll will be in excess of $2 million and the anticipated Federal income taxes to be paid by the new corporation will be approximately $250,000 annually. Remember now, Mr. Chairman, at the present time no one is getting any benefit, including the Federal Government, because this is a new operation. By making a loan of only $500,000, which the Government will get back in its entirety, the Federal Treasury will be receiving, in income taxes, at the beginning, approximately $250,000 annually, with this amount to increase as production and sales increase. Does not this make good sense that we should provide assistance to these communities and provide retraining programs to the unemployed where the Government will receive untold benefits in new returns for the Treasury, in eliminating what now is nothing more than a dole through relief payments, and above all, eliminating the economic sores in certain areas throughout the country at a time when the general prosperity of the Nation is high? If we cannot afford to retrain our workers and give assistance to the unemployed now, I ask you when would be a good time? I want to congratulate the Committee on Education and Labor and particularly Mr. HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania, for bringing

this legislation before the House. It is a great step in the right direction.

In behalf of all the unemployed people of southern Illinois and the Nation let me say once again a big thanks.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to support the Manpower Development and Training Act because I believe it is a constructive measure to actually solve a portion of the persistent problem of unemployment.

Although these are times of relative prosperity for many workers, Department of Labor figures show that on a seasonally adjusted basis, as of every month during 1961, more than 6 percent of the civilian labor force has been unemployed. The committee report indicates that a substantial number of these people have been unemployed for 6 months or more.

To a large extent these unemployed people are the innocent victims of conditions entirely outside their control—they are not unemployed because of a lack of ability, or a lack of industry.

For example, in my district in Missouri there are a substantial number of unemployed people who have been working in the lead mining industry. Many of the mines have closed because of the depression of prices caused by lead imports. These people, many of whom are highly skilled workers, have certainly been caught by conditions which they cannot control, and they need help.

Similarly, the tremendous increasing of efficiency of agricultural production has driven many people off the farm onto the labor market. The agriculture census shows that for my State of Missouri from 1950 to 1959, the number of farm operators has decreased from 230,000 to 169,000, and the number of farmworkers from 197,000 to 151,000. Similar reductions have taken place and are taking place all over the country. Due to age, and often to inadequate training for industrial work, the people displaced from agricultural work contribute more than their proportionate share to the number of unemployed.

It has been pointed out that technological changes in industry also displace many workers. It is ironical that automation and other industrial improvements, which do so much to improve industrial efficiency, should prove a tragedy to some workers by rendering their skills obsolete, or unneeded.

Unemployment insurance, and in some cases welfare assistance, is a help, but these programs just tide the worker over. They do not solve the problem. That is why we need the Manpower Development and Training Act.

I think this act contains a number of good features.

The first is that it provides for the Department of Labor to determine what our manpower needs are in order to be sure that the people who complete training programs will have a reasonable chance of marketing their new skills. It would certainly be a mistake to conduct training programs without first determining what skills are required. It would be tragic to retrain workmen only to find that they had been trained for the wrong job. And I think it is wise for the Department of Labor to have the responsibility for determining these manpower needs because the problem cuts across State lines.

The second feature of this bill which I would like to commend is the provision for testing and selecting the people who will be referred to training programs. Unfortunately, we cannot expect ever to solve our entire unemployment program retraining. Among the people in the ranks of the unemployed are some who may not be able to profit through training. And of those who could profit, their training should be adapted to their capabilities.

And finally, I like the fact that this bill provides that this program will be carried out through the existing agencies, much of it through agencies of the States. Use of these established agencies will make available their skill and experience, and will minimize the overhead cost of administering the program—it will help to accomplish the greatest possible results for the money spent.

I believe this is a good bill, that it should help a great many unemployed people to learn skills that are needed—skills that will enable them to get good, permanent jobs. It will get them off the relief rolls. It will restore their self-respect. It will enable them again to become productive, taxpaying members of our economy. We need this sort of program, and we can afford it. In the long run, it will probably pay for itself in reduced unemployment and welfare costs, and in increased taxes and production, not to mention the importance of the human values involved.

I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, the general debate on this bill will come to a close within a few minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] will introduce a substitute sponsored by himself and by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL]. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the substitute will be adopted.

It seems to me that this substitute will do two important things. First, it will face up to the problems of unemployment which are resulting from automation and other technological developments. And second, it will give us an opportunity to upgrade the skills of our country and thus to improve our industrial potential.

The dynamic and expanding economy of the United States is continually eliminating some jobs and continually creating other jobs. We need the ability to move our workers out of skills that are outmoded into skills that are up to date and required in industry. The need is well known and well recognized. We have 4 million-plus unemployed and a record high of 66 million employed. Many of those who are unemployed might fill job openings listed in the want ad columns of any daily newspaper, but they lack the skills for such jobs. This bill undertakes to help give them the necessary skills and it seeks to do so through well-established institutions, public and private, Federal, State and local. The training facilities are in existence. They have the ability to do the job, but they cannot do the job alone.

There are those who say this bill will not work, that the unemployed are here to stay, and that there is nothing we can do about it. I refuse to accept this attitude of defeatism toward a problem which involves not only the American economy, but the daily welfare of thousands of American citizens. Of course, we have people who are unemployable, but I think the average American worker whose job has become obsolete can find a place in our expanding economy, if he is given proper guidance and proper training. The program, of course, will cost money but is it not better to try to prepare a man for a job and to give him a chance to be self-reliant than to continue him indefinitely on public relief? Does our progress in technology mean that we must prepare to finance larger and larger unemployment compensation programs and public assistance programs? Certainly, the best way out of this, and I think it is the practical way out, is to get our unemployed people back on the payrolls. This will improve the dignity of the worker; it will raise the self-respect of his family; and it will upgrade the economic ability of our country to meet its problems in the 1960's.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Holland substitute or, if you will, the Holland-Goodell substitute, improves the bill substantially. One of the provisions of the substitute provides training for farmers whose families have incomes of less than $1,200 a year. There is no place in our economy where the technological revolution has been so rapid as in American agriculture. If any of my colleagues were not here yesterday when the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] gave authentic data on this subject, I suggest that he read his excellent remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, another provision which, in my opinion, is an important one, is the provision relating to youth training.

Mr. Chairman, I think this bill will have broad public support. This bill will have the support of all classes of workers because its broad and integrated programs will help all classes of American workers to adjust to the quickening pace of American technology. It will have the support of management because its training programs are to be tailored to the changing skill requirements of industry and to shape American manpower to meet the changing needs.

It will have the support of the Nation because this practical approach to this critical problem will bolster the purchasing power of the Nation as it leads to higher employment.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad this bill has wide bipartisan support. Members of both parties on the committee have made significant contributions to this bill and all will share in the credit.

Reducing unemployment in the face of automation is a test of American ingenuity. The effort must be made. The bill before us offers a sound program which is strongly supported by public opinion. I hope the bill will be enacted into law.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. I would just like to ask the gentleman one question. Are the funds necessary to implement this bill in the budget?

Mr. ALBERT. It is my understanding that they are, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGER. I have been trying to find out but have not been able to get any definite information about it.

Mr. ALBERT. I cannot make a categorical statement, but it is my opinion that they are.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. POWELL. I can say that funds are in the budget.

Mr. YOUNGER. I thank you.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay great tribute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the majority leader; also to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND], of Pittsburgh, chairman of the committee. We went through the process of committee consideration with meticulous care and presented the bill on the floor. On our side there is the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], our ranking Member.

This is the way I like to see legislation handled. It should be handled this way most of the time. After we have done a good job, then let us agree.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. I think it is good for the country.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I might say in expressing appreciation to the majority leader for his fine speech that I share his views and also support this much-needed measure. There is one aspect of the program that has not been dwelt upon sufficiently that I think is important, and that is that unemployed men who are retrained not only may be reemployed but can also frequently become self-employed and independent businessmen in their own right. That has been the experience of our outstanding Oklahoma State Technical School at Okmulgee, which will be playing a major role in Oklahoma's vocational training program under this bill, and I am sure it will be the case when this national retraining program is underway.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the manpower development and training proposal in this bill is meritorious. There is a great need for such a program and it should be passed.

The advance of automation and the growth of unemployment have created serious problems which require action of this kind to end the waste of human resources and the needless suffering and distress that inevitably follow the decline in job opportunities.

No one in this Congress has more experience in dealing with the effects of automation and unemployment than the author of this bill, my colleague from Pennsylvania, Representative ELMER HOLLAND.

Mr. HOLLAND has served for many years in both the State house and senate at Harrisburg. He has been closely associated with working people and knows from long experience as a labor unionist and legislator the impact that automation and unemployment have on the lives of the people and the economic health of the Commonwealth.

He has applied his efforts and talents to alleviate the hardship of families affected by unemployment and loss of income. He has sought to end the waste of human resources and the tremendous loss in productivity and wealth.

If enacted, the Holland proposal should go a long way in solving one of our Nation's more serious problems. No one can seriously doubt the positive effect this legislation will have in accelerating our rate of economic growth, increasing our national productivity, and in making our industries more able to compete abroad.

The problem which this proposal attempts to meet is a relatively new one. For the first time in history a Nation has within its midst a large number of unemployed people who have lost their jobs because they and their fellow workers have worked too well. During the years between 1950 and 1960, production increased 43 percent while the employment of our factory workers decreased by 10 percent. Today our blue-collar workers are the first to feel the impact of automation; tomorrow many white-collar workers—accountants, clerks, and secretaries—will also find themselves replaced by machines.

How we deal with this early impact of automation will determine the economic fate of the Nation. If Congress fails to act on this matter and the people come to fear automation, we can expect an increase in make-work policies, and in hostility to progress. If, on the other hand, we insure that the benefits of automation will be distributed among all our people, the way of the future will be the way of progress and growth.

Authoritative studies have revealed that the rate of unemployment for the poorly trained, poorly educated, and unskilled workers is about three times as great as for the well trained. The evidence reveals that jobs are available, but that for the most part, they require more education and more skills than many of the unemployed now have.

The bill before us will establish a 2-year program for training unemployed workers through the use of vocational education or on-the-job training facilities. Provision is also made for subsistence allowances to the trainees. And the Secretary of Labor is to make a comprehensive study of the Nation's "manpower requirements, resources, utilization, and training."

There are those who say we cannot afford to help our structurally unemployed fellow citizens. There are those who claim that the Nation cannot afford to deal with the oncoming problems of increasing technology and automation.

Yet, it seems that the Nation can ill afford to do nothing. Our manpower is our greatest natural resource. Without a highly skilled and highly productive working force, no nation can survive in the rough and tumble of international competition. Nor can our Nation be at its maximum strength to meet the challenge of totalitarian tyranny unless it is producing at the highest possible level.

Investment in the education and skills of a nation's people is one of the keys to economic growth and national well-being. I look upon this proposal not as a "spending proposal" but as an investment in America's future. It is a bill which should be passed and the program implemented without delay.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, it is a truism to state that we are living in a rapidly changing world. By and large each of us benefits from the changes that are taking place. Our standards of living are the highest ever enjoyed by any people, and they are constantly improving. New products and new services have made our lives easier and more enjoyable and have opened up opportunities for accomplishment that could hardly have existed under older methods.

I daresay, the rate of changes we have seen will continue and increase in the years ahead. Some say that automation is merely a continuation of the change in technology which began with the industrial revolution but that only the degree of change has increased. Granting that this is so, the degree of change is itself astounding.

The great technological changes that are increasing our productivity and improving our standard of living are having a serious side effect which is familiar to us all. These changes are making some men's skills obsolete. They are responsible for a great amount of the so-called "prosperity unemployment" that is troubling the labor market.

Machines are doing many jobs today that men did a short while ago. They are mining coal, controlling assembly lines, rolling steel, dispensing food. They are doing a multitude of tasks, many tedious, that once required the labor and attention of countless numbers of workers. They have also displaced workers and potential workers from these jobs. The U.S. Census Bureau is handling a bigger job in processing the 1960 census with the aid of new machines and the work of 50 statisticians than was done on the 1950 census by 4,100 statisticians—a small item in our total economy but typical of the proportions of the changes that are taking place. Productivity doubled in the soft coal industry from 1947 to 1959 and yet the number

of jobs in that industry declined by 262,000.

We are left facing some hard decisions by the impacts of automation and improved technology. One of the most serious of our problems is how to supply the trained manpower that today's and tomorrow's jobs call for. A correlative problem exists concerning the employment of the worker whose experience, training, and skills have been outmoded by the machine.

There are no easy solutions to these problems. An important and necessary step that must be taken, however, is to train workers for the jobs that are available. During 1961 the average rate of unemployment in the United States was over 6 percent of the labor force. At the same time we were reading of this in the front sections of our newspapers, the want ads in the back section carried notices of jobs that were not being filled for lack of trained manpower. The same is true today even though the adjusted rate of unemployment has dipped below 6 percent.

I, therefore, wish to voice my support of the administration's bill calling for the training and retraining of unemployed workers—the Manpower Development and Training Act. A version of this bill, S. 1991, passed the Senate last year. A similar House bill, H.R. 8399, is before us today.

This bill has enjoyed unusual support because it proposes a realistic approach to supplying our country with the trained manpower it needs and at the same time alleviating many problems connected with unemployment. As the House report on the bill (H. Rept. No. 879) states:

> The bill thus seeks not only to deal with a major aspects of the Nation's problem of unemployment, but also to assist in achieving the goal of maximum employment and a more fully productive work force. It recognizes that a large share of the unemployment problem represents not the inability of the economy to create jobs but our failure to train people with the proper skills to qualify them for jobs.

Describing the bill briefly without going into detail, it directs the Secretary of Labor to study and determine the need for training programs both on a national and local basis. It provides funds for establishing training programs to fit the requirements of a particular locality. It also authorizes the payment of subsistence allowances to persons who are undergoing training under such a program. These allowances would be geared to State unemployment compensation payments and could be paid up to a maximum of 52 weeks. The training programs would be conducted largely through the use of existing or expanded public vocational educational facilities and also through on-the-job training. It is also hoped that new and improved training methods will be developed under the programs established pursuant to the bill.

This bill, in my opinion, represents a sensible and logical approach in coming to grips with the manpower needs and unemployment problems we face today. At the same time, I recognize the limits of this approach. Training programs will have to be planned to meet the economy of a locality and the vocational potential of the worker. Secretary of Labor Goldberg stated at the hearings on this proposal:

> This legislation, of course, cannot be a cure-all. It can enable us to do a tremendously valuable and, indeed, essential job. It is, however, but a part, though a closely related part, of the total job that needs to be done to meet our national objectives of raising the capacity of all our citizens to cope with increasingly complex problems in a fast-moving world, those of making a living as well as those of a nonvocational nature. General education, which is outside the scope of this particular legislation, provides the platform from which we launch specific job training. Unless a job trainee has a good basic education it is extremely difficult to teach him to do the work demanded by modern technology.

This bill is an integral part of the administration's overall plans to improve the general welfare. It meshes with other proposals submitted by the President concerning unemployment compensation, education and public welfare. Moreover, it carries forward the responsibility of the Federal Government under the Employment Act of 1946, which states:

> The Congress declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practical means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the enactment of H.R. 8399.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I heartily support this bill now before us, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. One of the most urgent problems facing us today is the impact of technological advances and automation upon our labor force. As a representative of an industrial area, I feel a special responsibility to those who are suffering the consequences of a progress which benefits the vast majority, but has disrupted the lives of so many. The whole program of reconciling a new type of economy to our existing labor force must be reappraised, accelerated and modernized. Existing facilities and funds are now inadequate; unemployment and therefore unemployment compensation is rising, and the morale of many workers is declining. The result: our economy suffers.

I feel strongly that one of the greatest assets of our country is manpower. It has been a continuing, thriving, positive force in our progress and growth. Shall we now treat it as a liability, charging off as lost the costs of unemployment and the resultant loss of manpower as to an investment on its way down? Or shall we take the positive approach—reinvest, and, through training and proper utilization, make this potential a good investment again?

The cost of the program under consideration will be $262 million, to be spent over a period of 2 years. Considering present unemployment costs, the loss of purchasing power and loss of Government revenues when, as now, more than four and a half million people are out of work, the investment is small. Granted that the proposed legislation will not solve each and every employment problem: it will still serve as a large nucleus for a solution.

Now, what will this bill do? First of all, it will coordinate the work of two agencies most concerned with training and manpower: the Department of Labor, and through it, State and local employment service offices; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and through it, State and local educational and vocational agencies. It will provide a nationwide opportunity for vocational testing and occupational training—with priority given to the unemployed. Training will also be given to employed persons to update and upgrade their skills. The training offered to the unemployed will be supported by 100 percent Federal financing; the training for others will be on a 50–50 State matching basis. Training allowances, roughly equal to unemployment compensation payments, will be paid to unemployed trainees who are not receiving unemployment compensation benefits. There will be placement services for trainees who have completed a training program.

These training programs, which are to be offered to about 160,000 people the first year and 250,000 the second year, will vary in several ways. For example, the exact balance between unemployed and others receiving training will change with need; the length of training periods will depend upon the occupation involved and the labor market needs; State vocational agencies will arrange for training in public institutions, but when these are not available, private institutions will be used. And here let me emphasize the local nature of the program in question: the testing, counseling and placement of trainees, as well as the training facilities which I have mentioned will be done through local public employment service offices.

This program, in conclusion, will offer new hope to the thousands of workers who want to work but feel that their skills are outdated and no longer needed, to the displaced worker who has no position, and to unskilled young people entering the labor market. It will provide security, a knowledge of the importance of the individual, and a means to attain full employment and prosperity.

It is for these reasons that I strongly urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the manpower development and training bill in general and the Holland-Goodell amendments in particular.

Retraining is clearly a constructive conservative approach to the problem of

unemployment. The objective of the bill is to assist individuals to develop their own potential and to return them to the productive stream of the American economy as rapidly as feasible. It focuses our effort on the hard core of residual unemployment, rather than indiscriminately raising Federal expenditures and Government deficits in order to stimulate the economy. In addition to concentrating on the most crucial needs, the retraining approach is an investment with real returns in both human and economic terms. It gives people on the unemployment rolls a new hope, a chance to regain the confidence, dignity, and self-esteem that derives from the full employment of their individual talents and potential. In economic terms it means increased productivity and tax returns from productive workers instead of stagnation and the endless drain of welfare payments.

In the past, I have applauded administration efforts to increase jobs in the depressed areas of my State. I have urged the Secretary of Labor not to overlook the pressing needs of western Maryland where the Cumberland labor market area has a current unemployment rate of 7.3 percent—December 1961—and Hagerstown 9.8 percent—December 1961. I welcome this bill as an important step in easing the substantial and persistent unemployment in these and similar areas.

While I welcome the administration's efforts, I have been disturbed, Mr. Chairman, by the impression that has been created, intentionally or not, that the Republican Party is dedicated to obstruction of this program.

This bill is a Republican contribution with bipartisan support. The Republican policy committee devoted considerable time in this general area last year. A special task force under the leadership of the gentleman from Missouri, Representative CURTIS, issued a report last summer entitled "Employment in the Dynamic American Economy." Retraining and manpower development were treated extensively in that report. The work of my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], on the subcommittee reporting this bill is generally known and appreciated within this body.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I should also like to endorse the specific amendments offered in the Holland substitute. These tighten up an already sound bill. They concentrate aid where it is most needed—to unemployed heads of families rather than high school dropouts. They extend the principle of matching Federal with State funds. They permit a smoother dovetailing with existing unemployment assistance programs. They eliminate potential abuses in the granting of training allowances. They institute attendance and progress requirements in regard to these allowances. I wholeheartedly support my colleague in his efforts to produce a carefully and narrowly drawn bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961".

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOLLAND: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962'.

"TITLE I—OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING AND MANPOWER UTILIZATION

"Statement of findings and purpose

"SEC. 102. The Congress finds that there is critical need for more and better trained personnel in many vital occupational categories, including professional, scientific, technical, and apprenticeable categories; that even in periods of high unemployment, many employment opportunities remain unfilled because of the shortages of qualified personnel; and that it is in the national interest that current and prospective manpower shortages be identified and that persons who can be qualified for these positions through education and training be sought out and trained, in order that the Nation may meet the staffing requirements of the struggle for freedom. The Congress further finds that the skills of many persons have been rendered obsolete by dislocations in the economy arising from automation or other technological developments, foreign competition, relocation of industry, shifts in market demands, and other changes in the structure of the economy; that Government leadership is necessary to insure that the benefits of automation do not become burdens of widespread unemployment; that the problem of assuring sufficient employment opportunities will be compounded by the extraordinarily rapid growth of the labor force in the next decade, particularly by the entrance of young people into the labor force, that improved planning and expended efforts will be required to assure that men, women, and young people will be trained and available to meet shifting employment needs; that many persons now unemployed or underemployed, in order to become qualified for reemployment or full employment must be assisted in providing themselves with skills which are or will be in demand in the labor market; that the skills of many persons now employed are inadequate to enable them to make their maximum contribution to the Nation's economy; and that it is in the national interest that the opportunity to acquire new skills be afforded to these people in order to alleviate the hardships of unemployment, reduce the cost of unemployment compensation and public assistance, and to increase the Nation's productivity and its capacity to meet the requirements of the space age. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to require the Federal Government to appraise the manpower requirements and resources of the Nation, and to develop and apply the information and methods needed to deal with the problems of unemployment resulting from automation and technological changes and other types of persistent unemployment.

"Automation and occupational training

"SEC. 103. To assist the Nation in accomplishing the objectives of technological progress while avoiding or minimizing individual hardship and widespread unemployment, the Secretary of Labor shall—

"(1) evaluate the impact of, and benefits and problems created by automation, technological progress, and other changes in the structure of production and demand on the use of the Nation's human resources; establish techniques and methods of detecting in advance the potential impact of such developments; develop solutions to these problems, and publish findings pertaining thereto; and to such ends conduct or cause to be conducted within the Department of Labor and other agencies of Government, a comprehensive and continuing program of research as may be necessary;

"(2) promote, encourage, or directly engage in programs of information and communication concerning automation, technological developments, and prevention and amelioration of undesirable manpower effects from such developments;

"(3) appraise the adequacy of the Nation's manpower development efforts to meet foreseeable manpower needs and recommend needed adjustments, including methods for promoting the most effective occupational utilization of, and providing useful work experience and training opportunities for, untrained and inexperienced youth;

"(4) arrange for the conduct of such research and investigations as give promise of furthering the objectives of this Act.

"Improving labor mobility

"SEC. 104. In order to encourage the mobility of labor, to determine existing impediments to such mobility, and to determine the feasibility and desirability of methods to improve the mobility of labor, the Secretary of Labor is directed to—

"(1) establish a program of factual studies of practices of employers and unions which tend to impede the mobility of workers or which facilitate mobility, including but not limited to early retirement and vesting provisions and practices under private compensation plans; the extension of health, welfare, and insurance benefits to laid-off workers; the operation of severance pay plans; the operation of seniority systems; and the use of extended leave plans for education and training purposes. A report on these studies shall be included as a part of the Secretary's report required under section 105.

"(2) promote by discussions, publications, and other appropriate means, the development and adoption of equitable practices which improve the mobility of workers.

"Manpower report

"SEC. 105. The Secretary of Labor shall make such reports and recommendations to the President as he deems appropriate pertaining to manpower requirements, resources, use, and training; and the President shall transmit to the Congress within sixty days after the beginning of each regular session (commencing with the year 1963) a report pertaining to manpower requirements, resources, utilization, and training.

"Information and research

"SEC. 106. The Secretary of Labor shall develop, compile, and make available, in such manner as he deems appropriate, information regarding skill requirements, occupational outlook, job opportunities, labor supply in various skills, and employment trends on a National, State, area or other appropriate basis which shall be used in the educational, training, counseling, and placement activities performed under this Act.

"Appropriations for administration

"SEC. 107. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Labor a sum, not to exceed $1,770,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and not to exceed $1,670,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, to administer the provisions of this title.

"TITLE II—TRAINING AND SKILL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

"Responsibility for programs

"SEC. 201. (a) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall

determine the skill requirements of the economy, develop policies for the adequate occupational development and maximum utilization of the skills of the Nation's workers, and develop and encourage the development of broad and diversified training programs, including on-the-job training, designed to qualify for employment the many persons who cannot reasonably be expected to secure appropriate full-time employment without such training, and to equip the Nation's workers with the new and improved skills that are and will be required.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor shall carry out his responsibilities under this title through the maximum utilization of all possible resources for skill development available in industry, labor, public and private educational and training institutions, State, Federal, and local agencies, and other appropriate public and private organizations and facilities.

"Selection of trainees

"SEC. 202. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall provide a program for testing, counseling, and selecting for occupational training under titles III and IV those unemployed or underemployed individuals who cannot be expected to secure appropriate full-time employment without training. Whenever appropriate the Secretary shall also provide a special program for the testing and counseling of youths, sixteen years of age or older, and for the selection of those youths for whom occupational training under this Act is indicated.

"(b) Although priority in referral for training shall be extended to unemployed individuals, the Secretary of Labor shall, to the maximum extent possible, also refer other individuals qualified for training programs which will enable them to acquire needed skills. Priority in referral for training shall also be extended to individuals to be trained for skills needed within the area of their residence. Workers in farm families with less than $1,200 annual net family income shall be considered unemployed for the purpose of this Act.

"(c) Before selecting an individual for training, the Secretary shall determine that there is a reasonable expectation of employment in the occupation for which the individual is to be trained. If such employment is not available in the area in which the individual resides, the Secretary shall obtain reasonable assurance of such individual's willingness to accept employment outside his area of residence.

"(d) The Secretary shall not refer individuals for training in an occupation which requires less than two weeks' training, unless there are immediate employment opportunities in such occupation.

"(e) The duration of any training program to which an individual is referred shall be reasonable and consistent with the occupation for which the individual is being trained.

"(f) Upon certification by the responsible training agency that an individual who has been referred for training does not have a satisfactory attendance record or is not making satisfactory progress in such training, absent good cause, the Secretary shall forthwith terminate his training and subsistence and transportation allowances, and withdraw his referral. Such individual shall not be eligible for such allowances for one year thereafter.

"(g) The Secretary of Labor shall provide placement services to individuals who have completed their training under this Act, as well as counseling services to such individuals for an appropriate period after they have been placed.

"Training allowances

"SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of Labor may, on behalf of the United States, enter into agreements with States (which, for the purposes of this Act shall include the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) under which the Secretary of Labor shall make payments to such States either in advance or by way of reimbursement for the purpose of enabling such States, as agents for the United States, to make payment of weekly training allowances to unemployed individuals selected for training pursuant to the provisions of section 202 of this title and undergoing such training in a program operated pursuant to the provisions of this Act. Each such agreement shall provide that eighteen months after the enactment of this Act any payments made thereafter under this section must be matched by State funds in an amount equal to the Federal payment. Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding fifty-two weeks, and the amount of any such payment in any week for individuals undergoing training, including uncompensated employer-provided training, shall not exceed the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the most recent quarter for which such data are available: *Provided however*, That in any week an individual who, but for his training, would be entitled to unemployment compensation in excess of such an allowance shall receive an allowance increased by the amount of such excess.

"With respect to any week for which an individual receives unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or any other Federal or State unemployment compensation law which is less than the average weekly unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payment during the most recent quarter for which such data are available, a supplemental training allowance may be paid. This supplemental training allowance shall not exceed the difference between his unemployment compensation and the average weekly unemployment compensation payment referred to above.

"For individuals undergoing on-the-job training, the amount of any payment which would otherwise be made by the Secretary of Labor under this section shall be reduced by an amount which bears the same ratio to that payment as the number of compensated hours per week bears to forty hours: *Provided*, That in no event shall the payment to such an individual, when added to the amount received from the employer, bring the total to more than the average weekly unemployment compensation payment referred to above.

"(b) Training allowances may be supplemented by such sums as may be determined by the Secretary of Labor to be necessary to defray actual and necessary transportation expenses of individuals engaged in training under this Act and, when such training is provided in facilities which are not within commuting distance of their regular place of residence, to defray actual and necessary transportation and subsistence expenses for separate maintenance of such individuals. The Secretary in defraying such subsistence expenses shall not afford any individual an allowance exceeding the rate of $35 per week; nor shall the Secretary authorize any transportation expenditure exceeding the rate of 10 cents per mile.

"(c) Training allowances shall be limited to unemployed persons who have had not less than three years of experience in gainful employment and who are heads of families or heads of households as defined in the Internal Revenue Code.

"(d) No weekly training allowance shall be paid to any person otherwise eligible who, with respect to the week for which such payment would be made, has received or is eligible for unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or any other Federal or State unemployment compensation law, but if the appropriate State or Federal agency finally determines that a person denied training allowances for any week because of this subsection was not entitled to unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or such Federal or State law with respect to such week, this subsection shall not apply with respect to such week.

"(e) Any agreement under this section may contain such provisions (including, so far as may be appropriate, provisions authorized or made applicable with respect to agreements concluded by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to title XV of the Social Security Act) as will promote effective administration, protect the United States against loss, and insure the proper application of payments made to the State under such agreement. Except as may be provided in such agreements, or in regulations hereinafter authorized, determinations by any duly designated officer or agency as to the eligibility of individuals for weekly training allowances under this section shall be final and conclusive for any purposes and not subject to review by any court or any other officer.

"(f) If unemployment compensation payments are paid to an individual taking training under this Act, or any other Federal Act, the State making such payments shall be reimbursed from funds herein appropriated. The amount of such reimbursement shall be determined by the Secretary of Labor on the basis of reports furnished to him by the States and such amount shall then be placed in the State's unemployment trust fund account.

"(g) A person who, in connection with an occupational training program, has received a training allowance or whose unemployment compensation payments were reimbursed under the provisions of this Act or any other Federal Act shall not be entitled to training allowances under this Act for one year after the completion or other termination of the training with respect to which such allowance or payment was made.

"(h) No training allowance shall be paid to any person who is receiving training for an occupation which requires a training period of less than six days.

"(i) A person who refuses, without good cause, to accept training under this Act shall not, for one year thereafter, be entitled to training allowances.

"Agreements with States

"SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter into agreements with States, or with the appropriate State agency, pursuant to which the Secretary of Labor may, for the purpose of carrying out his functions and duties under this title, utilize the services of the appropriate State agency and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may reimburse the State or appropriate agency and its employees for services rendered for such purposes.

"(b) Any agreement under this section may contain such provisions as will promote effective administration, protect the United States against loss and insure that the functions and duties to be carried out by the appropriate State agency are performed in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of Labor.

"Rules and regulations

"SEC. 205. The Secretary of Labor shall prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.

"Appropriations

"SEC. 206. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Labor a sum, not to exceed $65,800,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and not to exceed

$110,667,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, to carry out the provisions of this title.

"TITLE III—ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

"Development of on-the-job training courses

"SEC. 301. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall encourage, develop, and secure the adoption of programs for on-the-job training needed to equip individuals selected for training with the appropriate skills. The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent possible, secure the adoption by private and public agencies, employers, trade associations, labor organizations and other industrial, educational, and community groups which he determines are qualified to conduct effective training programs under this title of such programs as he approves, and for this purpose he is authorized to enter into appropriate agreements with them.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in coordinating on-the-job training programs with vocational elucational programs conducted pursuant to the provisions of title IV.

"Training program standards

"SEC. 302. In adopting or approving any training program under this title, and as a condition to the expenditure of funds for any such program, the Secretary shall make such arrangements as he deems necessary to insure adherence to appropriate training standards and policies, including assurances—

"(1) that the training content of the program is adequate, involves reasonable progression, and will result in the qualification of trainees for suitable employment;

"(2) that the training period is reasonable and consistent with periods customarily required for comparable training;

"(3) that adequate and safe facilities, personnel, and records of attendance and progress are provided; and

"(4) that the trainees are compensated by the employer at such rates, including periodic increases, as may be deemed reasonable under regulations hereinafter authorized, considering such factors as industry, geographical region, and trainee proficiency.

"Supervision of on-the-job and related training programs

"SEC. 303. The Secretary of Labor shall make appropriate provision for supervision of the on-the-job training programs conducted under this title to insure the quality of the training provided and the adequacy of the various programs.

"State agreements

"SEC. 304. (a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter into an agreement with a State, or with the appropriate agency of the State, pursuant to which the Secretary of Labor may, for the purpose of carrying out his functions and duties under this title, utilize the services of the appropriate State agency and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may reimburse such State or appropriate agency for services rendered for such purposes.

"(b) Any agreement under this section may contain such provisions as will promote effective administration, protect the United States against loss, and insure that the functions and duties to be carried out by the appropriate State agency are performed in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of Labor.

"Rules and regulations

"SEC. 305. The Secretary of Labor shall prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.

"Appropriations

"SEC. 306. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Labor a sum, not to exceed $2,800,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and not to exceed $4,800,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, to carry out the provisions of this title.

"TITLE IV—VOCATIONAL TRAINING

"Provision of vocational training

"SEC. 401. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, pursuant to the provisions of title II of this Act, enter into agreements with States under which the appropriate State vocational education agencies will undertake to provide the vocational training needed to equip individuals, referred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 202, for the occupation specified in the referrals. Such State agencies shall provide for such training through public education agencies or institutions or, if facilities or services of such agencies or institutions are not adequate for the purpose, through arrangements with private educational or training institutions. Any such agreement may provide for payment to such State agency of up to 100 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement with respect to unemployed individuals, and up to 50 per centum of the cost with respect to other individuals, and shall contain such other provisions as will promote effective administration (including provisions for reports on the attendance and performance of trainees, with immediate notice to the Secretary of Labor in the event a trainee fails to attend or progress satisfactorily, and provision for continuous supervision of the training programs conducted under the agreement to insure the quality and adequacy of the training provided), protect the United States against loss, and assure that the functions and duties to be carried out by such State agency are performed in such fashion as will carry out the purposes of this title: *Provided,* That, after eighteen months after the enactment of this Act, any amount paid to a State to carry out an agreement authorized by this part shall be paid on condition that such State shall bear 50 per centum of such cost. In the case of any State which does not enter into an agreement under this section, and in the case of any training which the State agency does not provide under such an agreement, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall provide the needed training by agreement or contract with public or private educational or training institutions.

"Cooperation with Secretary of Labor

"SEC. 402. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall cooperate with the Secretary of Labor in coordinating vocational education programs with on-the-job training conducted pursuant to the provisions of title III.

"Rules and regulations

"SEC. 403. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.

"Appropriations

"SEC. 404. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare a sum, not to exceed $28,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and not to exceed $42,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, to carry out the provisions of this title.

"TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

"Apportionment of benefits

"SEC. 501. For the purpose of effecting an equitable apportionment of Federal expenditures among the States in carrying out the programs authorized under titles II, III, and IV of this Act, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in accordance with uniform standards and in arriving at such standards, shall consider the following factors: (1) the proportion which the labor force of a State bears to the total labor force of the United States, (2) the proportion which the unemployed in a State during the preceding calendar year bears to the total number of unemployed in the United States in the preceding calendar year, (3) the lack of appropriate full-time employment in the State, (4) the proportion which the insured unemployed within a State bears to the total number of insured employed within such State.

"Other agencies and departments

"SEC. 502. (a) In the performance of his functions under this Act, the Secretary of Labor, in order to avoid unnecessary expense and duplication of functions among Government agencies, shall use the available services or facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, under conditions specified in subsection (d). Each department, agency, or establishment of the United States is authorized and directed to cooperate with the Secretary of Labor and, to the extent permitted by law, to provide such services and facilities as he may request for his assistance in the performance of his functions under this Act.

"(b) Funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act may be transferred, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, between departments and agencies of the Government, if such funds are used for the purposes for which they are specifically authorized and appropriated.

"(c) The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may make such contracts or agreements, establish such procedures, and make such payments, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, or otherwise allocate or expend funds made available under this Act, as they deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"(d) The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall not use any authority conferred by this Act to assist in relocating establishments from one area to another. Such limitation shall not prohibit assistance to a business entity in the establishment of a new branch, affiliate, or subsidiary of such entity if the Secretary of Labor finds that such assistance will not result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location or in any other area where such entity conducts business operations, unless he has reason to believe that such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary is being established with the intention of closing down the operations of the existing business entity in the area of its original location or in any other area where it conducts such operations.

"Maintenance of State effort

"SEC. 503. No training program which is financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government under this Act shall be approved unless the Secretary of Labor, if the program is authorized under title III, or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, if the program is authorized under title IV, satisfies himself that neither the State nor the locality in which the training is carried out has reduced or is reducing its own level of expenditures for vocational education and training, including program operation under provisions of the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and titles I, II, and III of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, except for reductions unrelated to the provisions or purposes of this Act.

"Selection and referral

"SEC. 504. The selection of individuals for training under this Act and the placement of such individuals shall not be contingent upon such individual's membership or nonmembership in a labor organization.

"Secretaries' reports

"SEC. 505. (a) Prior to March 1, 1963, and again prior to March 1, 1964, the Secretary of Labor shall make a report to Congress. Such report shall contain an evaluation of the programs under titles I, II, and III, including the number of individuals trained and the number and types of training activities under this Act, the number of unemployed or underemployed persons who have secured full-time employment as a result of such training, and the nature of such employment, the need for continuing such programs, and recommendations for improvement.

"(b) Prior to March 1, 1963, and again prior to March 1, 1964, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall also make a report to Congress. Such report shall contain an evaluation of the programs under title IV, the need for continuing such programs, and recommendations for improvement. The first such report shall also contain the results of the vocational training survey which is presently being conducted under the supervision of the Secretary.

"Termination of authority

"SEC. 506. (a) All authority conferred under titles II, III, and IV of this Act shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1964.

"(b) Notwithstanding the foregoing, the termination of these titles shall not affect the disbursement of funds under, or the carrying out of, any contract, commitment, or other obligation entered into pursuant to these titles prior to the date of such termination: *Provided*, That no disbursement of funds shall be made pursuant to the authority conferred under titles II, III, and IV of this Act after December 30, 1964.

"Appropriations

"SEC. 507. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretaries of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary to administer the provisions of this title, but not to exceed the sum of $1,600,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and not to exceed the sum of $2,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964."

Mr. POWELL (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute be considered as read, and be open to amendment at any point.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire as to whether the substitute the gentleman from Pennsylvania now offers is the same as H.R. 10363, the bill which was introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL]? Is it identical in all respects?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is identical.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] be known as a cosponsor of the bill? We had one famous bill here known as the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. This is of bigger importance than the Landrum-Griffin bill.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, in making this proposal, I am encouraged by the wide support given this legislation and the many fine things said about it from all parts of the country and from both sides of the aisle.

In proposing this substitute, I am, in effect, reintroducing my own bill, H.R. 8399, as it was reported by the Committee on Education and Labor, 24 to 3, last July 27. With the cooperation and assistance of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], the ranking minority member of our subcommittee, we worked untiringly for the passage of this legislation, we have made certain modifications which will have a wide appeal to the Members of this body.

I would like to remind the House that it has been 7 months since the committee discharged its obligations on H.R. 8399.

Since then we have had two hearings before the Rules Committee—one last September and a second one several weeks ago.

I have also had the benefit of letters from many parts of the Nation as well as firsthand discussions with many of my own constituents, who are looking forward to the promise and hope which this bill will provide for them.

As the Senate passed a companion bill on August 23, I have carefully studied the debate which took place in that Chamber and, finally, I have consulted quite frequently with many of the Members, from both sides of the aisle, since Congress convened.

From all these sources, some significant additions to H.R. 8399 have been incorporated into the substitute. I would like to summarize these changes for you.

First. The most important is to spell out the fact that payment of training allowances are for those adults who have had at least 3 years of gainful employment and who are heads of households. This has always been my view, but to define it clearly is quite agreeable to me and to my colleagues.

Second. This bill was developed for the unemployed—the factory worker, the miner, and the white-collar clerk. It has been brought out, however, that the small farmer and the farmhand are also experiencing hardship from technological change. To help those whose net income is less than $1,200 per year we have considered them unemployed, rather than underemployed, for the purposes of this bill. I appreciate the help of my Republican and Democratic colleagues from the rural areas of the Nation for this suggestion and recommendation.

Third. It was the intent of this bill to preserve the system of training allowances separate from unemployment insurance benefits. In order to make this intent perfectly clear, a provision has been added which states the reimbursement of moneys will be given to those States which pay insurance benefits for time spent in training. This will insure replacement of funds to those States now following this practice.

Fourth. A fourth change has to do with the training for youth. H.R. 8399, as reported, provided training for all ages. In order to clarify this intent for those of us who are interested in the many unemployed between the ages of 16 and 21, my substitute includes a provision to provide this training.

Fifth. One oversight has been brought to our attention. It is the theory of the bill that those getting training will get training allowances rather than unemployment insurance benefits. These allowances are pegged at the State average. We failed, however, to take account of the unemployed person receiving benefits above the State average; the substitute makes this change.

Sixth. The original bill provided for 10 supergrade positions and we find this is no longer appropriate. It has, therefore, been eliminated in this substitute.

Seventh. The training for minor skills, requiring less than 2 weeks' time, will be prohibited unless immediate job opportunity is available before the training is undertaken.

Eighth. No training allowance will be available for those requiring less than 6 days' training. For jobs such as dishwashers, waitresses, and the like which require only 2 days' training, training will be available but not allowances.

Ninth. Trainees are required to have satisfactory attendance and show progress to remain under the program. Failure to do so—without good cause—will automatically stop the payment of allowances, and trainee cannot again qualify for at least 1 year.

Tenth. Applicants for training under this program cannot qualify if they have, during the previous year, received allowances for training under any other Federal program.

Eleventh. In regard to the subsistence and transportation expenses of trainees under this program, actual and necessary expenses must be shown. In no event shall these exceed $35 per week or 10 cents per mile.

Twelfth. States will be required to match Federal funds covering the cost of training allowances as quickly as is feasible.

These changes were discussed and approved by all interested persons.

I appreciate the help given me by all the Members who assisted and I would again like to commend Congressman GOODELL for his suggestions and recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, I am interested in getting our unemployed back to work—active in the work force of the Nation—thereby allowing our people to regain their self-respect and permitting them to again support their families and educate their children.

This, Mr. Chairman, is first and foremost in my mind.

To accomplish this I will cooperate with all Members on both sides of the aisle.

I know many Congressmen—both Republican and Democratic—who represent districts that need this legislation, and I know these Members want to vote for this bill.

I want them to be able to do so and I will bend over backward to let them.

What is most important is that we give our unemployed of the Nation the chance they so greatly need.

With the assistance and advice of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] I believe we have the legislation properly prepared to meet the approval of all factions in this Congress.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask the support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the amendment in the nature of a substitute bill which is now on your desk.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I want at the outset to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND], for his work on this legislation, and I want to pay particular tribute to him for his willingness to accept this substitute, H.R. 10363, and offer it jointly on a bipartisan basis. And, I wish to emphasize the difference between this substitute on which we will vote and the bill that came from the committee.

This substitute will focus the bill on the unemployed workers who are heads of families and who have held jobs for at least 3 years. There will be no training allowance to a worker who does not fall in that category. It requires matching by the States of the administrative cost and of the training allowance cost after a period of 18 months. Experience has shown that where the States participate and put up some of this money, and they participate in this program through the employment offices locally and through the vocational offices locally as well as through the State legislatures appropriating money, that the program turns out to be much more efficient. The unemployment compensation fund will be protected by a new provision in my substitute bill. We had a running debate throughout the consideration of this bill as to how we could preserve the independence of this unemployment compensation system and the local control over it. We have worked out a system of reimbursing those unemployment trust funds which permit the payment of benefits to workers who are undergoing training. This, I believe, is important. It means that there will be an inducement for our State legislatures to extend the provision permitting unemployed workers to take their training while collecting unemployment benefits. Today, in most of our States, in all but 17, this is forbidden. A worker who is unemployed cannot be trained and still draw unemployment compensation. He has no choice. In other words, he must sit and just take the benefits. The substitute requires that there must be an immediate job opportunity if training is to be for less than 2 weeks. It is my view that if you are going to train a worker for less than 2 weeks' time, you should know that there is a job waiting for him at the end of that period.

The substitute forbids any training allowances for training of less than 6 days. This does not mean they cannot train workers for skills which take less than 6 days to acquire. But such trainees are not going to be paid a training allowance during that period. H.R. 10363 requires specifically satisfactory attendance and progress and requires the vocational school, or whatever other facility is involved, to notify the local employment office immediately if satisfactory performance is not forthcoming from the trainees.

Mr. Chairman, the bill forbids any payment of training allowances for 1 year after the training is completed, or after the training is turned down by a worker. This will foreclose the possibility of a worker collecting unemployment compensation after being advised by the office of employment locally that he should get some training and go back to work and he deciding that he wants to wait until his unemployment compensation runs out and then go over and get some training allowances. If he is offered the opportunity to train and turns it down, under the substitute and under the bill he will thereafter be ineligible for a training allowance for 1 year. We will permit no training eligibility to be determined by the employment office on the basis of union membership or nonunion membership, and we restrict the types and amounts of transportation and subsistence allowances that can be paid.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 10363, which is the substitute now pending before the House, I believe is an efficient and effective and progressive program that this Congress should support upon a bipartisan basis. The program will help these workers get off the welfare and unemployment rolls and back into the productive stream of our economy.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. What happens to the money in case a State does not want to participate, or does not have the money to participate? What happens to the money that is appropriated by the Federal Government? Does it go to some other State?

Mr. GOODELL. First of all, I do not think we will have many States that will not participate. If they do not participate the Office of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has the authority to set up some programs of vocational training in the area. This is only in the event that the State refuses to go along and provide these services themselves. We have such a vast program of vocational education today with 47 percent of it paid locally, 35 percent by the States, and only 19 percent by the Federal Government, that I do not think there is much danger of the States refusing to go along with this program.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment now pending before the House. I am in full agreement with the previous speakers to the effect that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] certainly deserve the gratitude and commendation of the entire Congress for working out an agreeable and acceptable formula that we can vote on today.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the substitute provision in some instances strengthens the bill. I would like to particularly point out the tribute that belongs to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND]. Two years ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] had asked the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House permission to conduct hearings on the effect of automation on the American economy. He has done a magnificent job. He has assembled a tremendous record of information and knowledge on this subject. The mere fact that we are here today, able to vote on this bill, I think is a tribute to his diligence and his sincere interest in this subject. I think the fact that we are able to vote on this bill today also reflects the new look in the Committee on Education and Labor of the House under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] who has indeed encouraged this investigation of the impact of automation on the American employment scene, and who has helped the committee in every aspect.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill is adopted today, and I hope it will be, we indeed are writing an historic piece of legislation into the books of our country.

We are in this way giving full meaning to the fact that the Congress of the United States recognizes that problems in the employment field of America must follow the trend of automation; but we are also strengthening the whole concept of free enterprise as contrasted to the communistic totalitarian system's economy. We are saying here in effect that we recognize that American industry, working within the concept of free enterprise, has the right, has the responsibility, has the duty to move forward, to develop new technological means; but we are also recognizing that in this process there is a great dislocation of workers. And we here today are trying to provide legislation which will take care of these dislocated workers and put them back into the stream of gainful employment.

There are people in this country who have been unemployed for many, many years. These are people who want to go to work. These are people who want to preserve their personal dignity and earn their livelihood. But they have been dislocated from their regular jobs for various reasons—automation, movement of industry, foreign imports, various other reasons.

This legislation will help an estimated 450,000 people become better trained to take on new skills to replace old ones for which there no longer is a need because of technological improvements. The impact of these 450,000 people who would be helped by this legislation would be of great benefit to the economic growth of the country, to an extent that can hardly be estimated.

The question was raised, can older people be retrained? I have such profound confidence in the ingenuity and ability of the American worker that there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that a man who has worked with machines all his life can, indeed, be retrained for another job regardless of his age. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that this can be done with considerable success. In Chicago, we have

seen hundreds of older workers lose their original jobs—jobs they held for many years—because some very large companies have moved to other parts of the country. There is no demand for these workers' particular skill in most instances. I believe the only way you can put these people back to work is to quickly train them for another job. There are jobs available. You need only look at the want ads of many newspapers to verify this statement. With just a little help in retraining, many of those now unemployed can be helped to qualify for these jobs.

The question was raised quite properly by the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. ASHBROOK, whether or not this is going to intrude upon other vocational programs. I think the substitute bill certainly reduces that possibility. Notwithstanding that, however, it appears to me that any legislation can be successful only if the legislative branch of the Government continues periodically to review the activities of the executive agencies of Government. We have had several examples of this in our committee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] when we called in administrators to see what they are doing with legislation that we pass in Congress; to see whether or not they are doing a good job. On a bipartisan basis we have suggested ways to improve administration of laws passed by Congress, in those cases where they have not been staying within the spirit of the act. I think if this act does not work, or is not administered properly by the agencies, Congress should react very swiftly. It is my judgment that Congress has a duty to ascertain whether the laws it enacts are being properly administered by the agencies.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], how many amendments are pending on his side?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, we have no amendments. We have worked this bill out in compromise.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, if there are any amendments pending on either side, may I ask whether they are perfecting amendments, or whether they are amendments that change the substance of the bill?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any amendments that are pending.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask what amendments are pending, if any?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment, which is at the desk.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] on the pending amendment.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:15 p.m.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished minority leader of my committee has moved that all debate close at 2:15. If he will amend his motion to reserve the last 5 minutes to this side, I would have no objection to that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman may not make a reservation on a motion.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my motion.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Holland-Goodell substitute and to call attention to several items which, I think, deserve particular attention. This bill would set up a 2-year program as it will be amended by the Holland-Goodell substitute and would authorize expenditures in the neighborhood of $253 million. I do not believe it is realistic to expect that the Department of Labor can properly and wisely spend as much money as is authorized for the first year of this program. Looking back at the area development legislation, sometimes referred to as the depressed-area bill, we know it has taken a long time to get that program underway. Before the pending bill could be effective, there must be made an inventory of the skills in short supply and a number of other steps must be taken. I should like to call the attention of the Committee on Appropriations to the fact that more money is probably being authorized than will be needed or can wisely be used in the first year. The Committee on Appropriations should take a close and careful look, and require that the Department of Labor justify fully the appropriation of any funds authorized by this bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would call the attention of my colleague to the fact that just the other day, in a discussion at the Department of Labor, I asked about the retraining provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act.

I was given to understand that as far as the retraining provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act are concerned, the funds appropriated have been almost completely committed for the current fiscal year. I do not know if the gentleman has other information, but that is the information which was given to me.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I join the gentleman in the desire to get this program underway as quickly as possible. It is not my purpose to retard it; however, I am suggesting that it is difficult to get a program of this kind rolling at once. It is going to take some time, and I question whether the full amount to be authorized by this bill is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to go to another point. The substitute contains an important provision in section 504 which provides that selection of trainees shall not be contingent upon membership or lack of membership in a labor organization. I would assume that if this provision had not been included we could expect that the Department of Labor, under no circumstances, would select trainees on the basis of whether or not they happened to belong to a union. In the selection of trainees, surely unemployed workers have the right to expect and demand that the Department of Labor will not discriminate on the basis of whether a person happens to be a union member or happens not to be a union member.

This can be very important because workers of the Negro race are excluded from membership in a number of unions, and a large percentage of the unemployed are Negroes.

Now that section 504 has been included in the Holland-Goodell substitute, it should not be taken out in conference. If the conferees should now allow the provision to be taken out it might be inferred that Congress would condone discrimination by the Department of Labor, on the basis of union membership or the lack of thereof. Accordingly, it is very essential now that section 504 be retained by the conferees.

I assume that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] will be among the conferees. Will he comment in regard to section 504 of the substitute he has offered which provides that the selection of individuals shall not be contingent upon membership or nonmembership in a labor organization?

Mr. HOLLAND. That was the judgment of the committee. I will stand by the committee's decision.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. This is a new bill we have before us now. Is there anywhere in writing an explanation of this bill similar to the analysis contained in the report on the original bill we had before us?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] to reply.

Mr. GOODELL. I believe in general terms the analysis applies, but in the substitute we have made probably a total of 15 or 16 changes that I think are rather substantial, matching provisions, priority of employment, and so forth.

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman will yield further, that is a matter I would like to know a little more about. There has been some discussion of matching provisions, but it has not been fully explained. I think we are probably going to be called upon to do something without knowing everything we ought to know. I understand in the substitute there is a section dealing with matching provisions which provides that in the event a State does not decided to match, then the Federal Government will assume the whole burden. I want to know if that is the fact.

Mr. GOODELL. May I say to the gentleman that last week I sent a letter to every Congressman dealing with the differences between the original bill and the substitute. Second, may I state that where a State does not enter into an agreement with the Federal Government under the vocational education system, then HEW can go in there and set up a program in the States where necessary to train workers.

Mr. HARDY. So that if the State does not pay half the cost then HEW pays it all.

Mr. GOODELL. No. In those instances HEW presumably will be able to provide only a limited program of training in such States, HEW will take over, if the State refuses to go along, and set up some kind of a small program in that State. They will use such facilities as may be made available to them, high school facilities, and so forth.

Mr. HARDY. But to the extent that it is carried on, the Federal Government will bear the entire cost.

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

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] may proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. I would like my distinguished friend from Michigan to direct his attention again to section 504, which he was discussing at the time this colloquy developed, with regard to membership or nonmembership in unions being required of people who are trained under this program in place. Take the case of an electrical contractor who has a collective bargaining agreement with a union; the union has an apprenticeship program which the prospective employee must complete before he can be employed under that collective bargaining agreement. How is the fellow who is to be trained under this act going to be protected in his right to get a job when he moves in to apply for employment in a concern which has a collective bargaining agreement of that type?

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Certainly I would not minimize the fact that in some situations even though a person did receive training he might still have difficulty in obtaining a job.

Mr. LANDRUM. This section 504 is not going to protect a person from that sort of situation?

Mr. GRIFFIN. It protects against discrimination in the selection of trainees.

Mr. LANDRUM. It does not give him protection in the placement of the fellow who has been trained?

Mr. GRIFFIN. No. The section goes only to the selection of trainees. In selecting trainees the selection shall not be contingent upon membership in a union or nonmembership in a union. That is as far as the section goes.

Mr. LANDRUM. So an employer with a collective bargaining agreement with a union is not going to be able to hire a person unless the person meets the apprenticeship requirements of the union?

Mr. GRIFFIN. That might be the case in some situations. There would be other situations in which it would not apply.

Mr. LANDRUM. If the gentleman will indulge me further.

Let us look at the situation which prevails in New York City today as between the electrical contractors and the electrical unions. Is it not likely that a person trained or retrained under this act would find himself absolutely helpless in the face of that situation?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Unfortunately, I think it is conceivable that in some localities a person who has been trained under this program and acquires certain skill might still find it difficult or all but impossible to find a job because of discriminatory practices, but at least we are taking a step in the right direction in training these people. Certainly they cannot obtain jobs if they do not have training or cannot get training in a particular skill or trade. To that extent I think we would be applying some pressure toward a change in the situation in some areas.

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have reread this list of jobs for which training would be provided by the Department of Labor and nowhere do I find any indication that voluntarily or unvoluntarily retired Members of Congress would be trained. Was any consideration given to that?

Mr. POWELL. There has already been a unanimous-consent request for the retraining of retired Members of Congress.

Mr. GROSS. What would they be retrained for—ticket sellers, bank tellers, waiters and waitresses?

Mr. POWELL. It might even entail twister tenders.

Mr. GROSS. I was going to ask if they might be in that category.

One Member a moment ago mentioned the unemployed because of foreign imports. Did the Committee on Education and Labor go into this subject, and can anyone on the Committee on Education and Labor tell us how many people are unemployed by virtue of imports?

Mr. POWELL. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] has been studying this problem of the impact of imports on unemployment. That study comes to a close tomorrow, March 1, and will be very helpful.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] can give us any information as to the number of unemployed and therefore would be likely to come under the provisions of this bill, as a result of foreign imports?

Mr. DENT. Do I have an estimate of how many people are unemployed because of the impact of imports that would be benefited by this bill?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. DENT. As I understand this bill, it relates to those who are unemployed because of internal conditions, such as automation. We are holding up relief for those who are displaced because of imports until we pass the new trade bill.

Mr. GROSS. It is as simple as that.

Mr. DENT. I do not know how simple it is.

Mr. GROSS. I am just wondering how you are going to find the jobs, not only for these people, but others who are out of work. How is it proposed to find jobs, by training or retraining, for people who are out of work because of foreign imports? There are no jobs for them because foreigners have taken over their employment.

Mr. DENT. The only thing I can say is, regardless of whether there are jobs available, it is absolutely essential that if persons are displaced from an industry in which they have worked and have been trained, we must, at least, give them hope that they will have a job, and at least take them to whatever job may come up.

Mr. GROSS. Do you think they can live on hope?

Mr. DENT. Well, I do not know. There are about 11 million people in the United States drawing relief, some in the third generation. They are doing pretty fair at it.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. It is my understanding as I read this legislation that it would apply to retraining the unemployed worker, regardless of what the cause of the unemployment may be.

Mr. GROSS. Now we have a difference of opinion on this subject. I wonder if the chairman could clarify it.

Mr. POWELL. I would like to say to the gentleman that there are 175,000 unfilled jobs reported each month.

Mr. GROSS. Well, but that does not answer the question of the number who are unemployed by virtue of foreign imports, and whether they can benefit under this bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania indicates they will not benefit, and there must be many thousands in this country who have been knocked out of their jobs because of imports.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. The bill provides specifically that it will apply to any employee who is seeking work; it does not matter whether he is out of work due to automation or due to the fact that his plant closed down or due to foreign imports or any other reason. As far as your statement about not being able to find a job after he gets training, the bill provides specifically that there shall be a survey as to what skills are needed, and when that determination is made he is trained for this potential job.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time for the purpose of begging the indulgence of either the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] for the purpose of presenting a couple of questions. The first one is this: If we are to distinguish between temporary programs as such and permanent programs as such, does the gentleman think that this program would be characterized as temporary or permanent?

Mr. GOODELL. May I say to the gentleman that I would hope that this program will be so effective that we will renew it and find that we want it to be a permanent program to put the people back to work. But, if we do not need it, we will not renew it. We require, in my substitute, a report in a year and then a report at the end of the second year, in great detail, as to the results, so that we can appraise whether we are really putting 3 percent, 5 percent, or 12 percent of these unemployed back to work through this training program. I intend to evaluate it very carefully as it goes along and eliminate it if it does not do the job.

Mr. KYL. The second question is in regard to the imposition of Federal control. Does not the gentleman believe there is a degree of compulsion on the part of the Federal Government in the very essence of these cost-sharing programs? In other words, does not the State legislature feel the Congress again has applied the blackjack. They say we can go along if we want to, but if we do not we lose the money.

Mr. GOODELL. Well, I would agree with the gentleman that this does apply.

In many instances, however, where the States are not doing this job it is because they do need the help of our employment office, and they do need the help of our vocational programs. We are trying to get them coordinated so that there will be liaison between the local, State, and Federal agencies that have to operate in this field in order to pinpoint those workers that can be retrained and those skills that are short, and to see that they train them in those skills and not in obsolescent skills.

Mr. KYL. I would say to the gentleman that within the last year or 2-year period the State of Iowa's office of unemployment and retraining has done the job outlined by the legislation under which they operate, but in each instance because they did the job they ran short of money. The Department of Labor did not furnish the necessary funds for the operation.

Mr. GOODELL. If the gentleman will yield further, I am aware that the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare cut back on these programs during the last year. While saying they were in favor of giving more emphasis to this, they cut back in their expenditures.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, in this list of occupations I notice airline hostesses and telephone operators. It has been my understanding that the private enterprise companies involved have been training people for these jobs. Is there anything in this legislation which would prevent these industries from turning over the cost of this training to the Federal Government?

Mr. GOODELL. If the gentleman will yield further, if there is any on-the-job training—and many of these fall in this category—if there is any on-the-job training program that is in existence they must go ahead and pay for it at their regular rate, and we will pay only a training allowance if the total pay to that individual involved in on-the-job training is less than the average unemployment compensation in that particular State. In other words, if they are getting on-the-job training, and are getting more than the average of unemployment compensation from the employer himself, there would be no training.

Mr. KYL. Is there any reason to suspect that the airline companies would not continue to accept the burden of training these people?

Mr. GOODELL. I think they would. I think with this program and with the restrictions we have written into it the Secretary of Labor would be compelled to see that they would continue it, and not give training allowances under such circumstances.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman mentions this on-the-job training. Is it conceivable that such a position as dishwasher, or housekeeper could not be as it has always been, an on-the-job training proposition? Are we not stretching the point a little bit by listing occupations such as these?

Mr. GOODELL. I say that I agree with the gentleman. I considered an amendment to forbid training for these types of things, but the difficulty was describing the various occupations we could list, such as dishwasher, and things of this nature, in the bill itself. But we do not expect them to give this type of training.

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

Mr. Chairman, up until now we have had quite a harmonious party, and a great many bouquets have been thrown to the committees and the individuals who have done this work, and I do not see the need to discourage those bouquets. No doubt they are deserved, and well deserved.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think we should consider what we are doing here. We are doing something that I am quite sure a lot of Members of this House would not do if they knew the facts.

Mr. Chairman, I opposed the rule yesterday because as I stated, there was going to be a substitute bill offered involving, as it is said, some 28 amendments, and this would be pretty much an entirely different bill than had been presented to the Rules Committee. I have studied these amendments, and many of them are acceptable, of course, but in effect we are writing a bill on the floor without ever having read it. This bill has not been read on the floor, and the entire amended bill is here presented. Requests have been made for the details on the changes, and to some degree they have been discussed, but not completely. In other words, we are voting blind if we vote on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, let us consider the fact that about 90 percent of the bills that have been sent up to us for enactment from the administration have three basic ingredients: No. 1, bigger Federal Government; No. 2, bigger executive power, especially within the Department of Labor, and No. 3, very much increased spending—in this case some $263 million. That is a colossal sum of money.

Mr. Chairman, testimony was offered yesterday that some of the vocational departments could not properly spend the money that had been appropriated, and I have no doubt that it is true. But here we would take $263 million to retrain a great many people.

I cited yesterday just a few instances, and I shall not repeat, but in a study made at Bridgeport, Conn., about 4,400 unemployed were checked and examined and cards made and deducting those who were not interested, those who could not pass a test and those who failed to show up, the inquiry wound up with 57 who finished the course. Only 53 trainees were placed, out of the original 4,400.

In Oklahoma City, Armour & Co. had to lay off 400 people. The company knew about it in advance and offered training courses and finally got 58 through the training courses, and only 7 of those were finally employed.

The Detroit Public Welfare Commission made a study of 761 people. Only 146 could qualify.

So it goes, in innumerable other cases. Why do I mention that? For this reason. The bill S. 1991, sent over from the other body, provides $655 million. It was estimated that this would train at least 100,000 people. Mr. Chairman, that is $6,550 per person. This bill authorizes $263 million, and taking the percentage of those who eventually can be trained, which would be about 41,000 people, it would cost $6,450 per person.

I think we have to consider what this bill really is. Is it the right bill or will the money just go down the drain?

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] mentioned the fact that we had, and he cited them, 20 vast training programs now being administered. This is a gigantic bill to be superimposed on all of those; there is no cooperation with them provided, and no coordination. It is proposed to train many thousands of others including, I am told, by the way—and I do not happen to be a farmer—but I am told practically all family farmers in the United States. I know of one—and there are several others, perhaps—that has a gross income of $75,000 and made less than $1,200 net income. All farmers with a net income of $1,200 would be eligible, and that means all family farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] has expired.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, here we have a project that will put the Federal Government into the business of guaranteeing jobs. Private industry could not guarantee jobs, of course not, and I question that the Federal Government can possibly do so.

With regard to the expense of the project, I propose to offer an amendment shortly that will cut the requested authorized amount about in half. I feel that if we pass this bill at least we ought to make it reasonable and sensible. I believe a good many Members who are in favor of the bill could vote for that amendment.

Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that our objections to this bill may be characterized in four ways. First, we have these three basic ingredients, of larger Government, bigger Executive power and Labor Department power, and bigger-spending. And second, we would attempt to doctor the symptoms of this disease of unemployment rather than getting at the causes of it. There has been no comprehensive survey. Several of our subcommittees are getting to it, but they have not had a complete survey of the whole unemployment picture and its causes. The Labor Department has not done it; nobody has done it.

The impact of automation, the impact of imports, labor troubles, the flight of industry from the community, other adverse business atmospheric conditions, scientific projects, changing markets, changing demands—Mr. Chairman, we cannot legislate intelligently unless we get at the causes of the problems we seek to correct. This only doctors the symptoms at a perfectly stupendous cost. We have all of these other programs, and many people have mentioned them. I do not care to belabor the point or go over them again, but I just say that these points are very important, and we need them to legislate intelligently. The need has not been shown because of all of these other programs involving millions and millions of people on vocational training, are now doing a large part of the job.

Furthermore and lastly, and more importantly than anything else, this is an impractical proposal. It cannot succeed. There are many changeable factors, some of which we have familiarity with and we do believe that the actual, the proposed, training cannot succeed. Only in rare cases and after study make it succeed. There must be some screening and some analysis to see whether a man is equipped to take training. Many people can qualify to make excellent coal miners and railroad workers. The shortage is in electronics and engineers. The bill does not solve any of these selective problems. True, we try to solve them, but I suggest this is completely impractical. It is a pipe dream. It might be called a gigantic boondoggle. I feel we ought to know what we are doing before we have any tremendous big scheme as this. I am sure when we offer the amendment to cut the expense at least that can be adopted. The bill is a bad bill with all of these 28 amendments, and I do not believe we should ever write a bill on the House floor as we are attempting here today. I oppose the bill and oppose the amendment and urge its defeat.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close at 2:30 p.m.

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

Mr. HIESTAND. I object.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close at 2:45 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the limitation of time, the Chair will recognize those Members standing and seeking recognition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALPERN to the amendment offered by Mr. HOLLAND: On page 22, after line 18, insert the following and renumber the following sections to conform:

"NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

"SEC. 503. (a) The Secretary shall appoint a National Advisory Committee which shall consist of ten members and shall be composed of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, education, and training, and the public in general. From the members appointed to such Committee the Secretary shall designate a Chairman. Such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Secretary relative to the carrying out of his duties under this Act. Such Committee shall hold not less than two meetings during each calendar year.

"(b) The National Advisory Committee shall encourage and assist in the organization on a plant, community, regional, or industry basis of labor-management-public committees and similar groups designed to further the purposes of this Act and may provide assistance to such groups, as well as existing groups organized for similar purposes, in effectuating such purposes.

"(c) The National Advisory Committee may accept gifts or bequests, either for carrying out specific programs or for its general activities or for its responsibilities under subsection (b) of this section."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will establish a National Advisory Committee, which will be named by the Secretary and will consist of 10 people who shall be chosen from representatives of labor, management, agriculture, education, and training and the public in general.

This Committee would encourage and assist in the organization of labor-management-public committees on a plant, community, regional, and industrial basis.

Such local committees are highly desirable, for they could and would provide the local initiative which is essential for the complete success of the manpower development and training program, and also for the achieving of an increase in the rate of U.S. productivity.

I strongly believe that this substantive amendment to this Manpower Development and Training Act gives this Congress a unique opportunity to plant the seeds of local cooperation throughout the country. The work of plant, community, regional, and industrywide councils in implementing the purposes of this act cannot but extend into other aspects of the productivity issue. When all facets of our economic community begin to understand and freely discuss with each other, many of our problems will be well on the way to solution. The important thing is to get these segments of our communities started on a common working relationship, built around common interest.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain that this amendment will serve this extremely desirable goal.

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York, tells me he has no objection to the concept of such an advisory committee and will urge it in conference.

Mr. Chairman, if it is good enough for conference, it seems to me it is good enough for this House to adopt. This, to me, is the proper way to legislate.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to congratulate my beloved friend, the gentleman from New York, for his amendment; but we are constrained to resist all amendments, because we believe that this substitute we have offered is the best possible solution to this problem. I therefore ask for a "no" vote on this amendment and all other amendments.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join the chairman in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER to the amendment of Mr. HOLLAND: On page 21, after line 4, insert the following:

"UNEMPLOYMENT RESULTING FROM EMBARGO

"SEC. 502. In carrying out his responsibilities under this Act with respect to the testing, counseling, and selecting for occupational training of individuals, the Secretary of Labor shall give particular attention to individuals whose unemployment is attributable to the embargo on trade with Cuba proclaimed by the President on February 3, 1962. In apportioning Federal expenditures as provided in section 501, the Secretary of Labor shall give special consideration to unemployment resulting from such embargo."

Renumber the sections which follow accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I think the objective of this amendment is obvious. There are nearly 6,000 people who are cigar manufacturers who will be unemployed in the Tampa area, put out of work as a result of the Government Cuban embargo which was imposed on February 3 of this year.

The chairman of the committee suggested that the substitute is the best

possible solution to the problems, but I submit to you that the best possible solution to the problem in this situation is the amendment which I have offered. I call your attention to the fact that I think that this particular industry deserves particular attention. This means that the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will be able to look at this problem at the present time, immediately, under the terms of the amendment, and give it some priority. I think it is entitled to priority for the simple reason that the people are being put out of work by the effects of a direct order of the Federal Government of the United States. Therefore, the Federal Government, in my opinion, has some responsibility. It should be emphasized that the embargo itself is so full of loopholes that the result is going to be that Havana tobacco will continue to come into the United States in the form of finished cigars or leaf that has been processed, coming from foreign countries.

So the loophole is so big and so broad that foreign governments will be able to absorb the $55 million Havana cigar market, all of that which is presently served by the cigar industry in this country. The effect will be that foreign countries will be able to take a $55 million industry from the United States.

I say that the provisions of the embargo have been shot full of loopholes by order of the Foreign Assets Control Division of the U.S. Treasury that has just ruled as follows:

Goods, including cigars, made from imports from Cuba may be imported into the United States from the Canary Islands.

The ruling was made by Mrs. Margaret W. Schwartz, Acting Chief of the Division.

And further from Mrs. Schwartz and Stanley Sommerfield, General Counsel of the Division:

Any and all goods processed or manufactured from Cuban imports in a country considered friendly (or at least neutral) may be imported into this country.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The gentleman exhausted his time on the previous amendment, did he not? I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Each Member was allocated 2 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, did not the gentleman from New York use his time in response to a previous amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Iowa that the gentleman from New York did not use his full 2 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. How much time does the gentleman have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida for the reasons heretofore stated. I might say that in conference with the Secretary of Labor, since the gentleman made his remarks earlier, he has promised me he will devote full attention immediately to the specific problems in the gentleman's district in Florida.

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

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman include the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as well?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I will not repeat the remarks I made earlier when I paid tribute to the gentleman from Florida for fighting for his people. He has done a fine job today. I join with the gentleman from New York, however, in opposition to his amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Does that include the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAMER) there were—ayes 50, noes 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASHBROOK: On page 14, on line 3 insert the following:

"(j) A person who within 13 weeks after receiving State unemployment compensation benefits fails to apply for retraining under the provisions of this bill shall not be eligible to utilize the provisions and benefits of this bill for 12 months: *Provided, however,* That any person drawing State unemployment compensation benefits at the time this bill is enacted will not be disqualified by this section."

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, a great amount of debate has concerned the fact that most of our unemployed want to find work. This amendment is predicated on that assumption. Simply stated, what we are doing here is to say that after drawing 13 weeks of unemployment compensation an individual must make a choice as to whether he wants to apply for retraining or take, in most cases, 26 weeks more of unemployment compensation. After 13 weeks he must make a choice. I know there is a certain pride of authorship in this bill which is leading the gentlemen to reject amendments but I suggest this amendment represents something that is badly needed.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that the substitute pending before the House contains restrictions upon the drawing of training allowances by persons who do not faithfully carry out their training program or who refuse to accept training for new jobs. I call to your attention particularly subsection (f) of section 202 on page 8 and subsection (i) of section 203 on page 14. Both would terminate training allowances for people refusing to cooperate with the program. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, however, would place an affirmative duty upon every unemployed person to make application for retraining under the act. I do not think it is reasonable to expect that each and every unemployed person would know of this act and of the duty imposed upon him by the proposed amendment. The amendment affords no real protection that is not already provided in the bill as it is now written, and it should not be adopted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and yield 37½ seconds to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding me these 37½ seconds. I would say to the gentleman from Michigan, Yes, this does place on the unemployed a positive obligation of making up his mind after receiving 90 days, roughly, of unemployment compensation, whether or not he wants to become entitled to the benefits of the bill. I think it is reasonable that we should do that. The average people will draw 2, 4, 6 to 8 weeks. If a person draws 10 weeks the chances are that they will exhaust all of their benefits. I am saying that after 13 weeks the person should make up his mind either to apply for retraining or get 26 weeks' unemployment compensation but not both.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly in opposition to the amendment. I sympathize with the purpose of it. I wish we had had such an amendment offered before the committee so that we might have come up with language to accomplish the purpose. I am afraid the effect or tendency of this amendment is to force the Secretary to put a man in training regardless of whether a job is available. We have provided in the substitute a good many other restrictions to eliminate wasteful training. I am afraid some of these restrictions would be undermined under the 13-week principle, forcing unemployed workers into training regardless of job availability or qualification of workers for that type of training.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HIESTAND to the amendment of Mr. HOLLAND: On page 15 on line 3, strike out "65,800,000" and insert "40,000,000", and on line 5 strike out "110,667,000" and insert "60,000,000."

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, and ask unanimous consent that these two amendments be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HIESTAND to the amendment of Mr. HOLLAND: Page 20, on line 9, strike out "28,500,000" and insert "15,000,000," and on line 10 strike out "42,000,000" and insert "30,000,000."

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, these amendments do not need explanation. I am quite sure that if the Members of the House will ponder this bill and its vast possibilities for waste, they will vote for these amendments to keep the bill within reasonable bounds.

Mr. Chairman, I think $30 million, or $15 million, is still a lot of the people's money to be spent without a sound plan having been developed.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] has discussed this stupendous cost most intelligently. A bureau of this size is very difficult to set up, especially for the first year. Any such amount of money as this is absurd. I think the amendments speak for themselves, and I think we should have a good deal of acceptance from both sides of the aisle. We would thereby considerably reduce the wild amount that is asked for. If we must have such a bill let's have one that approaches sanity.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman knows he is in error when he says that these amounts of money could not be properly set up, because the gentleman sat in during all of the discussion when these figures were arrived at; the truth is, the gentleman was one of the four members who was opposed to this legislation in the committee. This is just a method of attempting to emasculate the bill. I ask for a vote against the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND], to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HIESTAND) there were—ayes 42, noes 99.

So the amendments were rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I do not have an amendment. I do have some questions. I see the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee, and the chairman of the subcommittee, present, and yet we are considering the bill authored by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL]. So I think I had better direct my questions to Mr. GOODELL.

Yesterday I was critical of the approach we were making under the Holland bill because the jobs were not identified for which these people might be trained. In regard to the Goodell bill, or the Holland substitute, as it may be called, am I correct in assuming that section 106 is a directive to the Secretary of the Department of Labor to proceed forthwith to identify these skills and professions and occupations in which there may be a shortage of qualified help; is that correct?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that is correct; and there is also such a direction to the Secretary of Labor in title II.

Mr. AVERY. One further question. Is the Secretary of Labor expected to refrain from commencing this retraining program until all of these skills have been identified, or may he determine that we need some technicians in a certain field, for example, and start retraining programs for technicians, but withhold the other aspects of the training program until a further identification can be made?

Mr. GOODELL. Many of these studies are now underway. The area skills survey studies, some of them, are completed, and we would anticipate when they are completed they would move immediately in those areas and if they found obvious shortages of skills in certain areas they would train immediately pending completion of those surveys.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], the chairman of the committee, whether he is in agreement with the responses of his colleague from New York [Mr. GOODELL], or was he able to give attention to what he said?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I had the gentleman from Michigan in one ear, but I did have the gentleman from New York in the other ear and will say that I do agree fully with him.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MAHON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8399) relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes pursuant to House Resolution 544, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HIESTAND. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HIESTAND moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

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

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 354, nays 62, answered "present" 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—354

Adair	Devine	Kastenmeier
Addabbo	Diggs	Kearns
Addonizio	Dingell	Kee
Albert	Dole	Keith
Alexander	Dominick	Kelly
Alford	Donohue	Keogh
Andersen, Minn.	Dooley	Kilgore
Anderson, Ill.	Dowdy	King, Calif.
Andrews	Doyle	King, N.Y.
Anfuso	Dulski	King, Utah
Arends	Durno	Kirwan
Ashley	Dwyer	Kluczynski
Aspinall	Edmondson	Knox
Auchincloss	Elliott	Kornegay
Avery	Ellsworth	Kowalski
Ayres	Everett	Kunkel
Bailey	Evins	Kyl
Baker	Farbstein	Laird
Baldwin	Fascell	Lane
Baring	Feighan	Langen
Barrett	Fenton	Lankford
Barry	Finnegan	Latta
Bass, N.H.	Fino	Lennon
Bass, Tenn.	Flood	Lesinski
Bates	Flynt	Libonati
Battin	Fogarty	Lindsay
Becker	Ford	Loser
Beckworth	Fountain	McCulloch
Belcher	Frazier	McDonough
Bell	Frelinghuysen	McDowell
Bennett, Fla.	Friedel	McFall
Berry	Fulton	McIntire
Betts	Gallagher	McMillan
Blatnik	Garland	McVey
Boggs	Garmatz	MacGregor
Boland	Gavin	Mack
Bolling	Giaimo	Magnuson
Bolton	Gilbert	Mailliard
Bonner	Glenn	Marshall
Bow	Gonzalez	Martin, Mass.
Boykin	Goodell	Mathias
Brademas	Goodling	Matthews
Bray	Granahan	May
Breeding	Grant	Merrow
Brewster	Gray	Michel
Bromwell	Green, Oreg.	Miller, Clem
Brooks, Tex.	Green, Pa.	Miller, George P.
Broomfield	Griffin	Miller, N.Y.
Brown	Griffiths	Milliken
Buckley	Gubser	Mills
Burke, Ky.	Hagen, Calif.	Minshall
Burke, Mass.	Halleck	Moeller
Byrne, Pa.	Halpern	Monagan
Byrnes, Wis.	Hansen	Montoya
Cahill	Harding	Moore
Cannon	Harris	Moorehead, Ohio
Carey	Harrison, Wyo.	Moorhead, Pa.
Cederberg	Harsha	Morgan
Celler	Harvey, Ind.	Morris
Chamberlain	Harvey, Mich.	Morrison
Chelf	Hays	Morse
Chenoweth	Healey	Mosher
Chiperfield	Hechler	Moss
Church	Hemphill	Moulder
Clancy	Henderson	Multer
Clark	Herlong	Murphy
Coad	Hoeven	Natcher
Cohelan	Holifield	Nedzi
Collier	Holland	Nelsen
Conte	Horan	Nix
Cook	Hosmer	Norrell
Corbett	Huddleston	Nygaard
Corman	Hull	O'Brien, Ill.
Cramer	Ichord, Mo.	O'Brien, N.Y.
Cunningham	Inouye	O'Hara, Ill.
Curtin	Jarman	O'Hara, Mich.
Curtis, Mass.	Jennings	O'Konski
Curtis, Mo.	Joelson	Olsen
Daddario	Johnson, Calif.	O'Neill
Dague	Johnson, Md.	Osmers
Daniels	Johnson, Wis.	Ostertag
Dawson	Jonas	Patman
Delaney	Jones, Ala.	Pelly
Dent	Jones, Mo.	Perkins
Derounian	Judd	Peterson
Derwinski	Karsten	
	Karth	

Pfost	St. George	Teague, Calif.
Philbin	St. Germain	Thomas
Pike	Santangelo	Thompson, N.J.
Pirnie	Saylor	Thompson, Tex.
Poff	Schadeberg	Thomson, Wis.
Powell	Schenck	Thornberry
Price	Schneebeli	Toll
Pucinski	Schweiker	Tollefson
Purcell	Schwengel	Trimble
Quie	Scott	Tupper
Rains	Scranton	Udall, Morris K.
Randall	Seely-Brown	Ullman
Reifel	Selden	Vanik
Reuss	Shelley	Van Pelt
Rhodes, Ariz.	Shipley	Van Zandt
Rhodes, Pa.	Short	Vinson
Riehlman	Shriver	Wallhauser
Rivers, Alaska	Sibal	Walter
Roberts, Ala.	Sikes	Watts
Roberts, Tex.	Siler	Weis
Robison	Sisk	Whalley
Rodino	Slack	Wharton
Rogers, Colo.	Smith, Iowa	Whitener
Rogers, Fla.	Spence	Wickersham
Rooney	Springer	Widnall
Roosevelt	Stafford	Wilson, Calif.
Rosenthal	Staggers	Wilson, Ind.
Rostenkowski	Stratton	Wright
Roudebush	Stubblefield	Yates
Roush	Sullivan	Younger
Ryan, Mich.	Taber	Zablocki
Ryan, N.Y.	Taylor	Zelenko

NAYS—62

Abbitt	Gross	Pillion
Abernethy	Haley	Poage
Alger	Hall	Ray
Ashbrook	Hardy	Reece
Ashmore	Harrison, Va.	Rivers, S.C.
Beermann	Hébert	Rogers, Tex.
Blitch	Hiestand	Rousselot
Bruce	Hoffman, Ill.	Rutherford
Burleson	Jensen	Smith, Calif.
Casey	Johansen	Smith, Va.
Colmer	Kilburn	Stephens
Davis,	Landrum	Teague, Tex.
James C.	Lipscomb	Thompson, La.
Davis, John W.	McSween	Tuck
Dorn	Mahon	Utt
Downing	Mason	Waggonner
Findley	Meader	Whitten
Fisher	Murray	Williams
Forrester	Norblad	Willis
Gary	Passman	Winstead
Gathings	Pilcher	Young

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Martin, Nebr.

NOT VOTING—19

Bennett, Mich.	Hagan, Ga.	Scherer
Broyhill	Hoffman, Mich.	Sheppard
Cooley	Kitchin	Smith, Miss.
Davis, Tenn.	Macdonald	Steed
Denton	Madden	Weaver
Fallon	Saund	Westland

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Westland for, with Mr. Martin of Nebraska against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Denton with Mr. Weaver.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Broyhill.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1991) relating to manpower requirements, resources, development, and utilization, and for other purposes, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 8399 relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes, just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961".

TITLE I—MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS, DEVELOPMENT, AND UTILIZATION

Statement of findings and purpose

SEC. 102. The Congress finds that there is critical need for more and better trained personnel in many vital occupational categories, including professional, scientific, technical, and apprenticeable categories; that even in periods of high unemployment, many employment opportunities remain unfilled because of the shortages of qualified personnel; and that it is in the national interest that current and prospective manpower shortages be identified and that persons who can be qualified for these positions through education and training be sought out and trained, in order that the Nation may meet the staffing requirements of the struggle for freedom. The Congress further finds that the skills of many persons have been rendered obsolete by dislocations in the economy arising from automation or other technological developments, foreign competition, relocation of industry, shifts in market demands, and other changes in the structure of the economy; that Government leadership is necessary to insure that the benefits of automation do not become burdens of widespread unemployment; that the problem of assuring sufficient employment opportunities will be compounded by the extraordinarily rapid growth of the labor force in the next decade, particularly by the entrance of young people into the labor force, that improved planning and expanded efforts will be required to assure that men, women, and young people will be trained and available to meet shifting employment needs; that many persons now unemployed or underemployed, in order to become qualified for reemployment or full employment must be provided with skills which are or will be in demand in the labor market; that the skills of many persons now employed are inadequate to enable them to make their maximum contribution to the Nation's economy; and that it is in the national interest that the opportunity to acquire new skills be afforded to these people in order to alleviate the hardships of unemployment, reduce the costs of unemployment compensation and public assistance, and to increase the Nation's productivity and its capacity to meet the requirements of the space age. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to require the Federal Government to appraise the manpower requirements and resources of the Nation, develop and apply the information and methods needed to deal with the problems of unemployment resulting from automation and technological changes and other types of persistent unemployment.

Evaluation, information, and research

SEC. 103. To assist the Nation in accomplishing the objectives of technological progress while avoiding or minimizing individual hardship and widespread unemployment, the Secretary of Labor shall—

(1) evaluate the impact of, and benefits and problems created by automation, technological progress, and other changes in the structure of production and demand on the use of the Nation's human resources; establish techniques and methods for detecting in advance the potential impact of such developments; develop solutions to these problems, and publish findings pertaining thereto;

(2) establish a program of factual studies of practices of employers and unions which tend to affect mobility of workers, including but not limited to early retirement and vesting provisions and practices under private compensation plans; the extension of health, welfare, and insurance benefits to laid-off workers; the operation of severance plans; and the use of extended leave plans for education and training purposes;

(3) appraise the adequacy of the Nation's manpower development efforts to meet foreseeable manpower needs and recommend needed adjustments, including methods for promoting the most effective occupational utilization of and providing useful work experience and training opportunities for untrained and inexperienced youth;

(4) promote, encourage, or directly engage in programs of information and communication concerning manpower requirements, development, and utilization, including prevention and amelioration of undesirable manpower effects from automation and other technological developments and improvement of the mobility of workers; and

(5) arrange for the conduct of such research and investigations as give promise of furthering the objectives of this Act.

Skill and training requirements

SEC. 104. The Secretary of Labor shall develop, compile, and make available information regarding skill requirements, occupational outlook, job opportunities, labor supply in various skills, training activities, and employment trends on a National, State, or area or other appropriate basis which shall be used in determining the educational, training, counseling, and placement activities performed under this Act.

Manpower report

SEC. 105. The Secretary of Labor shall make such reports and recommendations to the President as he deems appropriate pertaining to manpower requirements, resources, use, and training; and the President shall transmit to the Congress within sixty days after the beginning of each regular session (commencing with the year 1962) a report pertaining to manpower requirements, resources, utilization, and training.

TITLE II—TRAINING AND SKILL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Part A—Duties of the Secretary of Labor

General Responsibility

SEC. 201. In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall determine the skill requirements of the economy, develop policies for the adequate occupational development and maximum utilization of the skills of the Nation's workers, promote and encourage the development of broad and diversified training and retraining programs, including on-the-job training designed to qualify for employment the many persons who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment without such training, and to equip the Nation's workers with the new and improved skills that are or will be required.

Selection of Trainees

SEC. 202. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall provide a program for testing, counseling, and selecting for occupational training those unemployed or underemployed persons who cannot reasonably be expected to secure appropriate fulltime employment without training. Whenever appropriate the Secretary shall provide a special program for the testing, counseling and selection of youths, sixteen years or older, for occupational training and further schooling. Workers in farm

families with less than $1,200 annual net family income shall be considered unemployed for the purpose of this Act.

(b) Although priority in referral for training shall be extended to unemployed persons, the Secretary of Labor shall also refer other persons qualified for training or retraining programs which will enable them to acquire needed skills. Priority in referral for training shall also be extended to persons to be trained for skills needed within the State of their residence.

(c) The Secretary of Labor shall determine the occupational training or retraining needs of referred persons, provide for their orderly selection and referral for training under this Act, and provide placement services to persons who have completed their training, as well as follow-up studies to determine whether the programs provided meet the occupational training needs of the persons referred.

Weekly Training Allowances

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of Labor may, on behalf of the United States, enter into agreements with States under which the Secretary of Labor shall make payments to such States either in advance or by way of reimbursement for the purpose of enabling such States to make payment of weekly Federal training allowances to individuals selected for training pursuant to the provisions of section 202 and undergoing such training. Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding fifty-two weeks, and the amount of any such payment in any week for individuals undergoing training, including uncompensated employer-provided training, shall not exceed the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the most recent quarter for which such data are available: *Provided however,* That in any week an individual who, but for his training, would be entitled to unemployment compensation in excess of such allowance, shall receive an allowance increased by the amount of such excess.

For individuals undergoing on-the-job training the amount of any payment by the Secretary of Labor under this section shall be reduced by a proportion equal to the ratio that the number of compensated hours per week bears to forty hours: *Provided,* That in no event shall the payment to such an individual, when added to the amount received from the employer, bring the total to more than the average weekly unemployment compensation payment referred to above.

(b) Such weekly training allowances may be supplemented by such sums as may be determined by the Secretary of Labor to be necessary to defray transportation and subsistence expenses for separate maintenance of individuals engaged in training under this title including compensated full-time on-the-job training, when such training is provided in facilities which are not within commuting distance of their regular place of residence: *Provided,* That the Secretary in defraying such subsistence expenses shall not afford any individual an allowance exceeding the rate of $35 per week; nor shall the Secretary authorize any transportation expenditure exceeding the rate of 10 cents per mile: *And provided further,* That where due to the unusual circumstances the maximum per diem allowance would be more than the amount required to meet the actual and necessary expenses the Secretary may prescribe conditions under which reimbursement for such expenses may be authorized on an actual expense basis.

(c) Except where the Secretary of Labor finds such training allowances are necessary to provide occupational training for youths over sixteen but under twenty-two years of age, and only to the extent of 5 per centum of the total allowances under this section, such training allowances shall be limited to unemployed persons who have had not less than three years of experience in gainful employment and who are heads of families or heads of households as defined in the Internal Revenue Code.

(d) After June 30, 1963, any amount paid to a State for training allowances under this section shall be paid on condition that such State shall bear 50 per centum of the amount of such allowances.

(e) No training allowance shall be made to any person otherwise eligible who, with respect to the week for which such payment would be made, has received or is seeking unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or any other Federal or State unemployment compensation law, but if the appropriate State or Federal agency finally determines that a person denied training allowances for any week because of this subsection was not entitled to unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act of such Federal or State law with respect to such week, this subsection shall not apply with respect to such week.

(f) A person who refuses, without good cause, to accept training under this Act shall not, for one year thereafter, be entitled to training allowances.

(g) Any agreement under this section may contain such provisions (including, as far as may be appropriate, provisions authorized or made applicable with respect to agreements concluded by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to title XV of the Social Security Act) as will promote effective administration, protect the United States against loss and insure the proper application of payments made to the State under such agreement. Except as may be provided in such agreements, or in regulations hereinafter authorized, determinations by any duly designated officer or agency as to the eligibility of individuals for weekly Federal training allowances under this section shall be final and conclusive for any purposes and not subject to review by any court or any other officer.

On-the-Job Training

SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall develop, and shall secure the adoption of programs for on-the-job training needed to equip individuals selected for training with the appropriate skills, including wherever appropriate special programs for youths over sixteen years of age. The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent possible, secure the adoption of programs by private and public agencies, employers, trade associations, labor organizations and other industrial and community groups which he determines are qualified to conduct effective on-the-job training programs.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in coordinating on-the-job training programs with vocational educational programs conducted pursuant to the provisions of this title.

(c) In adopting or approving any training program under this part, and as a condition to the expenditure of funds for any such program, the Secretary shall make such arrangements as he deems necessary to insure adherence to appropriate training standards, including assurances—

(1) that wages paid to trainees are not less than those customarily paid in the training establishment and in the community to learners on the same job; and

(2) that adequate and safe facilities, personnel, and records of attendance and progress are provided.

(d) Where on-the-job training programs under this part require supplementary classroom instruction, appropriate arrangements for such instruction shall be agreed to by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor.

National Advisory Committee

SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary shall appoint a National Advisory Committee which shall consist of ten members and shall be composed of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, education, and training, and the public in general. From the members appointed to such Committee the Secretary shall designate a Chairman. Such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Secretary relative to the carrying out of his duties under this Act. Such Committee shall hold not less than two meetings during each calendar year.

(b) The National Advisory Committee shall encourage and assist in the organization on a plant, community, regional, or industry basis of labor-management-public committees and similar groups designed to further the purposes of this Act and may provide assistance to such groups, as well as existing groups organized for similar purposes, in effectuating such purposes.

(c) The National Advisory Committee may accept gifts or bequests, either for carrying out specific programs or for its general activities or for its responsibilities under subsection (b) of this section.

Reports on Operation of Training Programs

SEC. 206. The Secretary shall develop, compile and make available information concerning—

(1) the number and types of training and retraining activities conducted under this Act;

(2) the number of unemployed persons who have secured full-time employment in fields related to such training or retraining; and

(3) the nature of such employment.

State Agreements

SEC. 207. (a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter into an agreement with a State, or with the appropriate agency of the State, pursuant to which the Secretary of Labor may, for the purpose of carrying out his functions and duties under this title, utilize the services of the appropriate State agency and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may reimburse such State or appropriate agency for services rendered for such purposes.

(b) Any agreement under this section may contain such provisions as will promote effective administration, protect the United States against loss and insure that the functions and duties to be carried out by the appropriate State agency are performed in a satisfactory manner.

Rules and Regulations

SEC. 208. The Secretary of Labor shall prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this part.

Part B—Duties of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

General Responsibility

SEC. 231. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, pursuant to the provisions of this title, enter into agreements with States under which the appropriate State vocational education agencies will undertake to provide training or retraining needed to equip individuals referred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 202, for the occupations specified in the referrals. Such State agencies shall provide for such training or retraining through public education agencies or institutions or, if facilities or services of such agencies or institutions are not adequate for the purpose, through arrangements with private educational or training institutions. Any such

agreement shall provide for payment to such State agency of 100 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement with respect to unemployed individuals, and 50 per centum of the cost with respect to other individuals referred under this Act, and shall contain such other provisions as will promote effective administration (including provision for reports on the attendance and performance of trainees and provision for continuous supervision of the training programs conducted under the agreement to insure the quality and adequacy of the training provided), protect the United States against loss, and assure that the functions and duties to be carried out by such State agency are performed in such fashion as will carry out the purposes of this title: *Provided*, That after June 30, 1963, any amount paid to a State to carry out an agreement authorized by this part shall be paid on condition that such State shall bear 50 per centum of such cost. In the case of any State which does not enter into an agreement under this section, and in the case of any training which the State agency does not provide under such an agreement, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may provide the needed training by agreement or contract with public or private educational or training institutions.

Rules and Regulations

SEC. 232. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this part.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

Apportionment of benefits

SEC. 301. For the purpose of effecting an equitable apportionment of Federal expenditures among the States in carrying out the programs authorized under title II of this Act, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall make such apportionment in accordance with uniform standards and in arriving at such standards shall consider only the following factors: (1) the proportion which the labor force of a State bears to the total labor force of the United States, (2) the proportion which the unemployed in a State during the preceding calendar year bears to the total number of unemployed in the United States in the preceding calendar year, (3) the amount of underemployment in the State, (4) the proportion which the insured unemployed within a State bears to the total number of insured employed within such State. For this purpose, the word "State" shall be defined to include the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

Maintenance of State effort

SEC. 302. No training or retraining program which is financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government under this Act shall be approved unless the Secretary of Labor, if the program is authorized under part A of title II, or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, if the program is authorized under part B of title II, satisfies himself that the State and/or the locality in which the training is carried out is not reducing its own level of expenditures for vocational education and training, including program operation under provisions of the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and titles I, II, and III of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, except for reductions unrelated to the provisions or purposes of this Act.

Other agencies and departments

SEC. 303. In the performance of his functions under this Act, the Secretary of Labor, in order to avoid unnecessary expense and duplication of functions among Government agencies, shall use the available services or facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, under conditions specified in section 306(a). Each department, agency, or establishment of the United States is authorized and directed to cooperate with the Secretary of Labor and, to the extent permitted by law, to provide such services and facilities as he may request for his assistance in the performance of his functions under this Act.

Appropriations

SEC. 304. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, respectively, such sums as are necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act. The total of such sums shall not exceed $90,000,000 for the fiscal year 1962, $165,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963, and $200,000,000 for each of the two succeeding fiscal years.

(b) Funds appropriated under the authorization of this Act may be transferred, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, between departments and agencies of the Government, if such funds are used for the purposes for which they are specifically authorized and appropriated.

(c) Any equipment and teaching aids purchased by a State or local vocational education agency with funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of part B shall become the property of the State.

(d) No portion of the funds to be used under part B of this Act shall be appropriated directly or indirectly to the purchase, erection, or repair of any building except for minor remodeling of a public building necessary to make it suitable for use in training under part B.

(e) Funds appropriated under this Act shall remain available for one fiscal year beyond that in which appropriated.

Additional positions

SEC. 305. Subject to the standards and procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, the head of any agency, for the performance of functions under this Act, including functions delegated pursuant to section 303, may place positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule established by such Act, and such positions shall be in addition to the number of such positions authorized by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to be placed in such grades: *Provided*, That not to exceed a total of ten such positions may be placed in such grades under this subsection, to be apportioned among the agencies by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Authority to contract

SEC. 306. (a) The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may make such contracts or agreements, establish such procedures, and make such payments, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall not use any authority conferred by this Act to assist establishments in relocating from one area to another. The limitation set forth in this subsection shall not be construed to prohibit assistance to a business entity in the establishment of a new branch, affiliate, or subsidiary of such entity if the Secretary of Labor finds that the assistance in the establishment of such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary will not result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location or in any other area where such entity conducts business operations, unless he has reason to believe that such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary is being established with the intention of closing down the operations of the existing business entity in the area of its original location or in any other area where it conducts such operations.

Termination of authority

SEC. 307. (a) All authority conferred under title II of this Act shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1965.

(b) Notwithstanding the foregoing, the termination of title II shall not affect the disbursement of funds under, or the carrying out of, any contract, commitment or other obligation entered into prior to the date of such termination: *Provided*, That no disbursement of funds shall be made pursuant to the authority conferred under title II of this Act after December 30, 1965.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the "Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962".

"TITLE I—OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING AND MANPOWER UTILIZATION

"Statement of finding and purpose

"SEC. 102. The Congress finds that there is critical need for more and better trained personnel in many vital occupational categories, including professional, scientific, technical, and apprenticeable categories; that even in periods of high unemployment, many employment opportunities remain unfilled because of the shortages of qualified personnel; and that it is in the national interest that current and prospective manpower shortages be identified and that persons who can be qualified for these positions through education and training be sought out and trained, in order that the Nation may meet the staffing requirements of the struggle for freedom. The Congress further finds that the skills of many persons have been rendered obsolete by dislocations in the economy arising from automation or other technological developments, foreign competition, relocation of industry, shifts in market demands, and other changes in the structure of the economy; that Government leadership is necessary to insure that the benefits of automation do not become burdens of widespread unemployment; that the problem of assuring sufficient employment opportunities will be compounded by the extraordinarily rapid growth of the labor force in the next decade, particularly by the entrance of young people into the labor force, that improved planning and expanded efforts will be required to assure that men, women, and young people will be trained and available to meet shifting employment needs; that many persons now unemployed or underemployed, in order to become qualified for reemployment or full employment must be assisted in providing themselves with skills which are or will be in demand in the labor market; that the skills of many persons now employed are inadequate to enable them to make their maximum contribution to the Nation's economy; and that it is in the national interest that the opportunity to acquire new skills be afforded to these people in order to alleviate the hardships of unemployment, reduce the cost of unemployment compensation and public assistance, and to increase the Nation's productivity and its capacity to meet the requirements of the space age. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to require the Federal Government to appraise the manpower requirements and resources of the Nation, and to develop and apply the information and methods needed to deal with the problems of unemployment resulting from automation and technological changes and other types of persistent unemployment.

"Automation and occupational training

"SEC. 103. To assist the Nation in accomplishing the objectives of technological progress while avoiding or minimizing individual hardship and widespread unemployment, the Secretary of Labor shall—

"(1) evaluate the impact of, and benefits and problems created by automation, technological progress, and other changes in the structure of production and demand on the use of the Nation's human resources; establish techniques and methods of detecting in advance the potential impact of such developments; develop solutions to these problems, and publish findings pertaining thereto; and to such ends conduct or cause to be conducted within the Department of Labor and other agencies of Government a comprehensive and continuing program of research as may be necessary;

"(2) promote, encourage, or directly engage in programs of information and communication concerning automation, technological developments, and prevention and amelioration of undesirable manpower effects from such developments;

"(3) appraise the adequacy of the Nation's manpower development efforts to meet foreseeable manpower needs and recommend needed adjustments, including methods for promoting the most effective occupational utilization of, and providing useful work experience and training opportunities for, untrained and inexperienced youth;

"(4) arrange for the conduct of such research and investigations as give promise of furthering the objectives of this Act.

"Improving labor mobility

"SEC. 104. In order to encourage the mobility of labor, to determine existing impediments to such mobility, and to determine the feasibility and desirability of methods to improve the mobility of labor, the Secretary of Labor is directed to—

"(1) establish a program of factual studies of practices of employers and unions which tend to impede the mobility of workers or which facilitate mobility, including but not limited to early retirement and vesting provisions and practices under private compensation plans; the extension of health, welfare, and insurance benefits to laid-off workers; the operation of severance pay plans; the operation of seniority systems; and the use of extended leave plans for education and training purposes. A report on these studies shall be included as a part of the Secretary's report required under section 105.

"(2) promote by discussions, publications, and other appropriate means, the development and adoption of equitable practices which improve the mobility of workers.

"Manpower report

"SEC. 105. The Secretary of Labor shall make such reports and recommendations to the President as he deems appropriate pertaining to manpower requirements, resources, use, and training; and the President shall transmit to the Congress within sixty days after the beginning of each regular session (commencing with the year 1963) a report pertaining to manpower requirements, resources, utilization, and training.

"Information and research

"SEC. 106. The Secretary of Labor shall develop, compile, and make available, in such manner as he deems appropriate, information regarding skill requirements, occupational outlook, job opportunities, labor supply in various skills, and employment trends on a National, State, area or other appropriate basis which shall be used in the educational, training, counseling, and placement activities performed under this Act.

"Appropriations for administration

"SEC. 107. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Labor a sum, not to exceed $1,770,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and not to exceed $1,670,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, to administer the provisions of this title.

"TITLE II—TRAINING AND SKILL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

"Responsibility for programs

"SEC. 201. (a) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall determine the skill requirements of the economy, develop policies for the adequate occupational development and maximum utilization of the skills of the Nation's workers, and develop and encourage the development of broad and diversified training programs, including on-the-job training, designed to qualify for employment the many persons who cannot reasonably be expected to secure appropriate full-time employment without such training, and to equip the Nation's workers with the new and improved skills that are and will be required.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor shall carry out his responsibilities under this title through the maximum utilization of all possible resources for skill development available in industry, labor, public and private educational and training institutions, State, Federal, and local agencies, and other appropriate public and private organizations and facilities.

"Selection of trainees

"SEC. 202. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall provide a program for testing, counseling, and selecting for occupational training under titles III and IV those unemployed or underemployed individuals who cannot be expected to secure appropriate full-time employment without training. Whenever appropriate the Secretary shall also provide a special program for the testing and counseling of youths, sixteen years of age or older, and for the selection of those youths for whom occupational training under this Act is indicated.

"(b) Although priority in referral for training shall be extended to unemployed individuals, the Secretary of Labor shall, to the maximum extent possible, also refer other individuals qualified for training programs which will enable them to acquire needed skills. Priority in referral for training shall also be extended to individuals to be trained for skills needed within the area of their residence. Workers in farm families with less than $1,200 annual net family income shall be considered unemployed for the purpose of this Act.

"(c) Before selecting an individual for training, the Secretary shall determine that there is a reasonable expectation of employment in the occupation for which the individual is to be trained. If such employment is not available in the area in which the individual resides, the Secretary shall obtain reasonable assurance of such individual's willingness to accept employment outside his area of residence.

"(d) The Secretary shall not refer individuals for training in an occupation which requires less than two weeks training, unless there are immediate employment opportunities in such occuption.

"(e) The duration of any training program to which an individual is referred shall be reasonable and consistent with the occupation for which the individual is being trained.

"(f) Upon certification by the responsible training agency that an individual who has been referred for training does not have a satisfactory attendance record or is not making satisfactory progress in such training, absent good cause, the Secretary shall forthwith terminate his training and subsistence and transportation allowances, and withdraw his referral. Such individual shall not be eligible for such allowances for one year thereafter.

"(g) The Secretary of Labor shall provide placement services to individuals who have completed their training under this Act, as well as counseling services to such individuals for an appropriate period after they have been placed.

"Training allowances

"SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of Labor may, on behalf of the United States, enter into agreements with States (which, for the purposes of this Act shall include the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) under which the Secretary of Labor shall make payments to such States either in advance or by way of reimbursement for the purpose of enabling such States, as agents for the United States, to make payment of weekly training allowances to unemployed individuals selected for training pursuant to the provisions of section 202 of this title and undergoing such training in a program operated pursuant to the provisions of this Act. Each such agreement shall provide that eighteen months after the enactment of this Act any payments made thereafter under this section must be matched by State funds in an amount equal to the Federal payment. Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding fifty-two weeks, and the amount of any such payment in any week for individuals undergoing training, including uncompensated employer-provided training, shall not exceed the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the most recent quarter for which such data are available: *Provided however,* That in any week an individual who, but for his training, would be entitled to unemployment compensation in excess of such an allowance shall receive an allowance increased by the amount of such excess.

"With respect to any week for which an individual receives unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or any other Federal or State unemployment compensation law which is less than the average weekly unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payment during the most recent quarter for which such data are available, a supplemental training allowance may be paid. This supplemental training allowance shall not exceed the difference between his unemployment compensation and the average weekly unemployment compensation payment referred to above.

"For individuals undergoing on-the-job training, the amount of any payment which would otherwise be made by the Secretary of Labor under this section shall be reduced by an amount which bears the same ratio to that payment as the number of compensated hours per week bears to forty hours: *Provided,* That in no event shall the payment to such an individual, when added to the amount received from the employer, bring the total to more than the average weekly unemployment compensation payment referred to above.

"(b) Training allowances may be supplemented by such sums as may be determined by the Secretary of Labor to be necessary to defray actual and necessary transportation expenses of individuals engaged in training under this Act and, when such training is provided in facilities which are not within commuting distance of their regular place of residence, to defray actual and necessary transportation and subsistence expenses for separate maintenance of such individuals. The Secretary in defraying such subsistence expenses shall not afford any individual an allowance exceeding the rate

of $35 per week; nor shall the Secretary authorize any transportation expenditure exceeding the rate of 10 cents per mile.

"(c) Training allowances shall be limited to unemployed persons who have had not less than three years of experience in gainful employment and who are heads of families or heads of households as defined in the Internal Revenue Code.

"(d) No weekly training allowance shall be paid to any person otherwise eligible who, with respect to the week for which such payment would be made, has received or is eligible for unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or any other Federal or State unemployment compensation law, but if the appropriate State or Federal agency finally determines that a person denied training allowances for any week because of this subsection was not entitled to unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or such Federal or State law with respect to such week, this subsection shall not apply with respect to such week.

"(e) Any agreement under this section may contain such provisions (including, so far as may be appropriate, provisions authorized or made applicable with respect to agreements concluded by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to title XV of the Social Security Act) as will promote effective administration, protect the United States against loss, and insure the proper application of payments made to the State under such agreement. Except as may be provided in such agreements, or in regulations hereinafter authorized, determinations by any duly designated officer or agency as to the eligibility of individuals for weekly training allowances under this section shall be final and conclusive for any purposes and not subject to review by any court or any other officer.

"(f) If unemployment compensation payments are paid to an individual taking training under this Act, or any other Federal Act, the State making such payments shall be reimbursed from funds herein appropriated. The amount of such reimbursement shall be determined by the Secretary of Labor on the basis of reports furnished to him by the States and such amount shall then be placed in the State's unemployment trust fund account.

"(g) A person who, in connection with an occupational training program, has received a training allowance or whose unemployment compensation payments were reimbursed under the provision of this Act or any other Federal Act shall not be entitled to training allowances under this Act for one year after the completion or other termination of the training with respect to which such allowance or payment was made.

"(h) No training allowance shall be paid to any person who is receiving training for an occupation which requires a training period of less than six days.

"(i) A person who refuses, without good cause, to accept training under this Act shall not, for one year thereafter, be entitled to training allowances.

"Agreements with States

"SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter into agreements with States, or with the appropriate State agency, pursuant to which the Secretary of Labor may, for the purpose of carrying out his functions and duties under this title, utilize the services of the appropriate State agency and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may reimburse the State or appropriate agency and its employees for services rendered for such purposes.

"(b) Any agreement under this section may contain such provisions as will promote effective administration, protect the United States against loss and insure that the functions and duties to be carried out by the appropriate State agency are performed in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of Labor.

"Rules and regulations

"SEC. 205. The Secretary of Labor shall prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.

"Appropriations

"SEC. 206. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Labor a sum, not to exceed $65,800,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and not to exceed $110,667,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, to carry out the provisions of this title.

"TITLE III—ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

"Development of on-the-job training courses

"SEC. 301. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall encourage, develop, and secure the adoption of programs for on-the-job training needed to equip individuals selected for training with the appropriate skills. The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent possible, secure the adoption by private and public agencies, employers, trade associations, labor organizations and other industrial, educational, and community groups which he determines are qualified to conduct effective training programs under this title of such programs as he approves, and for this purpose he is authorized to enter into appropriate agreements with them.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in coordinating on-the-job training programs with vocational educational programs conducted pursuant to the provisions of title IV.

"Training program standards

"SEC. 302. In adopting or approving any training program under this title, and as a condition to the expenditure of funds for any such program, the Secretary shall make such arrangements as he deems necessary to insure adherence to appropriate training standards and policies, including assurances—

"(1) that the training content of the program is adequate, involves reasonable progression, and will result in the qualification of trainees for suitable employment;

"(2) that the training period is reasonable and consistent with periods customarily required for comparable training;

"(3) that adequate and safe facilities, personnel, and records of attendance and progress are provided; and

"(4) that the trainees are compensated by the employer at such rates, including periodic increases, as may be deemed reasonable under regulations hereinafter authorized, considering such factors as industry, geographical region, and trainee proficiency.

"Supervision of on-the-job and related training programs

"SEC. 303. The Secretary of Labor shall make appropriate provision for supervision of the on-the-job training programs conducted under this title to insure the quality of the training provided and the adequacy of the various programs.

"State agreements

"SEC. 304. (a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter into an agreement with a State, or with the appropriate agency of the State, pursuant to which the Secretary of Labor may, for the purpose of carrying out his functions and duties under this title, utilize the services of the appropriate State agency and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may reimburse such State or appropriate agency for services rendered for such purposes.

"(b) Any agreement under this section may contain such provisions as will promote effective administration, protect the United States against loss, and insure that the functions and duties to be carried out by the appropriate State agency are performed in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of Labor.

"Rules and regulations

"SEC. 305. The Secretary of Labor shall prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.

"Appropriations

"SEC. 306. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Labor a sum, not to exceed $2,800,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and not to exceed $4,800,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, to carry out the provisions of this title.

"TITLE IV—VOCATIONAL TRAINING

"Provision of vocational training

"SEC. 401. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, pursuant to the provisions of title II of this Act, enter into agreements with States under which the appropriate State vocational education agencies will undertake to provide the vocational training needed to equip individuals, referred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 202, for the occupation specified in the referrals. Such State agencies shall provide for such training through public education agencies or institutions or, if facilities or services of such agencies or institutions are not adequate for the purpose, through arrangements with private educational or training institutions. Any such agreement may provide for payment to such State agency of up to 100 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement with respect to unemployed individuals, and up to 50 per centum of the cost with respect to other individuals, and shall contain such other provisions as will promote effective administration (including provisions for reports on the attendance and performance of trainees, with immediate notice to the Secretary of Labor in the event a trainee fails to attend or progress satisfactorily, and provision for continuous supervision of the training programs conducted under the agreement to insure the quality and adequacy of the training provided), protect the United States against loss, and assure that the functions and duties to be carried out by such State agency are performed in such fashion as will carry out the purposes of this title: *Provided*, That, after eighteen months after the enactment of this Act, any amount paid to a State to carry out an agreement authorized by this part shall be paid on condition that such State shall bear 50 per centum of such cost. In the case of any State which does not enter into an agreement under this section, and in the case of any training which the State agency does not provide under such an agreement, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall provide the needed training by agreement or contract with public or private educational or training institutions.

"Cooperation with Secretary of Labor

"SEC. 402. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall cooperate with the Secretary of Labor in coordinating vocational education programs with on-the-job training conducted pursuant to the provisions of title III.

"Rules and regulations

"SEC. 403. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may prescribe such rules

and regulations as he may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.

"Appropriations

"SEC. 404. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare a sum, not to exceed $28,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and not to exceed $42,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, to carry out the provisions of this title.

"TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

"Apportionment of benefits

"SEC. 501. For the purpose of effecting an equitable apportionment of Federal expenditures among the States in carrying out the programs authorized under titles II, III, and IV of this Act, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in accordance with uniform standards and in arriving at such standards, shall consider the following factors: (1) the proportion which the labor force of a State bears to the total labor force of the United States, (2) the proportion which the unemployed in a State during the preceding calendar year bears to the total number of unemployed in the United States in the preceding calendar year, (3) the lack of appropriate full-time employment in the State, (4) the proportion which the insured unemployed within a State bears to the total number of insured employed within such State.

"Other agencies and departments

"SEC. 502. (a) In the performance of his functions under this Act, the Secretary of Labor, in order to avoid unnecessary expense and duplication of functions among Government agencies, shall use the available services or facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, under conditions specified in subsection (d). Each department, agency, or establishment of the United States is authorized and directed to cooperate with the Secretary of Labor and, to the extent permitted by law, to provide such services and facilities as he may request for his assistance in the performance of his functions under this Act.

"(b) Funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act may be transferred, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, between departments and agencies of the Government, if such funds are used for the purposes for which they are specifically authorized and appropriated.

"(c) The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may make such contracts or agreements, establish such procedures, and make such payments, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, or otherwise allocate or expend funds made available under this Act, as they deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"(d) The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall not use any authority conferred by this Act to assist in relocating establishments from one area to another. Such limitation shall not prohibit assistance to a business entity in the establishment of a new branch, affiliate, or subsidiary of such entity if the Secretary of Labor finds that such assistance will not result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location or in any other area where such entity conducts business operations, unless he has reason to believe that such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary is being established with the intention of closing down the operations of the existing business entity in the area of its original location or in any other area where it conducts such operations.

"Maintenance of State effort

"SEC. 503. No training program which is financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government under this Act shall be approved unless the Secretary of Labor, if the program is authorized under title III, or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, if the program is authorized under title IV, satisfies himself that neither the State nor the locality in which the training is carried out has reduced or is reducing its own level of expenditures for vocational education and training, including program operation under provisions of the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and titles I, II, and III of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 except for reductions unrelated to the provisions or purposes of this Act.

"Selection and referral

"SEC. 504. The selection of individuals for training under this Act and the placement of such individuals shall not be contingent upon such individual's membership or nonmembership in a labor organization.

"Secretaries' reports

"SEC. 505. (a) Prior to March 1, 1963, and again prior to March 1, 1964, the Secretary of Labor shall make a report to Congress. Such report shall contain an evaluation of the programs under titles I, II, and III, including the number of individuals trained and the number and types of training activities under this Act, the number of unemployed or underemployed persons who have secured full-time employment as a result of such training, and the nature of such employment, the need for continuing such programs, and recommendations for improvement.

"(b) Prior to March 1, 1963, and again prior to March 1, 1964, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall also make a report to Congress. Such report shall contain an evaluation of the programs under title IV, the need for continuing such programs, and recommendations for improvement. The first such report shall also contain the results of the vocational training survey which is presently being conducted under the supervision of the Secretary.

"Termination of authority

"SEC. 506. (a) All authority conferred under titles II, III, and IV of this Act shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1964.

"(b) Notwithstanding the foregoing, the termination of these titles shall not affect the disbursement of funds under, or the carrying out of, any contract, commitment, or other obligation entered into pursuant to these titles prior to the date of such termination: *Provided*, That no disbursement of funds shall be made pursuant to the authority conferred under titles II, III, and IV of this Act after December 30, 1964.

"Appropriations

"SEC. 507. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretaries of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary to administer the provisions of this title, but not to exceed the sum of $1,600,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and not to exceed the sum of $2,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 8399) was laid on the table.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate bill, and ask for a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes thereon.

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

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. POWELL, HOLLAND, O'HARA of Michigan, SMITH of IOWA, JOELSON, KEARNS, GOODELL, BRUCE, and GARLAND.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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

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

There was no objection.

ANNUAL RED MASS HELD AT ST. MATTHEW'S CATHEDRAL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the annual red Mass was held at St. Matthew's Cathedral, at 10 a.m., on Sunday, January 28, 1962. It can be truthfully said that many persons of consequence in public life, representatives of foreign lands and of our Government, were present.

During the celebration of the holy Mass, the Most Reverend Philip M. Hannan, auxiliary bishop of Washington, gave the sermon. With the sparkling fervor of true religious faith, the auxiliary bishop delivered one of the most touching and invigorating sermons that has ever been given before a mixed congregation in the annals of Washington churchdom. His masterful treatment of the subject matter, before an audience of men dedicated to the public service of governments, was eloquent, spiritually touching and humble in its pronouncements. The humbleness of this great churchman in the presence of so many distinguished and brilliant leaders, reflected the true virtue of his training at the hands of his mother church.

He announced, with true devotion, the true interpretation of freedom enjoyed by those who live as freemen and servants of God.

Mr. Speaker, so long as we have men of the cloth who speak in no uncertain terms depicting true lifetime religious values of our people and their honest obligations to government, the less will hypocracy be practiced among men. A wonderful message was delivered to us by a holy man who loves his God, his country, and his fellow men. In his sermon he earned the admiration of his listeners, regardless of faith, because of the direct, positive and practical treatment of the subject. May God bless him and keep him among us always to carry

on the light of knowledge of our religious freedom for all men.

TEXT OF SERMON BY THE MOST REVEREND PHILIP M. HANNAN, AUXILIARY BISHOP OF WASHINGTON, AT ANNUAL RED MASS AT ST. MATTHEW'S CATHEDRAL, 10 A.M., SUNDAY, JANUARY 28, 1962

"Live as freemen, yet not using your freedom as a cloak for malice, but as servants of God." (First Epistle of St. Peter, ch. I, verse 16.)

Thus did St. Peter urge the Christians of his day. Such also was the goal of the founders of this Nation who envisaged personal freedom under God as the basis of the Nation. Their beliefs in God, the natural law and reason buttressed their conviction—on which they staked their lives—that man could be free and conduct a successful government. They believed in "life, liberty and happiness" but liberty was the source of the happiness they sought. The taxes that they revolted against injured their conscience more than the economy, as the Federalist papers show. They were keenly aware that freedom demanded sacrifice and self-discipline, that the enemies of freedom were present in our own wills and passions as well as those of opposing nations. They recognized that freedom could be destroyed by those who abuse it as much as by those who forcibly overthrow it.

It was this concept of an individual's right to freedom under God that made our Revolution relevant to all humanity. It was this fact that impelled a great churchman and patriot to exclaim, "America, thy destiny is all humanity." This devotion to freedom under God remains our national will as evidenced so recently at Punta del Este in Uruguay. That will was solemnly affirmed a few weeks ago by our President who said, "While no nation has ever faced such a challenge, no nation has ever been so ready to seize the burden and the glory of freedom, and in this endeavor, may God watch over the United States of America."

As a result of our initiative in the field of industry and scientific advances, our country has fulfilled in large measure the hopes of our forefathers in the "pursuit of happiness." But the right of man that is still under heavy menace is the right to freedom, individual freedom, both at home and in our international relations. This is the crucial issue for the future of the world.

Freedom is under attack in our communities by the widespread crime which represents a subversion of the concept of individual freedom. It is under attack by those who use economic power to infringe the freedom of others in the business and labor world. It is under attack by those who fail to regard their fellow citizen as an equal and welcome Son of God, regardless of language or race or national descent. It is under attack by those who confuse freedom with its material fruits, who confuse freedom with personal indulgence.

To mark the defects in our life is not to deny the progress. Since our national beginning, we have constantly enlarged the scope of freedom, despite the lapses to which mortal man is always subject. Every lapse has sparked a fresh resolve and a quick advance. Today, with thanks to God in whose name and with whose help these advances were made, our country's system of free government is more relevant than ever to all humanity; it is still the best vindication of freedom under God that the world has seen.

The chief attack upon freedom comes in the international sphere. The scale of the attack indicates, I think, the extent of the success of our system of freedom under God.

Freedom is under attack in the international order because the traditional, God-centered concept of man is under attack. Materialistic collectivism or communism, denying the dignity of man by denying his creation, denies his personal freedom. Personal freedom is dispensable, even anachronistic, in any system which regards man as all matter, responsive to his environment but not personally free. For us, freedom is so essential to man that its denial is not a deprivation but an attempted mutation of man. For unless a man is free, all morality, all responsibility is only a mirage. Man is free or he is not a man. When Patrick Henry cried, "Give me liberty or give me death" he was voicing a basic fact of human life and civilization. The heedless slogan, "Better Red than dead" misses the nature of freedom and man. Rather should it read, "Dead in spirit if Red?" The essence of all materialistic belief is that man is essentially a consumer, content because he is fat, not because he is free.

The crisis today comes largely from the fact that man confuses his enjoyment of material goods with freedom. While we know that man must live on bread—and this country has been notable in its compassion on its neighbors throughout the world—he does not live by bread alone. Freedom is not identical with the standard of living, nor the enjoyment of material goods. Although freedom will generally produce a higher standard of living and higher production than a system of slave labor, freedom is not the possession of more cars, bigger houses, and television sets.

A distinguished scholar, Arnold Toynbee, noted the tendency today, during his address at Williamsburg last year of preferring material equality to liberty. He said: "The first objective on the agenda of the depressed majority of mankind is, I believe, not liberty but equality." He called upon the United States to help the world raise its material standard of living "as a means toward helping them to raise their spiritual standards."

His warning has merit. Has not this priority of material equality been the slogan of so many dictators who robbed the people of liberty by promises of bread? Social justice, so eloquently supported in the encyclical of the Holy Father, "Mater et Magistra," springs from the fact that man enjoys the right to freedom conferred by God. He needs decent housing and sufficient food to achieve his God-given destiny. He needs to be given the material means for the use of his freedom, but freedom under God is the goal, not material equality. Material equality is not enough, for there can be equality among slaves as well as among freemen. The only equality worth having is that of freemen who know that their freedom comes from God.

It is a curious, perhaps symptomatic fact that the Iron Curtain and concentration camps are the distinctive institutions of this age of totalitarian tyranny, an age also of relatively general prosperity. The question arises: Are the Iron Curtain and the concentration camps there because the world has so much preoccupation with wealth? Would Samuel Adams and his colleagues of 1776 have accepted them as quasi-permanent institutions of political life? Has the great postwar boom in the West failed freedom by a case of mistaken identity between freedom and prosperity? Are we ready for the "burden and glory of freedom"?

We can safeguard freedom only when we prize it for what it is and defend it against materialism. The conflict is basically spiritual and can ultimately only be solved by a spiritual resurgence that sees every man as a welcome fellow son of God endowed with His freedom. Even if the military threat of armed materialism no longer existed, even if hunger and poetry and all the aids to the materialist revolt were abolished, freedom would not be secure unless we had grasped the full splendor of freedom as the gift of God, an attribute which makes us His image.

No campaign for the cause of God can ever be waged except in the spirit of God, by His love for every man. We can defeat the emptiness of materialism only by conveying the richness of a life of faith. We can lose the fight against materialism only by fighting it on the wrong ground—by a greater materialism. For this reason, it is always instructive, even edifying, to speak with defectors from the cause of materialism. Basically, they left it because it disillusioned them, because it did not fill their God-given aspirations to achieve a life of freedom. I have not met one who did not sacrifice his material benefits to enjoy freedom. They do not come to us to enjoy greater material benefits. They come to enjoy freedom and their dignity as men.

Furthermore, they always tend to measure our system by the worth of our lives, for they have learned to distrust words. Herein lies the obligation of each of us to our country and to the world. Each one of us vindicates the system of freedom by the worth of his life. We defend freedom under God every day by honoring the just law that enshrines it. The just law of freedom is not only an ordinance of reason, it is a rule of action. The just law of freemen can exist only if freemen are virtuous. It is an old rule that if we do not act the way we think, we shall think the way we act. Every man, by his actions, contributes to the law. Centuries ago, Solon, the great Greek lawgiver remarked that fact. When asked whether he had devised the best law possible, he said, "The best that the people will accept." A distinguished professor of the University of Pennsylvania Law School expressed the same fact when he said, "If our profession sired our constitutional system, we have all the more obligation to see to it that it works—that your Nation does not lose sight of those self-evident principles upon which it was founded." This is a task incumbent upon all freemen. Freedom under God does not exist by virtue of a document or an agreement. Freedom exists only in act, in the will. Freedom lives only by the virtue of freemen, as St. Peter taught, "Live as free men, yet not using your freedom as a cloak for malice, but as servants of God." (First Epistle of St. Peter, ch. I, verse 16.)

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 29, 1962]

PERIL TO FREEDOM WARNING ISSUED AT RED MASS

Cabinet members, Ambassadors, Senators, and Congressmen attended Washington's traditional Roman Catholic red Mass yesterday and heard a warning that freedom is under attack in the United States.

The Most Reverend Philip M. Hannan, Catholic auxiliary bishop of Washington, told the 1,200 guests at St. Matthew's Cathedral that widespread crime and improper use of economic power infringe on freedom and added:

"It is under attack by those who fail to regard their fellow citizens as an equal * * * regardless of language or race or descent. It is under attack by those who confuse freedom with its material fruits, who confuse freedom with personal indulgence."

The Mass, taking its name from the color of the vestments worn by officiating priests, is celebrated annually to ask God's blessing on the administration of justice in the United States.

[From the Catholic Standard, Feb. 2, 1962]

BISHOP DEFINES FREEDOM

The American system of freedom is vindicated by the worth of the life of each of us, Bishop Philip M. Hannan told a distinguished congregation of top Government officials, judges and diplomats at the annual red Mass Sunday in St. Matthew's Cathedral.

Archbishop O'Boyle celebrated the Mass which is an annual event held near the be-

ginning of the judicial year for judges, lawyers, and Government officials of all faiths to invoke God's blessings on their work. It is sponsored by the Lawyers' Committee of the John Carroll Society.

Notables attending the Mass included Speaker of the House John W. McCormack who headed a large delegation of Senators and Congressmen; Chief Justice Earl Warren and Associate Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., of the Supreme Court who led the judicial delegation; Attorney General Robert Kennedy and Postmaster General J. Edward Day who represented the Cabinet; and representatives from 15 foreign governments.

The prayer for civil authorities, written by Archbishop John Carroll in the early days of this country, was recited at the Mass.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include a statement of the commander of the American Legion before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on Tuesday, February 27, 1962.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday—Tuesday, February 27, 1962—was a very busy and eventful day on the third floor of the Old House Office Building. From all over America, members of the American Legion filled to capacity the large caucus room as their national commander, Charles L. Bacon, appeared before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Such activity on this floor has not been seen in many years. Down the hall in the large Armed Services Committee room, appearing before the House Science and Astronautics Committee—House Space Committee—were America's three astronauts. Present were Comdr. Alan Shepard and Capt. Gus Grissom, both having earlier made successful suborbital flights; and with them, our great hero of the day, the humble, likable, really down to earth astronaut—Col. John H. Glenn.

Though every minute of that hearing was a new thrill for each and every person crowded into the committee room, we, as members of the House Space Committee, had to forgo the first part of their testimony. This was because at that particular time we had been awarded the enjoyable opportunity, which was at the same time a high privilege and a great honor, to introduce and present to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee our fellow Missourian, the national commander of the American Legion, Charles L. Bacon, who in his statement, presented the legislative objectives of the American Legion for the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

In asking leave to insert my remarks of introduction, it is not for any personal reasons but rather that through the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, widespread circulation may be given to the personal history of the man who will this year lead the greatest veterans organization in the world. Therefore, following our remarks of introduction, we are asking leave that the statement of Commander Bacon be spread in the RECORD. He delivered a sincere, yet thought-provoking message from the American Legion to every Member of the Congress. The remarks of introduction and the commander's statement follow:

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues on this great Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It is a real privilege, and I am highly honored this morning, for a fellow committee member to be permitted to introduce to the committee the distinguished commander in chief of the American Legion.

Charlie Bacon, as we all call our good friend, is one and the same Charles L. Bacon, of Kansas City, Mo., and a native of the city of Marshall, Saline County, Mo., who was unanimously elected national commander of the American Legion at the 43d National Convention in Denver, Colo., September 14, 1961.

It is very significant that Bacon was unopposed at Denver and was, in fact, elected by acclamation. This is not always the case. Not only was he the delegates' candidate at the beginning—he soon became the other candidates' candidate.

After the new commander's whirlwind trip of 30,000 miles in October 1961, there was at least one witness in every county in the United States who could bear witness to the fact that their new national leader was able, instantly likable, sincerely devoted to the principles of the American Legion and American citizenship, endowed with a high order of ability and basic good sense, possessed of a personal manner that is frank, friendly and reassuring.

He is the "Show Me" State's first member to be elected to the top position in the American Legion. But this is only one of a series of firsts on Bacon's part. He is the first—and so far the only—member of Post 191 at Marshall, Mo., to be awarded a life membership. He was the first of Missouri's World War II veterans to be elected department commander of the American Legion out in Missouri. It should be recalled that he graduated first, as the honor graduate of his class at Missouri Valley College, at Marshall, Mo. After leaving this small college he entered the University of Missouri where he was elected president of the student body, which made him the first—or top man—on the campus.

Another first for Bacon was that he was the youngest local president that the chamber of commerce at Marshall, Mo., had ever elected then and even to this date.

Our commander graduated from the University of Missouri in 1934 with honors, and returned to his home city of Marshall, Mo., where he engaged in the general practice of law until he was called into the service early in 1942, at about the beginning of World War II. It was then he was commissioned in the United States Navy and served first as a communications officer and later as a legal officer until April 1946 when he was separated from the service with the permanent rank of lieutenant commander.

After his release from the service he returned to his home city of Marshall, Mo., and to active membership in Marshall Post 191 of the American Legion. He has held several post and district offices. In 1948 he was elected department judge advocate; in 1949 he rose to the office of senior vice commander; and in 1950 was elected department commander of Missouri.

Although he soon completed his term as commander, he later served with distinction on many department and national commissions and committees.

But, to show the humility of our guest here this morning, after he had served as State American Legion commander in 1950, and did an outstanding job honoring and dignifying the department, he returned to his local post in Marshall and learned they badly needed an adjutant, and though he had just stepped down from the highest Legion office in the State, he jumped back in the harness to the lowly rank and glamourless job of post adjutant for a year.

Bacon followed his law profession in the city of Marshall until 1952, when he moved to Kansas City, Mo., to become chief counsel for the marketing division of Skelly Oil Co., and remained with that firm until 1956, at which time he became a partner in the firm of Shook, Hardy, Ottman, Mitchell & Bacon. While Charlie Bacon might be described as a corporation lawyer, he is certainly recognized in the courts where he has practiced as an outstanding trial lawyer.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, if I may digress for a moment, I would like to interject just a word of personal observation about our distinguished guest here this morning. Having personally practiced law for many years in Jackson County, Mo., I know something of his great reputation as a trial lawyer, but I also served as a member of the Jackson County court for over 12 years (and during that time Charlie Bacon appeared before our court repeatedly), usually arguing the cause of a client before the board of equalization or representing some client on a question of zoning or land use and to the very best of my recollection there was not a single instance in which he did not prevail in behalf of his client.

Mr. Chairman, our commander has always been active in civic and educational affairs. He is now serving as vice president of the board of trustees of Missouri Valley College. It was not very long ago, in January 1962, that he was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws by that institution. He has been a member of the Missouri Citizens Commission for Education. He is a lifelong member and deacon of the Presbyterian Church; a member of the Masonic Lodge; a member of Sigma Nu social fraternity; and Phi Delta Phi legal fraternity.

Our commander is married to the former Helen Selvage, and is the father of two children—a daughter, now Mrs. Charles Rule, and a son, Charles L. (Buddy) Bacon, Jr.

Our guest is endowed with a good and warm sense of humor and an infectious smile. He is one who seems to grow on you. There must be something extraordinary about a man who continually rises in leadership and the answer is that he has the ordinary qualities that we look for in anyone on whom we seek to rely. He has the very ordinary things such as sincerity, friendliness, genuineness, clarity of judgment, capacity for hard work, general ability and that elusive thing we know as personal charm.

One of the great papers in mid-America, the Kansas City Star, in a warm editorial following Bacon's election stated, "* * * integrity and intelligence have marked his career. Calm and easygoing in appearance, he is a dynamo of energy. The Legion will have a whirlwind year under the leadership of Charlie Bacon."

He is a man of great loyalty to his country. He will ask for nothing that is not right or completely fair on behalf of the great veterans' organization that he represents. I am sure he puts his country above everything else, and this notwithstanding that he is the leader of a great organization, the largest veterans' organization in this country.

Mr. Chairman, Missouri is mid-America. It is neither South nor North nor East nor West. Kansas City, Charlie Bacon's home, is the heart of America, and he will give his heart and mind and full efforts all this year to the great organization he heads. Missouri is famous for the finest mules in the world, and the most famous country cured ham in all America. She has had many famous sons—Mark Twain, Champ

Clark, Gen. Black Jack Pershing, Gen. Omar Bradley, President Harry S. Truman—but in the realm of leadership for the veterans of this country, it is my considered judgment Charlie Bacon has been and will add luster to our State as a famous son of Old Mizzou.

Out in Missouri we are known as the "Show Me" State, and we are proud of that description. But everyone should remember that none of us ever have to be shown but once. That will be typical of the great year of service ahead for the veterans of this country by our witness here this morning.

My colleagues of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, it is my great pleasure and high honor to present to you the Honorable Charles L. Bacon, national commander of the American Legion.

STATEMENT BY CHARLES L. BACON, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 27, 1962

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this occasion has always meant much to the American Legion. In a personal way, it has added significance by virtue of the fact that I have been presented to this committee by my friend and fellow Missourian, Congressman RANDALL.

At the outset, may I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee for your consideration in receiving all of us this morning. We are grateful for this opportunity to present the American Legion's rehabilitation legislative program for the year.

We are extremely conscious of the fact that service on this committee constitutes one of the most difficult yet one of the most rewarding of congressional assignments. It is also a thrilling experience for a citizen to appear before legislative bodies, for it is in this arena that life and meaning are given the democratic processes.

The legionnaires who have joined me today are representatives of every State in the Nation. They are in Washington attending our annual commander's conference. This is an important series of meetings and, in addition to the 39th Annual Rehabilitation Conference, includes the convening of seven of the major commissions of the American Legion. The keynote of our conference is our conviction that the more effective we make the programs of the American Legion today, the stronger and better will be the America of tomorrow. This keynote calls attention to the reason for the very existence of the American Legion: a stronger and better America.

The American Legion is indebted to the Veterans' Affairs Committee for its significant efforts to improve and perfect legislation controlling veterans benefits. We know this committee is conscientious, is hard working, is sympathetic and is cooperative. If I were to epitomize the actions and results of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I would say that both strongly indicate that its members recognize and accept a compassionate responsibility for those who offered their lives in defense of this Nation. We have much to thank this committee for, not the least of which is the fact that it invariably receives our proposals, and those who present them, with understanding and grace.

Mr. Chairman, your committee staff has been most helpful to us. Mr. Meadows, Mr. Patterson, and all the others seem to consider us interested parties engaged in a mutual undertaking. We thank them for their willingness to receive and consider our suggestions and to keep us informed of the special studies in which they engage.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we have a substantial number of legislative proposals which we will urge for your consideration this session. To us of the American Legion, all are important and we will work diligently toward their enactment. Although we appear and participate here today as advocates and not as the judge and jury, we desire that our participation be responsible, and may I assure you that we are aware of the fact that there can be a unity of purpose without a strict conformity of thought. Some of our proposals are more far reaching than others, or have a greater number of beneficiaries, or have a greater impact upon the veterans benefits program.

I intend, this morning, to discuss in rather general terms several which, in my judgment, fall into this latter category, and to submit, as an appendix to my statement, a complete list of all of our resolutions in the rehabilitation legislative field.

Disability and death compensation: It has been the well-established position of the American Legion that the service disabled and the survivors of those who die of service-connected causes, are the first concern of our organization and of the Congress. Their welfare and their best interests are always uppermost in our minds. Our complete dedication to the service disabled does not mean, however, that we will endorse every compensation bill presented. Last session, this committee did not approve the Legion's proposal to adjust the service-connected compensation law; that fact certainly does not justify the allegation by anyone that the committee is not for the service disabled. There are some compensation increase bills which in our judgment fail to meet basic and fundamental needs. It is most important to note here that I do not speak only of the question of how much of an increase should be granted. In addition to that important point are two other considerations about which we feel strongly. The American Legion is convinced that balance should be restored to the rate structure and that additional allowances, on a pro rata basis, should be provided for veterans rated 10 through 40 percent disabled. As to balance, we cannot escape the logic of the argument that contends that a man who is rated 90-percent disabled by the Veterans' Administration should receive a monthly sum equal to 90 percent of the amount payable for total disability. He did until 1952, when the rate structure was thrown out of balance. At present, he receives an amount equal to 79 percent of the amount payable for total disability. The imbalance continues down through the remaining percentage evaluations. If he is not truly 90-percent disabled, he should not be so rated, or the rating schedule, which specifies the evaluation to be assigned, should be modifed. Nor can we in the Legion see the rationale in the law which provides additional allowances for the family of a man rated 50-percent disabled but not for the family of the man rated 40 percent. The inequity is particularly striking when we consider the case of a man with several children who is reduced, because of a changed physical condition, from 50 to 40 percent. He loses not only the 10-percent compensation, but also all allowances for his family—as though they had suddenly ceased to exist. It is the conviction of the American Legion that a compensation bill which does not restore balance and provide the additional allowances described is basically and fundamentally deficient. We urge your consideration of our proposal in this field.

Disability and death pension: Public Law 211, passed in the 86th Congress, instituted a number of substantial changes in existing pension legislation. These amendments were intended to perfect the controlling law and to especially benefit the most needy. Our experience with 86-211 impels us to the conclusion that certain revisions are in order. The resolution which our last national convention approved will, we believe, put the law in a form that will fulfill the purposes for which it was originally passed.

National service life insurance: Notwithstanding the value of national service life insurance, millions of veterans were unable to retain their insurance after discharge. The demands of education, growing families, economic adjustments, and so forth, were too great. We feel that had the Congress established a prospective termination date for the life insurance program, which had been in effect since the close of World War I, giving veterans a last but reasonable period in which to apply, many would have made the sacrifices necessary to secure the insurance. We urge that the privilege of securing national service life insurance now be reopened for a limited time, under specific conditions and with due regard for those who are now uninsurable as a result of service-connected disabilities.

Aging veterans: The aging and chronically ill veteran has been a source of great concern to us for some time. We have devoted much time and study to his problems. We have a joint economic-rehabilitation subcommittee whose sole function it is to consider this matter. The American Legion has urged that special medical facilities be provided for the veteran, usually advanced in age, who is afflicted with a long-term illness. I single out this subject because of its growing importance and because I know you share our interest in the subject.

Administration of veterans' benefits: We are aware of proposals to vest in agencies other than the VA the administration of certain veterans' benefits. We oppose such a move. Tradition and reason, in our judgment, require that the agency experienced and trained in these matters continue to control them. We fear, too, that one such loss would be followed by another, leading ultimately to the completely unsatisfactory condition that existed when veterans' matters were administered according to subject matter by various Federal agencies. Experience led the Congress to establish a single agency, charged with the responsibility for veterans' affairs. That same experience, now fortified by time and achievement, dictates that the single agency concept must be retained.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the legislative proposals which we present to you today constitute one part of the whole effort to which the American Legion devotes itself. Were we an organization that only asked, I might be hesitant in coming before you today—even though that which we seek is for others. But our record of giving is a source of pride and satisfaction—giving, not only in the field of rehabilitation, where the Legion annually spends $2 million and where thousands of service officers, almost all unpaid, give countless thousands of hours of service; but giving, also, in our other programs, such as child welfare, boys state and junior baseball, in Americanism, and national security.

We are keenly aware that some of our proposals cost substantial amounts of money. I can assure you that the delegates to our conventions bear in mind constantly their responsibility to the public as well as to veterans. We believe that what we seek is right and reasonable. We are convinced that it will always be within the power of this Nation to do that which is right and reasonable.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time, our staff will present to your committee the details of all of our specific legislative proposals. We will try, as always, to establish and document their validity and their desirability.

Thank you again for your kindness and for your attention.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, when the roll was called this afternoon I was at

a hearing at the Veterans' Administration. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

CONSTRUCTIVE APPROACH ON LEGISLATION BY REPUBLICAN MEMBERS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, adoption of a substitute for the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961, offered by the gentleman from New York, the Honorable CHARLES E. GOODELL, is further evidence of the constructive approach being taken toward legislation by Republican Members of the Congress.

The bill has now been passed by an overwhelming vote, 354 to 62, with 1 "present," and certainly an overwhelming vote of approval on my side of the aisle, where 145 voted "yea"; and for that I am very happy. While under House procedures the bill actually passed bears the name of a majority party Member, and that is as it should be, it embodies completely the substitute proposals put forward by the gentleman from New York Representative GOODELL and other Republican members of the Committee on Education and Labor.

By this action in accepting the Republican program for retraining unemployed workers, the House has effectively refuted the unfounded accusation that our position is always negative.

The Goodell substitute reflects in large measure an extensive study known as Operation Employment made by a task force of some 60 Republicans who called on some of the most knowledgeable private citizens in the Nation to advise them on ways to attack the problem of unemployment.

It should also be recalled that when the depressed areas legislation was before the House last year an attempt was made by Republicans to increase funds for a manpower retraining program. This proposal, however, was defeated by votes from the Democratic side of the aisle.

I am convinced that this sound Republican approach will give the country an effective new program to help those jobless people who want to work to regain a useful place in our economy as breadwinners. It is clear evidence of responsible Republican initiative and action in the Congress of the United States.

ROCHESTER'S EASTMAN PHILHARMONIA DESERVES HIGHEST PRAISE

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. WEIS] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, the Eastman Philharmonia, the student symphony orchestra of the renowned Eastman School of Music, in Rochester, N.Y., returned Sunday from a tour abroad which has reaped great and enduring benefits for the United States. I rise today to pay special tribute to Dr. Howard Hanson, the beloved head of the Eastman School and conductor of the orchestra, to his very talented assistant, Frederic K. Fennell, and to the extraordinarily gifted young student musicians of the philharmonia.

Under the auspices of our people-to-people program, the Eastman Philharmonia has just completed a 3-month tour of 16 nations, including the Soviet Union, and every single performance of this magnificent student group was met with the highest critical acclaim. In my judgment, the music of the philharmonia has done more to enhance the cultural prestige of the United States abroad than any other single effort we have ever made. America owes a tremendous debt of gratitude to this dedicated and extremely gifted group of young people.

Wherever they went, these young musicians, ranging in age from only 17 to 22, performed splendidly. Newspaper accounts indicate that audiences and critics alike were amazed at their poise and ability. Their three concerts in Moscow drew rave notices and audiences demanded repeated playings of John Philip Sousa's "Stars and Stripes Forever"; in Lvov, in the heart of the Ukraine, the lights had to be turned off after seven encores so the audience would go home. Everywhere the reception was the same. The philharmonia captured the hearts of music lovers throughout Europe as they long ago captured the hearts of the people of my home city of Rochester.

Mr. Speaker, I am enormously proud of this wonderful group of young people and their devoted director, Howard Hanson, an old and dear personal friend of mine. I salute them for a job well done and wish them all many more successes in their musical careers. They have performed a truly great service in the cause of better understanding between the people of this country and those of the 16 other nations who were privileged to hear their beautiful music.

I should like to include at this point in the RECORD a series of newspaper clippings from Rochester papers which vividly describe the impact of the philharmonia's tour:

PHILHARMONIA WOWS REDS WITH "STARS AND STRIPES"

A Moscow audience last night took to heart John Philip Sousa's march honoring the everlasting quality of the American flag, thanks to Rochester's Eastman Philharmonia.

Wire service reports from Moscow indicated that most members of the enthusiastic audience in Tchaikovsky Conservatory heard Sousa's "Stars and Stripes Forever" last night, for the first—and second—time.

The first performance came as a third encore and drew shouts from the audience of "March. March." Several Russians asked Americans the name of the march. They seemed a little surprised when told but continued applauding.

The overflow audience of 2,000 called the orchestra back for encores for more than 40 minutes. The rousing march went over so well that it was played twice.

The march is being played regularly as an encore during the orchestra's 3-month European and Asian tour. Last night's was the first of three concerts to be played in Moscow by the 87-member orchestra.

The philharmonia enjoyed what conductor Howard Hanson called "one of our greatest receptions" in its first concert in the Soviet Union.

Among Soviet notables hailing the performance was Deputy Culture Minister A. N. Kuznetsov, who told Hanson:

"You made a wonderful impression. You played music that is seldom heard in our country."

The Tass News Agency described the performance as a smash hit and said the orchestra's wide ranging program "made an impression of very great musical culture."

U.S. Ambassador and Mrs. Llewelyn Thompson were on hand, but some members of the Embassy staff were unable to get tickets.

Rhythmic clapping and cheering by the audience lasted more than half an hour after the end of the regular concert which included works of Mozart, Purcell, De Falla, Ravel, and Conductor Hanson.

One enthusiastic Moscovite remarked to a reporter:

"I was worried because they all looked so young. But they are marvelous."

Kuznetsov, in an apparent reference to the Sousa march, told Hanson that part of the concert's success was somewhat unusual.

Sousa, America's "March King," is well known for his stirring patriotic marches. In 1880 he was appointed leader of the Marine Corps Band and served under Presidents Garfield, Arthur, Cleveland, and Harrison. In World War I he was given the rank of lieutenant commander and was director of music at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station.

Also well received was Hanson's Symphony No. 2 "Romantic." Tass said the symphony "is regarded by Moscow music critics as one of the most striking manifestations of American romanticism of the 20th century."

The concert included Purcell's "Dioclesian," the overture to Mozart's opera "Abduction from the Seraglio," Ravel's suite "Ma Mere l'Oye," and the suit from De Falla's "Three Cornered Hat."

After the audience filed out of the ornate Tchaikovsky Conservatory Hall into the frosty Moscow night, the orchestra remained seated.

In a burst of youthful exuberance it suddenly began playing again to an empty hall—without Hanson.

The orchestra is to play in Moscow tonight and tomorrow before touring the Soviet Union.

Hanson obviously spoke for the group when he said to the delighted audience "spasibo"—"thank you" in Russian.

PHILHARMONIA REPEATS MOSCOW HIT

MOSCOW.—The Eastman School of Music's all-student philharmonia orchestra scored another rousing triumph last night in the Soviet capital.

The audience at the Tchaikovsky Conservatory demanded six encores, including two repeats of the stirring Sousa march "Stars and Stripes Forever."

"This is the first time we ever had to play an encore to an encore," declared conductor Howard Hanson.

"Stars and Stripes Forever" appears to have become a favorite of Muscovite music lovers. At the philharmonia's opening concert Thursday night the audience took to the march music instantly and demanded to hear it again.

Last night's performance was televised over the Soviet network.

Hanson said in an interview on Moscow radio "I was impressed by the warmth of the reception."

Hanson said playing in the conservatory was a sentimental occasion for him because the late Serge Koussevitzky—"one of my very best friends"—was a graduate of the conservatory.

"Koussevitzky began directing the Boston Philharmonic in 1924," said Hanson, "the same year I went to Eastman."

Hanson said members of the Moscow audiences were surprised by the youth of the orchestra, whose members range in age from 17 to 22.

He reported that a Russian woman who came in to take a picture of the group stopped short at the sight of them and exclaimed "Amazing."

She was almost as surprised to learn that all were studying to be professionals, Hanson related.

PHILHARMONIA A SMASH HIT IN 3-DAY MOSCOW STAND

Moscow.—Eighty-seven young Americans of the University of Rochester's Eastman Philharmonia ended a 3-day stand in Moscow last night playing six encores for a delighted audience of Muscovite music lovers.

A standing-room-only audience showed its appreciation in the ornate Tchaikowsky Conservatory Hall for a program that included works of Beethoven, American Walter Piston, and Eastman Director Howard Hanson.

But the orchestra made its greatest hit with Sousa's "Stars and Stripes Forever" which it had to play twice on each of the three nights by popular demand.

Today the group continues its tour of the Soviet Union, which ends about February 23.

After Saturday night's concert, five of the American musicians held a jam session at the American Club, moving diplomats to do the charleston and jitterbug.

"This has been a fantastic experience," said Daniel T. Perantoni, 20, of Johnsonburg, Pa.

"The whole trip has been a fantastic experience—all 16 nations—everywhere we've been. Music is an international language."

The orchestra's associate director, Frederic K. Fennell, who conducted the first half of last night's concert, was highly enthusiastic about the orchestra's European tour under the cultural exchange program.

"This is the greatest kind of diplomacy since the days of Benjamin Franklin," he said. "It's like playing baseball in Yankee Stadium."

Fennell said that while the young musicians have been "up" for the whole tour, they are even keener to make a good impression in the Soviet Union.

From indications of the last 3 days, they will have no trouble.

Director Hanson, who conducted the second half of last night's concert as well as all of the Friday and Saturday performances, found himself still taking bows before a cheering audience 45 minutes after the end.

In an interview on Moscow Radio, Hanson commented:

"I was impressed by the warmth of the reception."

He said playing in the conservatory was a sentimental occasion because the late Serge Koussevitzky—"one of my very best friends"—was a graduate of the conservatory.

"Koussevitzky started directing the Boston Philharmonic in 1924, the same year I went to Eastman," Hanson said.

Last night's performance of the philharmonia was televised over the Soviet network.

ALLEN REPORTS FROM RUSSIA: "THEY WOULDN'T GO HOME"—PHILHARMONIA GIVES SEVEN ENCORES IN LVOV

(By Hamilton B. Allen)

(Ham Allen left February 5 to be with the Eastman Philharmonia during the latter weeks of its Russian tour. He arrived in Moscow a week ago and made arrangements to join the orchestra in Lvov. More detailed accounts of Allen's experiences in Russia will be published later in the Times-Union.)

KIEV, U.S.S.R.—They had to turn out the lights in a theater at Lvov Sunday night so the Eastman Philharmonia could go home.

The reception was that enthusiastic. An applauding audience brought the philharmonia back for seven encores for 1 hour after their performance had concluded.

Everyone agrees the reception in Lvov was the greatest of the entire 3-month oversea tour.

As the 87-member Rochester student orchestra left the theater and headed for their hotel, Russians stopped them in the streets. They wanted to talk and invite them to their homes and music schools.

Everybody with the orchestra and its staff is well.

These young people are making such an impression in Russia that it is hard to understand. The Russian visit has provided a series of fantastic experiences.

Lvov is an industrial center in the western Ukraine, about 50 miles from the Polish border. It is the former Galician capital in the old Austro-Hungarian Empire.

We journed by train from Lvov to Kiev where the philharmonia will perform Thursday night. Tonight, the orchestra and staff will go to the Kiev Ballet.

The philharmonia's performances in Lvov were brilliant.

Director Howard Hanson said he felt the orchestra was "playing well—way over their heads."

Sunday night's concert, devoted entirely to modern works, was led by Frederick Fennell, the associate conductor. The audience numbered more than 1,000, and 500 persons were turned away.

After the concert in Kiev Thursday night, the philharmonia will go to Leningrad for the windup of the Russian tour.

Hanson said he has accepted an invitation for the orchestra to give a concert April 7 in Philadelphia for the Musical Arts Society of America.

RUSSIANS WANT TO KNOW THE SCORES—THEY STOP PHILHARMONIA MEMBERS FOR MUSIC, FACTS ON AMERICA

(By Hamilton B. Allen)

The Russian man-in-the-street is packed full of curiosity. Drop an American in his town—or better, 97 Americans—and he and they are apt to cause quite a stir. The Russian people are deeply interested in the who and what and why of America.

Members of the Eastman Philharmonia told me that what I saw on this score happened in every town on the Russian tour.

It was particularly evident in the areas where Americans are decidedly in short supply, Lvov and Kiev, for instance. This I saw and was a part of. The impressions are lasting.

For instance, a few steps outside the concert hall in Lvov, on a side street, shortly before midnight, I came upon a crowd of people neck-stretching to hear and see what was going on in the middle of the tight-ringed circle.

Curious myself, I joined the stretch, all 6 feet 2, and saw Dr. Frederick Fennell, somewhat less than that height, way down in the center. He was being interrogated by a woman who spoke bits of English, translating for a Russian gentleman obviously of some distinction.

The immediate issue was Sousa's "Stars and Stripes Forever" march that had been played and later repeated at the concert. The man was a professor of music and he insisted that he "must have that music for his orchestra." He had never been so thrilled, he said, and if the maestro (Fennell) would allow him a score he would stay up all night to copy it and have it at the hotel before breakfast.

Satisfied that Fred was in no trouble, I broke off the fringe of the mesmerized audience and walked along the dark street. I wasn't half a block away when I sensed someone walking immediately behind me.

Then a young man caught my arm and said in stilted, halting English (that was much better, by the way, than my travel-book Russian) that he had seen me taking pictures at the concert and suspected I was a journalist from the United States and would I please answer a couple of questions about my homeland.

I decided to play it cool, so I said to go ahead and shoot the questions.

This is verbatim, for I made notes the moment I gained the quiet safety of the hotel:

"Tell me, is it true that all the future for youth is in our land [Russia] and that in America there is no future for your young people?"

I told him that I wasn't in Russia to make propaganda but that I wanted to tell him the truth, as long as he had asked.

I said, "No, that the future for young people in the United States was very bright and from what I had seen of Russia it was equally bright for the Soviet youth.

"Together," I said, hoping to add a clincher, "we could have the greatest future man ever knew if we learned how to get along in peace."

Then he said, "Our papers tell us that you people want war. Is that true?"

I vigorously denied that, said that it just plain wasn't true, that the papers that said that were not sticking to the facts, that he must remember that if you cut us we bleed the same as a Russian and that we wanted most of all to have peace on this earth and for all men everywhere to live happily and peaceful together.

He faded from my side as quietly as he had arrived. Who he was I do not know.

Many in the orchestra tell of similar experiences.

Two of the girls in the philharmonia, Patricia Dengler of Amarillo, Tex., and Linda Van Sickle of Cleveland, told me of one.

Again it was night (these meetings don't happen in daylight) when a couple accosted them after a concert and invited them to their home the next day. The man spoke good English.

The girls, eager to see how Russian people live, accepted. They took a taxi to the address and were welcomed into the "clean, neat, fairly comfortable" home (apartment; there are few single houses).

The man was a teacher of English, they learned, and was hoping that he could add to his library, his latest works of American origin being Mark Twain's writings. He wanted his children to become familiar with U.S. writers. He did not know of William Faulkner, nor of F. Scott Fitzgerald nor of any of the crop of major latter day authors, the girls said.

The girls said his hunger for "something beyond what he could get in local bookstalls" was pitiful.

They added what little they could from their travel reading. They said he was "touchingly grateful."

This is the way it went.

ORCHESTRA WOVE WEB OF UNDERSTANDING

(By Hamilton B. Allen)

The real story of the Eastman Philharmonia tour cannot be written in black and white. It was graven in the hearts of men in the universal language of beautiful music by 87 gallant young people from Rochester, N.Y. They and those who heard and those who saw will never think the same again, nor perhaps even be the same.

The transformation both in those who gave and in those who received, was visible and touching; a wonderment to a bystander briefly in their midst whose own experience never shall be forgotten.

Their story is as big as the land that stretches from the Atlantic eastward to the red-towered walls of the Kremlin; from the hot streets of Cairo, thick with the diseased, to the silent, frozen beauty of sophisticated Leningrad.

It is a story of tired people and long plane hops; crowded buses, and dirty trains; of warm receptions, and cold rooms; of gustatory delights, and horsemeat.

It is a story of eager kids who chose to forget sick bellies and homesick hearts to keep the show on the long, long road.

It is a story of an old man of Lvov, crying silently in a corner of the concert hall and through his tears muttering "duh-svee-dah-nee-yah" (so long, until the next time) as the young players left the hall; of others so smitten with the young musicians from America that they wanted only to touch them as they went by; of opened homes in a shuttered land; of struck-up friendships that ignited on dark streets between music hall and hotel and sparkled into bright, wonderful moments of a spontaneous people-to-people thing that no government bureau could have planned, nor stopped; of unmeasurable good will spread across Europe and through the Iron Curtain into the vast, forbidding darkness of Russian hinterlands where no American orchestra had ever been before.

It is the biggest story in the history of Rochester music, a fantastic triumph for Yankee diplomacy and complete vindication of the American system of music education pioneered here and showcased so brilliantly in the Eastman Philharmonia.

This is the reaction of a reporter on the "home" side.

Let's look at what the "other" side thought of the orchestra for a measure of its artistic accomplishments. Here is a professional view, written by Prof. M. Teryan, a leading critic in Soviet musical circles, for Soviet Culture, the principal magazine of music and the arts in all of Russia.

It was translated for me in the last moments before leaving Kiev for Moscow and home. Here it is:

"Despite the young age of the musicians, the orchestra impresses us first of all with its fine ensemble, with technical and group perfection, a high quality of sound, irreproachable in its intonation and rhythmic stability. The orchestra is superb in its dynamic gradation—from the softest pianissimo to a powerful forte, to which any harshness is foreign.

"Composer Dr. Howard Hanson is the artistic leader and the chief conductor of the Eastman orchestra. He is unquestionably a musician of high caliber.

"Dr. Hanson's manner of conducting bears no trace of affectation but is characterized by appealing modesty and charm. At the same time he is a deeply emotional and brilliant artist.

"Complex in style and character, the (first) concert program was carried out with great artistic mastery and variety of performance. The overture, 'Abduction from the Seraglio' by Mozart, sounded light and transparent; Ravel's 'Mother Goose Suite' was full of fresh orchestral color and shadings of timber. In de Falla's suite, 'The Three Cornered Hat,' the orchestra dazzled us with its rhythmic accuracy and true inner temperament. We were deeply impressed by the interpretation of Purcell's 'Dioclesian' suite—the utterly clear voice leading providing expressive and beautiful sonority.

"By the way, recalling the third concert, I must say that the magical mastery of the orchestra's full palette of colors revealed itself to the utmost in such scores as Respighi's 'Fountains of Rome' and in Liador's 'The Enchanted Lake.'

"For the first time Muscovites heard Howard Hanson's Second Symphony, 'Romantic.' The audience highly appreciated both the mastery of the orchestra and of its leader.

"I shall not speak of the second concert of the American musicians where the superb art of Dr. Hanson and his students was reaffirmed anew. I shall just mention briefly the third and last concert in Moscow when the audience met another guest conductor, Dr. Frederick Fennell. I am pleased that Shostakovich's First Symphony found in Dr. Fennell a profound and thoughtful interpreter."

Said Dr. Hanson, with a sly chuckle of delight, "I couldn't have done better if I had written it myself."

PHILHARMONIA WINS PLAUDITS ON DEPARTURE FROM RUSSIA

Moscow.—The Eastman Philharmonia Orchestra of Rochester left for home last night after giving concerts in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, and other Soviet cities, Moscow radio said.

Tass, the Soviet news agency, appended this comment in reporting the departure:

"The greatest plaudits went to the art director of the orchestra, Composer Howard Hanson. It was noted in musical circles that the Eastman orchestra largely owes to Howard Hanson its high professional skill. The conductor has a natural bearing on the podium and does not strive for effects for effects' sake. Having a perfect command of the orchestra he is able to insure an amazingly balanced sound, making use of all the rich hues of the orchestra palette. The second conductor, Frederick Fennell, also produced a fine impression.

"The Soviet press and music critics noted that despite its youth the Eastman orchestra attracts one by its excellent feeling of ensemble, high technical skill, fine sound, a faultless intonational quality and sustained rhythm.

"The orchestra is equally good in the full dynamic range, from the most delicate pianissimo to a powerful forte without any ostentation, wrote the paper Sovetskaya Kultura."

PHILHARMONIA RETURNS TONIGHT FROM 3 MONTHS OF TRIUMPHS

The Eastman Philharmonia will return tonight in triumph after a three-continent, 3-month tour.

Hundreds of Rochesterians are expected to greet the 96-member orchestra when it arrives at Niagara Falls Airport at 8:25 p.m.

Political, civic and cultural leaders will be joined by scores of students and faculty members from the Eastman School of Music and University of Rochester.

Members of the troupe will be "piped" a welcome by the Eastman Wind Ensemble, organized by Dr. Frederick G. Fennell, associate philharmonia conductor and founder of the ensemble. Dr. Fennell was with the group during its tour.

Parents and friends of the young musicians will journey to Niagara Falls by auto. A local delegation of greeters will be headed by County Manager Gordon A. Howe and City Manager Henry R. Dutcher, Jr.

The travelers will leave Amsterdam, the Netherlands, today via a DC-3 jet. Rochester-Monroe County Airport's 5,500-foot runway is too short to accommodate the big plane, which carries 120 passengers.

After the landing at Niagara Falls, the company will return here by bus.

Persons wishing to drive to the welcoming ceremonies tonight were advised to leave the New York Thruway at exit 49. From there they should go north on Route 78 for 2 miles, then west on Route 324 to the junction of Routes 18 and 62 (about 6 miles). Continue northwest on Route 62 for 11.5 miles to Bell Aircraft plant. Signs pointing toward the airport and Air Force base show the way from there.

After the first salutations, an official welcome-home dinner will be held Wednesday night in the Sheraton Hotel. The dinner will honor Dr. Howard Hanson, director of Eastman School; Dr. Fennell; Richard Kilmer, concertmaster; and the other musical tourists.

The orchestra, made up of Eastman School students, led by Dr. Hanson and Dr. Fennell, left here on its State Department-sponsored tour November 24. They made their final appearance Thursday in Leningrad. That triumphant concert climaxed more than 70 played during the 10,000-mile itinerary.

Critics in Lisbon, Portugal (their first stop), described the philharmonia as sounding better than the Lisbon orchestra.

Reports reaching here disclosed that the young musicians found only critic acclaim in their journey.

That commendation was duplicated again and again in Switzerland, Luxembourg, Belgium, Sweden, West Germany, Egypt, Lebanon, Turkey, Poland, and the Soviet Union.

Perhaps in that country more than any other, the greatest triumphs were scored. The precision of the group impressed both Soviet critics and audiences.

At the first concert in Moscow January 26, more than 2,000 persons jammed into Moscow Conservatory. The crowd's shouts of appreciation kept the philharmonia playing encores for 40 minutes.

On that night the third encore was "Stars and Stripes Forever" and the Russians insisted it be played a second time.

A Tass critic wrote that the orchestra "made an impression of very great musical culture."

After the Moscow concert series, the philharmonia enchanted music lovers in other cities of eastern Russia. The Soviet tour ended last week in musically sophisticated Leningrad.

The philharmonia left the Soviet Union yesterday afternoon en route for Amsterdam, radio Moscow reported last night.

On January 22 in Warsaw, Poland, the acclaim brought four encores from a cheering crowd. In Cracow an audience broke precedent by asking an encore even before intermission.

"This just never happens," commented Dr. Fennell, who was conducting that day.

Besides exposing Iron Curtain countries to the performance level of an American student orchestra, the tour brought a large sampling of American music to many areas where it was rarely heard.

Among the works favorably cited most consistently by critics was Hanson's Second Symphony.

During the tour minor emergencies arose.

The most serious was the illness of Karen Phillips. Miss Phillips, a violist from Dallas, Tex., suffered an appendicitis attack which confined her to a hospital in Istanbul, Turkey.

But the 19-year-old artist caught the orchestra 10 days later in Warsaw. In true show business tradition she insisted on taking her place for the next concert.

But through both tribulations and triumphs the company apparently performed its musical mission of friendship to other nations.

The community's salutations which will begin tonight will be added to the long litany of praise recited so often in so many places.

HANSON MOVED BY RUSSIANS' RECEPTION

NIAGARA FALLS.—Russian audiences "could not have been nicer to us" Dr. Howard Hanson said last night as friends and well-wishers mobbed him inside the Niagara Falls Airbase hangar.

"No one could have given our Eastman Philharmonia Orchestra a warmer reception. Russia is a fascinating country and the whole experience has been tremendous."

The veteran conductor was most explicit in saying:

"I feel that the European and Middle East peoples not only like our young musicians for their talent but also for the way they conducted themselves."

Dr. Hanson, who lost nine pounds on the first 3 weeks of the tour, admitted he was very tired but very happy.

"It was hardly a vacation. When that big plane finally landed here in the United States, there was a reaction that I can't really put into words," he said. "Incidentally, we have had letters from embassies and consulates all over Europe, congratulating our philharmonia for its magnificent contribution to musical and cultural understanding.

"These young musicians were a great success. We all should be proud of them."

Dr. Hanson looked fit and ready and, with his usual ability to understate, remarked:

"I am amazed at the size of the crowd welcoming us here."

Among them was his private secretary, Mary Louise Creegan, who burst into tears as she gave the boss a bearhug.

THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] may extend his 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. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Agriculture has been studying H.R. 10010 which is entitled, The Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. Under this proposal the dairy industry would come under Government controls such as no dairy farmer has ever anticipated in the past.

One of the serious faults of this legislation is that all future production will be based on the production of farmers in the year 1961. At best this will be backward looking rather than forward looking legislation. It will freeze existing patterns of production and marketing not to levels of the present day but to 1961 levels. The dairy industry has undergone great changes in the last decade. This change and progress would virtually be stopped if the proposed legislation were enacted.

No Government regulation and no attempt to bring the dairy industry into a public utility status can possibly take into consideration and make adjustments for changes caused by population growth, changing consumer preferences, changing farm management efficiency, and new management practices and technological advantages which are assisting dairy farmers.

This lack of flexibility is of great concern to dairy farmers in my area of the country. I have received letter after letter from young dairy farmers, many of whom spent 1961 in the service and who now have gone back to their fathers' farms. The father reduced production in 1961 in order to handle production while his boy was in the service and now together they plan on operating an efficient dairy farm which will utilize the labor of both the young man and his own.

If this legislation is enacted it would prevent such an increase and in effect it would force the young man off the farm to find employment elsewhere. The letters which I received indicate that many young men, who have begun large expenditures for modernization of their dairy plant with the eventual goal of securing the number of cattle necessary to make an efficient operation of their farm, now find they would be prevented from reaching the point of efficient production because their production base would be their 1961 production.

Under the bill marketing allotment or bases could be transferred from one farm to another, but only according to the rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture and he could also be in the market purchasing dairy bases and in that way bid up the prices of these bases. This would make an additional expenditure for any young farmer wanting to become a dairyman or to increase his herd to the size necessary for him to be an efficient dairyman.

The only individual that this program could possibly work for would be one who planned to reduce production next year anyway. The dairy farmers who would be satisfied with this program would be those who would comply with reduction of production automatically because of management decisions made by themselves.

The bill provides that all other dairy farmers would be kept in line because of substantial fines and imprisonment in a Federal penitentiary. Now, the Department of Agriculture has changed its mind and says this is no longer necessary. However, it should be pointed out that this is a portion of the bill and evidently was considered necessary at the time the bill was written.

The only way I can ever see that a production control plan would be in any way equitable is if it would apply equally to all dairy farmers. However, this law provides that so-called deficient areas could be exempted. Also, minimum allotments would be provided so that the small producer would not be subject to the act and in this way all the reduction in production would be saddled on commercial producers in areas where some supply of dairy products is provided for other areas of the country.

As the administration testified on the dairy section of this legislation they realized that there were many complex and difficult areas in which decisions must be made. Some of them are: what are to be the price support levels, how much will production be reduced, exactly how would transfer of allotments be provided, how would they define deficient areas, at what level would they set the minimum allotment, how would the country be divided into 15 different areas—and so on.

In every case it was stated by administration witnesses that these were details that had not yet been worked out. It seems to me that such details should be made available to the Congress in order that we may make a decision as to whether or not this is just legislation rather than waiting until the time of the referendum to inform the farmers to what kind of regulations and controls they actually would be subjected.

From all the studies I have made of quota plans—and this definitely is a quota plan—any of the present problems which would be solved would be dwarfed compared to the great problems that would be created. If we want a healthy and prosperous dairy industry in this country this is not the approach to take. Let us rather listen to the experience of the people involved in our great dairy industry—people who almost unanimously oppose this legislation—and let us take recommendations from them.

THE LATE HONORABLE RALPH GWINN

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] may extend his 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. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened at the passing of our good friend and former colleague Ralph Gwinn. It was a real privilege to serve with him here in the House. I was sorry when Ralph Gwinn announced his retirement from the Congress a few years ago and now the knowledge of his passing brings home a much greater loss.

Ralph Gwinn was one of the most devoted and conscientious men with whom I have served in the House. He was gracious, kind, and always willing to assist his colleagues with their many problems.

Ralph Gwinn was a great American who fought to the very end for the ideals in which he believed. He will be sorely missed.

My deepest sympathy goes out to his family in their bereavement.

SENATOR IRVING M. IVES

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] may extend his 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. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, this country suffered a considerable loss with the passing of former U.S. Senator Irving M. Ives of New York. Irving Ives was a

humanitarian in the true sense of the word. He was a man of principle and conviction and could always be counted on to pursue the course which he felt in his own heart and mind was in the best interests of his country.

Irving Ives was an inspiration to those around him, coming as close as anyone could, in my estimation, to setting a perfect example for those who would pursue a life of public service. Dedication, thoroughness, objectivity, effectiveness—these were hallmarks of Irving Ives' service.

His contributions to the well-being of his fellow man are marked indelibly on his outstanding record of public service in the New York State Assembly and in the U.S. Senate. Admiration and respect for Irving Ives would flow from a knowledge of his public record alone. These feelings are heightened by the fact that I was personally acquainted with him for many years before we both came to Washington in 1947 to serve in the Congress.

In this day and age when men of wisdom and vision are sorely needed, we are the worse for his passing. He has left as one of his many legacies, however, his shining example of statesmanship which will endure as a valuable guidepost for our individual actions in the months and years ahead.

ORGANIZATION OF THE DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY

Mr. WINSTEAD. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, on August 31 the Secretary of Defense announced the organization of the Defense Supply Agency. As a member of the Armed Services Committee I have long been concerned with the effort to economize and improve defense procurement through centralization of functions. I applaud the Secretary's current effort in this direction.

Implementation of the new Agency will have a drastic and curtailing effect upon many older segments of the defense structure. High among these is the Quartermaster Corps of the Army. This dedicated corps has, in the past, performed a huge part of defense procurement with unquestionable efficiency, and it is not due to any lack of progressive adaptation on the part of the Quartermaster Corps that has inspired this change. These changes could only be justified on the grounds that greater economies and efficiencies can be effected by the creation of the Defense Supply Agency.

The Quartermaster Corps is as old as the U.S. Army and older than the Navy and Marine Corps. Age alone does not warrant veneration. The corps, however, through 10 generations of war and peace has won the respect of the Armed Forces, the Nation, and our many allies. Of more significant interest in recent years—years marked by growth of management techniques—the corps has been in the forefront in applying modern business methods to military supply. It has been the leader in joint supply of common items. Around the world, beginning in World War II, it has supplied food and petroleum to all services. It was a pioneer in the joint purchase of clothing as early as 1954. Two years later it organized the first single managers which contributed to the U.S. taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars savings.

When progress dictates the withdrawal of responsibility and prestige from any member of the governmental family, it is fitting that unusual and honorable performance in the past should be recognized and applauded. This should be in appreciation to the outgoing performers and for the encouragement and dignity of those left to continue remaining significant functions.

It is with these thoughts that I express appreciation to the Quartermaster Corps of the Army for its superior and traditional performance over these many years in the broadest field of defense procurement, and the confidence that its future performance in the field of direct supply will continue to contribute to the support and comfort of our combat forces.

RETIREMENT OF MAJ. GEN. PAUL B. BELL

Mr. WICKERSHAM. 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. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow Maj. Gen. Paul B. Bell will be retired from the U.S. Army Reserve. He has served our country in war and in peace. It is my distinct honor now to offer him, before this House assembled, our congratulations and our thanks.

General Bell has devoted almost 40 years to the Army National Guard and the U.S. Army Reserve. He terminates his military career as Commanding General of the 95th Division. He rose to this position of eminence from the enlisted ranks of the Wisconsin National Guard, which he first served as a private in January 1920. As Commanding General of the 95th Division and as a citizen of the State of Oklahoma, we honor him today.

General Bell is a fine American possessing a truly outstanding record of service. He was for many years with the 45th Division. During World War II, General Bell served nearly 6 years of active duty. His assignments included artillery battalion commander, artillery group executive officer, artillery group commander, and assistant artillery officer, artillery section of the European General Board. During 26 months of duty in the European theater, he earned many awards of merit and distinction, including the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Air Medal, and the French Croix de Guerre with Palm.

After the war, General Bell joined the Army Reserve program, eventually undertaking his present command in April 1958.

General Bell should be proud of his service and the Army Reserve should be proud of General Bell. His leadership and high moral character mark him as one of the finest products of our military reserve program. It is through the dedication and service of men like General Bell—the civilian soldiers of our democracy—that the United States can face the challenging future with confidence.

On the occasion of General Bell's retirement, we now salute a man who has served his country well.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend his 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. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, this country's first modern apprenticeship law was enacted in my State of Wisconsin in 1911. Over the years other States adopted laws patterned after ours and today there are 26 States and Territories with apprenticeship laws and agencies similar to our apprenticeship division.

Wisconsin has participated in the veterans' training under Public Laws 346 and 550. Forty-three thousand veterans were approved for training. Thirteen thousand were on-the-job trainees, training for periods not to exceed 2 years, in every imaginable business and occupation.

It is my understanding that under H.R. 10363—H.R. 8399 as amended—State agencies having the experience and know-how will be utilized to assist in carrying out the intent of the program. I am only too aware that it is difficult for us to predict just what the Department of Labor will do in the administration of this legislation once it becomes law. However, I do wish to state for the record that many of my colleagues share with me the hope that existing State agencies dealing with apprenticeship and training programs will not only be utilized in administering the program but will be used to give the benefit of their experience in setting up approval criteria for all types of training on the job under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of the Manpower Development and Training Act and the objectives toward which it is directed. The

widely recognized advances in American technology have produced profound results in our industrial production. The quality and quantity of our products have increased markedly. But hand in hand with these industrial changes has been a shift in the manpower skills necessary to operate industry. Only too frequently both industry and worker are found lacking the needed skills. It is specifically to this problem of training and retraining workers that the Manpower Development and Training bill is aimed.

I should like to direct attention specifically to that section of the bill which provides for educational institutions to offer the needed training programs. The bill authorizes State vocational education agencies to provide for such training through "public education agencies or institutions or, if facilities or services of such agencies or institutions are not adequate for the purpose, through arrangements with private educational or training institutions"—section 401, lines 10 to 15. Hence it is envisoned that existing available public facilities will be sought first and then qualified established private facilities will be utilized to provide any additional facilities. Such a priority system is only just for the administration of a public program.

However, it is significant to point out that section 503 of the bill requires that the present level of State and local vocational training effort be maintained. Hence, all existing programs must be continued at least on the present scale. Since most communities are already utilizing their public vocational facilities at near capacity, it is anticipated that existing public facilities may not be adequate to fulfill the new demands. In my own State, the University of Minnesota already utilizes through contract agreements the facilities of the William Hood Dunwoody Industrial Institute of Minneapolis for vocational education. The Dunwoody Institute is a nonprofit institution of extremely high reputation. It provides industrial and technical training of the finest caliber to men in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area. It is my understanding that institutions of such high caliber as Dunwoody were specifically intended to be eligible under provisions of this bill. I am sure that my distinguished colleagues who conducted hearings and drafted this bill would heartily concur that such is the intent of this bill. The following letter from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare also indicates agreement by the administration:

JUNE 23, 1961.

DEAR MR. HOLLAND: There is a definite role for private, vocational, technical, and training schools and institutes under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961, H.R. 7373, if there were a training need in the area and the public schools were unable or preferred not to provide this particular training need.

The legislation specifically authorizes the State vocational agency to contract with private institutions to provide training and retraining requested by the employment services.

As you know, your bill authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to contract directly with private institutions in an area if the State vocational education agency does not or cannot provide vocational training requested by the Secretary of Labor.

In the particular case of the Dunwoody Institute, Minneapolis, Minn., one of the Nation's outstanding technical institutes, it is noteworthy that the State University of Minnesota presently has a relationship with Dunwoody to provide training for university students which is not available through the university.

Thank you for your inquiry about this important matter. Please feel free to call on us for any further information you may need.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP H. DES MARAIS,
Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Speaker, other fine nonprofit private vocational institutes of high caliber are located in major industrial areas throughout the country. One example would be the David Rankin School of Mechanical Trades located in St. Louis, and so prominently discussed by the distinguished gentleman from St. Louis, Congressman THOMAS CURTIS. I am convinced from talking with subcommittee members that such eminently qualified institutions as Dunwoody and Rankin are intended to be eligible for participation in the programs established by the bill. It is the fly-by-night type of schools which took undue advantage of the earlier veterans education acts that cause concern to the framers of this legislation. The committee has assured me frequently that institutions of the excellent caliber of Dunwoody and Rankin are desired and necessary for the fullest implementation of this manpower program. Therefore, I feel it is essential in the passage of the manpower development and training bill to establish clearly the intention of Congress that qualified nonprofit private institutions should participate in the newly established program.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR]. He is always alert and vigilant to the detailed items of legislation before this body, and particularly so when people of his Third Congressional District are affected. I wish to assure the gentleman that it is my understanding that the Labor Department has high respect for Dunwoody Institute.

As legislative history to this substitute bill, I want it clearly understood that we do not contemplate requiring trainees to attend public facilities when better private facilities are available in the community. The language of the bill authorizes agreements between the Secretary of HEW and State agencies to provide training "through public educational agencies or institutions, or, if facilities or services of such agencies or institutions are not adequate for the purpose, through arrangements with private educational or training institutions."

I would certainly contemplate that trainees at Dunwoody would normally qualify for training allowances since, as I understand it, no technical institutes in that area compare with Dunwoody in the particular type of training Dunwoody offers. It is not our intention to make life more difficult for private technical institutes or any other private institutions providing needed training facilities. I would certainly hope that the administrators of this substitute bill would lean over backward in this respect. Having discussed this with my Democratic colleagues, I believe my views are shared in this respect on a bipartisan basis.

KENNEDY'S POLITICAL TRICKERY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, in my entire political career, I do not believe I have ever seen an instance of transparent political trickery to match President Kennedy's attempt to browbeat Congress into acquiescence in his unwise proposed reorganization plan to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

When the President, in an angry reaction to the House Rules Committee's refusal, by a vote of nine to six, to grant a rule for the consideration of a bill to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, announced that he would create such a Department by a reorganization plan and appoint Dr. Weaver, a Negro, as Secretary of the new Department, some of my friends of the press, while amused, said they regarded this as a brilliant stroke of political genius.

When, however, the House and Senate refused to be intimidated into voting for a plan which had no merits, on the threat of political extinction, the general press comment turned around the other way and indicated that the President had tried to get by with a fast one, but got caught in it and fell on his face.

For example, the following was the analysis of the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot:

The introduction of the race issue was, as we called it some time ago, a shoddy political trick. It is good to see it turn into a political blunder.

I insert the entire editorial at this point in my remarks:

PRESIDENT'S POLITICAL BLUNDER

Washington news analysts are beginning to agree that President Kennedy's tactics with respect to the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs are not producing the political results he expected.

Republicans who were shaking in their boots when the President injected the racial issue into the argument, are beginning to regain their confidence. As James Marlow, our Associated Press news analyst, reported Friday, it was the Democrats who helped wreck the Kennedy political steamroller.

The President has centered all of his fire on the Republicans, blaming them for denying the cities the so-called benefits of his scheme.

He has had not a word to say about Democrats who voted against him in the House, the Senate and in the House Rules Committee.

Neither has he taken cognizance of the fact that his party holds a hefty majority in each House of Congress. If the Democrats followed his leadership, every Republican in the place could vote against him and he still would get what he wants.

These facts are so obvious that the President's political moves lose their punch. Abraham Lincoln's "you can fool some of the people * * *" and so on still is true. After an issue reaches a certain degree of phoniness, the voters see through it without a magnifying glass or having a picture drawn for them.

And even if he tried, the President couldn't lay all the blame on a Republican-Dixiecrat coalition.

No less than seven Representatives from outside the Solid South and the so-called border States joined the Republican majority in rebuffing the President.

That gives weight to the Republican contention that the merits of the proposal, rather than the racial issue, were paramount in their considerations.

And, as a matter of fact, Republicans tend to be opposed to big government. They need not justify a vote against the creation of another department, with a threat of Federal control over local affairs, on any grounds other than that it is contrary to their political philosophy.

The introduction of the race issue was, as we called it some time ago, a shoddy political trick. It is good to see it turn into a political blunder.

On Wednesday, February 21, the House, by a resounding 264 to 150 roll-call vote, handed President Kennedy his most disastrous and humiliating defeat since he assumed office.

The President held a press conference shortly after this vote and made some amazing statements, seeking to pick up what political advantage he could out of the debacle. Among other things he said:

Now, the difficulty, of course, is that many of those who do not live in urban areas are opposed to it. But if we in this country began to adopt a system that everyone who lives in a city area voted against those things which were of assistance to the farmer, and everybody who comes from a rural area voted against those policies which provided a better life for people in the city, and everybody who lived outside the Tennessee Valley voted against the Tennessee Valley Authority, and everyone who lived in the East voted against development in the Northwest or the development of natural resources, this country would come to a grinding halt.

Before the vote, the President's strategy was to promote the Urban Affairs Department proposal as a race issue to fill the void of his inaction in civil rights matters and to put Republicans on the spot. After his defeat, in his press conference, for the first time the President ascribed it to a farm versus city vote and as quoted above, deplored divisiveness and its possible effect upon the future of our system of government.

This is putting things in reverse. It was the President, by appealing to sectionalism and racial animosities and exploiting them rather than discussing the proposal on its merits, who sought to set class against class and section against section for his political advantage. I agree that divisiveness is harmful to our system of government and deplore anyone's attempting to appeal to racial or sectional prejudices.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in my remarks a number of editorials and columns which seem to me clearly to demonstrate that in this instance, at least, the President was not able to fool very many people.

For example, the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram carried an editorial on January 27, 1962, entitled "Keep the Issue Clear," which I insert herewith.

KEEP THE ISSUE CLEAR

President Kennedy's proposal to create a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing with Cabinet status should be considered on its merits or lack of them. Either such a Department is needed or it is not needed. Partisan emotionalism and racialism ought not be a part of the decision. But that will not be the case. The President has helped to make it that way.

Upon learning that the House Rules Committee had turned down his bill to create the proposed Department, Mr. Kennedy announced he would create it by Executive order and that Robert C. Weaver, a Negro, would be named its head. That Mr. Weaver was in line for the appointment had been known a long time. The President's announcement thus was not news but it was challenging. It was a partisan challenge.

By using the procedure of an Executive order, Mr. Kennedy seeks to put the Members of the House or the Senate, or both, on record. For unless one or the other vetoes the plan, it will go into effect. And vetoes are a matter of record. Each Mem- of the House or Senate has to stand up and be counted.

There can be little objection to that. But there is valid objection to the reason that the President gave for deciding to issue the Executive order. He said he was "somewhat astonished at the Republican leadership" for opposing the bill in committee. The committee has a majority of Democrats. It was the votes of four southern Democrats plus those of five Republican members that killed the bill in committee. The southern Democrats in the committee deserted the Democratic leadership—the President's leadership. But Mr. Kennedy said nothing about that.

Thus the President, by singling out the Republicans, sought to make the proposed Department a partisan issue. But there is more to it than that. By saying that Mr. Weaver would be named head of the Department, he seeks to create the impression that the Republicans are supporting the southern Democrats on a racial issue. Almost immediately the headquarters of the National Association for Colored People announced that anyone opposing the Department would be acting out of racial prejudice.

That cannot be allowed to stand as the issue, no matter what the state of American politics. Neither of the two big political parties can be put in the position of being entitled to the exclusive allegiance of racial segments of the population. The color of a citizen's skin has no more to do with his stand on a new Department of Urban Affairs than the color of his eyes. The issue about the new Department is simply whether it is needed or not needed.

Certainly the population growth and the movements of the population in recent years have created problems. New areas have sprung up on the fringes of cities—the big cities and even the smaller cities—that are neither urban nor rural areas. But that does not prove the need for a new Federal Department on Urban Affairs.

Many of the opponents of the proposed Department think, and with good reason, that the Federal Government already is meddling too deeply in municipal affairs. They do not see any need for Federal grants to study city problems and recommend solutions. They think local governments should handle local affairs. They fear the trend toward centralized government. They think a new Department of Urban Affairs would likely seek broader fields of operation once it was established. They see it trying to get into such things as zoning, transportation, water supply, sewers, police and fire protection. They fear the creation of a vast new bureaucracy.

Clearly any such Department would engage in more social planning. With this country engaged in a cold war and with $52 billion a year being spent on national defense where are the extra billions for social plans coming from? Certainly it is far more essential now that we concentrate on the Nation's military and economic strength than on social plans.

Let's halt this trend into centralized government in Washington. Let's keep government in the hands of the people. Let's keep it out of the hands of bureaucrats.

The Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, on January 26, 1962, carried the following editorial, "What About the Democrats?"

WHAT ABOUT THE DEMOCRATS?

In his Wednesday press conference, President Kennedy made quite an issue of the rejection, by the House Rules Committee, of his proposal for establishing a new Department of Urban Affairs.

The President said he was "somewhat astonished" by the votes cast against the plan by the five Republican Members and indicated that he would submit the demand for a new department as a reorganization proposal.

Well, it's good politics to blame the other party for any negative action, but the story of the voting in the committee raises serious questions about the President's leadership of his own party.

The Democrats hold a 10-to-5 majority on the House Rules Committee. With an edge like that—the largest on any of the standing committees of the House—the President ought to be able to get just about anything he wants.

He was frustrated on this matter, however, by four southern Democrats who voted with the Republicans to make the tally nine to six against the proposal for a new Cabinet post.

Mr. Kennedy did not mention the four Democrats who went against his wishes. His criticism of the Republicans would have been more effective if he had included the members of his own party in his denunciation.

The President would gain more respect if he had the stomach to stand up and blast the Republicans for opposing his proposal on political grounds—and, at the same time, rebuke the four Democrats for bringing the racial issue into the matter. Mr. Kennedy affirmed, at his press conference, the general impression that he would appoint a Negro, Dr. Robert C. Weaver, to the Department of Urban Affairs. And that is exactly why the southern Democrats refused to go along.

As matters stand now, here is another case in which the President is backing and filling on, and playing politics with, civil rights. It ranks with his refusal to fulfill his campaign pledge to end, "with the stroke of a pen," discrimination in federally backed housing.

Mr. Kennedy, however, is a politician. He has to live with the southern Democrats because the New Frontier, for all practical purposes, does not represent the majority of Americans. This is a fact he must face, even though it occasionally leaves him with egg on his face.

The Ann Arbor (Mich.) News carried the article, "Kennedy's Racial Issue" on January 31, 1962.

KENNEDY'S RACIAL ISSUE

It hardly seems that the Nation needed another racial issue, particularly one involving Federal officials. But that is what President Kennedy has created, intentionally so far as anyone can tell, by his approach to the issue of adding a Department of Urban Affairs to the Cabinet.

Congressmen who oppose needless centralization of government—there are many in both parties—are now in a position where they can be accused of racial prejudice if they vote against the reorganization order Kennedy has sent them. The NAACP has seen to this by issuing a statement to the effect that prejudice can be the only reason for anyone opposing creation of an urban affairs department.

Robert C. Weaver, a Negro and Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, made no racial appeals when he argued for creation of an urban affairs department in a Detroit speech last November. This is being done by others. Weaver argued the case on its merits, although he is the one with greatest personal interest in the matter.

It is being argued that southern Democrats and northern Republicans oppose the proposed new Cabinet post because they don't want a Negro in so high a position. This may be true in some cases, but it is most unfair to generalize. Many sound reasons for doubting the wisdom of an urban affairs Cabinet post were advanced years before Kennedy was President, or before he said that Weaver would get the job.

These boil down to the argument that an urban affairs department in Washington would include within its jurisdiction many problems which can be settled more effectively and more rapidly on the local level.

In his message to Congress yesterday, Kennedy said the new Cabinet post would assume all duties of the agency Weaver now heads, including "advances and loans to assist in the planning and construction of needed public facilities, advances and loans to assist in comprehensive local planning, and others still."

It isn't necessary to be a Goldwater-style States righter to have honest fears that the new Federal department Kennedy proposes would soon be involved in such matters as Ann Arbor's controversial zoning ordinance and the decision of where and when to build the Northbelt bypass between U.S. 23 and Interstate 94.

Kennedy's mistake in wanting more centralization in dealing with local problems is probably an honest one. Local government is the area in which he has the least personal experience. Yet he seems to have some talent for it. His success in converting the matter into a racial issue must be the envy of many metropolitan political bosses.

On the same day, the Monroe (Mich.) Evening News had an editorial, "Urban Affairs Bureau or Bust":

URBAN AFFAIRS BUREAU OR BUST

It is obvious from statements made to the press by the administration and others that every trick in the political bag is going to be hauled out and sprung in the effort to force Congress acceptance of the organization of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

The first effort appeared at the President's news conference last week. In the lead-off question put to him, Mr. Kennedy managed to imply that those who opposed a bill to create the new Department were against those who lived in cities. The bill met its predicted dismal end in the House Rules Committee by a 9 to 6 vote with five Republicans and four Democrats opposing the bill.

Following the committee's rejection of the bill, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People telegraphed Representative JOHN BYRNES, chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee, that GOP opposition to the President's new Department "will be interpreted as Republican opposition to a possible Negro Cabinet appointment." To which Representative BYRNES replied that the committee rejected the new Department "as a dangerous attempt to centralize more power in the Federal Government. * * *" He further castigated the NAACP in attempting to "inject the race issue into what is essentially a question of public policy." BYRNES also charged the President with having made "a callous attempt" to the same end.

Unfortunately, such exchanges have resulted in obscuring the basic issues at stake. Because the President made the unusual move of naming a Cabinet post before that post is even created, he must be considered somewhat at fault.

The reorganization order, if it follows the wording of the House bill, would establish the new Department "to provide technical assistance and information, including a clearinghouse service" and many other "benefits," not only to urban complexes, but "to * * * all communities, regardless of size, whether incorporated or unincorporated."

Such a plan surely would swell the growing Federal bureaucracy. Objections on such grounds are well founded. Experience shows that such additions constantly grow in costs and number of employees. One can be sure that the original $64,000 to administer the new Department a year is merely an opening wedge masking an expansion well calculated to assume vast proportions.

The Washington Evening Star, on Tuesday, February 20, the day before the vote in the House, carried an editorial entitled "Strictly Political":

STRICTLY POLITICAL

The spectacle of Congressmen being threatened, in effect, with reprisals at the polls if they vote their convictions on the question of creating an Urban Affairs Department is not an admirable one. Yet this is the consequence of injecting a racial issue into the urban affairs debate.

It began when the President announced in advance that Robert C. Weaver, a Negro, would be named to the new Cabinet-level post if it should be created. This automatically insured the opposition of southern Democrats. But it raised a thorny political question for Republicans, especially in the House.

Most of them would not be opposed to the appointment of Mr. Weaver to a Cabinet-level post. But they are opposed to the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs on the ground that it would lead to costly extension of the Federal bureaucracy. As of now, however, they find themselves in something of a political trap. If they vote their beliefs—that is, if they vote against the President's urban affairs plan, they will be accused of doing so because they do not want to see a Negro in a Cabinet post. The stage for this was set by the President, and the backdrop was supplied Sunday by Mr. Weaver when, in his first public comment, he said he was sure "the minority group people will react very adversely against those" who vote against the President's plan.

It is deplorable that the fact of Mr. Weaver's race is alienating southern Democratic votes, for he seems fully qualified for the post to which he would be named. It is even more deplorable, however, that the fact of his race is being used in an attempt to coerce Members of Congress into voting for a Government reorganization plan in which, on its merits, they do not believe. This may be representative of the Kennedy brand of bare-knuckle domestic politics. But we doubt that all of its implications have been thought through.

The Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram on the same day carried an article entitled "How Bureaucracy Grows":

HOW BUREAUCRACY GROWS

When President Kennedy told Congress about the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing he wants to create, he left the function and powers of the department largely undefined. He asserted that city problems "are as complex as they are manifold" and mentioned among these the matter of mass transportation. When he enumerated the programs and responsibilities that would be transferred to the new department, he listed only those of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

As the law now stands, the Federal Government has no authority in the mass transportation field, none except that of the Home and Finance Agency to allocate funds for transit surveys. So it would appear that the President is leaving some of the objectives of the new department to be implemented later as its bureaucratic structure grows and grows.

And Senator HARRY BYRD has offered some observations on what growth may be expected. He uses the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as an example. That Department was set up in 1953 as a regrouping of agencies in the fields the name given it covers. The first year of its existence HEW had $1.9 billion to spend, employed 40,264 persons and had a payroll of $170 million. For the new fiscal year HEW proposes to spend $5.1 billion. It will have 79,456 employees and a payroll of $473.8 million. In 10 years the Department is spending two and a half times as much as at the outset, has nearly twice as many employees and a payroll about two and a half times as great.

Senator BYRD is known as the watchdog of the Treasury. He has declared he will vote against forming the urban affairs department.

The day after the defeat in the House, the Washington Evening Star carried an editorial entitled "Deserved Defeat":

DESERVED DEFEAT

The President's plan to set up a Department of Urban Affairs has met with a crushing defeat in the House, and deservedly so. The adverse vote was 264 to 150, and this 114-vote margin was much larger than anyone had predicted.

One reason, certainly, stems from the crude political pressure tactics used by the Kennedy administration. The first indication of this came on Tuesday when the Senate, which probably would have voted in favor of the plan on its merits, rejected a maneuver to get the Senate on record before the House could act. To do this it was necessary to discharge the Senate committee considering the plan, although it was conceded the committee had not used delaying tactics. In short, this was an attempt to use the Senate as a club with which to belabor the House, and the scheme was rejected by the decisive margin of 58 to 42.

Before the vote in the House, there was a contrived effort to inject racism into the debate. This was set up by the President when he announced that, should the new Department be created, he would appoint Robert C. Weaver, a Negro, as its head. The effect was to put pressure on the Republicans, since a vote against creating the Department would be attacked as a vote against permitting a Negro to achieve Cabinet status. Of course, this automatically assured the opposition of virtually all Southern Democrats, and left Republicans who might be against the new Department on its merits in a position where they could and would be charged with racism. To their credit, the vast majority of House Republicans refused to be

intimidated by this shabby strategy, and, somewhat surprisingly, they were joined in voting against the plan by a substantial number of Democrats from the West and Midwest.

We do not think that either the Senate or the House vote is an accurate reflection of sentiment with respect to the merits of the urban affairs plan, since it might have fared better had it not been for the attempt to put its opponents in such an obviously false position. Perhaps, as the President says, an Urban Affairs Department surely will be created later on. But the first requirement, we think, is for the administration to abandon the rash and even dangerous type of politicking which was the hallmark of this first unsuccessful effort.

The Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram also after the defeat of the plan in the House carried the following editorial, "Urban Department Blocked":

URBAN DEPARTMENT BLOCKED

President Kennedy has been defeated in his move to create a new Department of Urban Affairs. He is the victim of the resentment created in both branches of Congress by the type of pressure politics he exerted.

The Senate turned him down Tuesday, 58 to 42, on an administration maneuver aimed at placing that body on record as in favor of the plan before the House could vote. The Senate vote was not on the merits of creating the Department but whether to discharge the Senate committee from further consideration of the plan. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Senate majority leader, led that effort. While admitting that the committee considering the measure was operating effectively, he said that the President needed, for political reasons, to get an immediate vote on the Senate floor. But resentment turned against the effort to bypass normal committee consideration of proposed legislation.

In the House, the vote Wednesday was 264 to 150 against creating the new Department. Administration leaders had expected a defeat in the House, but the President's hope had been to first get the Senate on record for it. In the House, as in the Senate, a great deal of the opposition centered on the White House's pressure tactics.

A few weeks ago the House Rules Committee turned down the administration's bill to have Congress create the new Department. Thereupon the President declared he would create it by Executive order. Under this procedure the Department would be formed unless vetoed by one or both Chambers of Congress. But the President tried to fasten the blame for his defeat in the House committee entirely on Republican opposition, ignoring that the Democrats are a majority in the committee and that the turndown in committee had to be with Democratic help. In blaming the Republicans, the President also was aiming at creating the impression they objected to his intention to name Robert C. Weaver, a Negro, to head the proposed Department. Thus racism was injected.

The President brought this up again Wednesday in his comment on the House vote. He observed that the opposition to the new Department of Urban Affairs had said it was opposed only to the Department as being unnecessary and would support Mr. Weaver for another Cabinet post. Then, somewhat sarcastically, he remarked that Mr. Weaver could be grateful "for those good wishers for a Cabinet post for him when none was available." But a Cabinet post will be available if Abraham Ribicoff resigns to run for Congress.

Actually, any issue over a Negro in the Cabinet is wholly phony. But Mr. Kennedy created it. And he tried tactics designed to get every Member of Congress on record. The plain reason was that it could be made into fine material for the forthcoming congressional election campaign. But the tactics backfired, and the proposed Department of Urban Affairs is blocked for the time being.

And it should be blocked until there is a clear showing that it's desirable and essential. Congress is not convinced of that as yet.

William F. Pyper, Head of the Washington Booth Newspaper Bureau, summarized the political situation following the defeat of the Urban Affairs proposal as follows:

STATE GOP UNCONCERNED OVER EFFECTS OF URBAN AFFAIRS VOTE

(By William F. Pyper)

WASHINGTON.—Most of the Michigan Congressmen who voted against President Kennedy's plan to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing say they would have done so without the racial issue being involved.

But, if the Democrats take the vote as a racial issue into the 1962 campaign, such Republican Congressmen have no fears. At least one of them believes it will work in reverse against the Democrats.

The outstate Republican Congressmen were unanimously against the reorganization plan, just as the Wayne County Democrats were, without exception, for it. In between the two categories is Representative JAMES G. O'HARA, a Democrat representing Macomb County and the Thumb area. He voted for the plan.

LOPSIDED VOTE

The plan was defeated by a vote of 264 to 150. The southern Democrats had been calculated to vote no, at least in part because President Kennedy had announced that the new Cabinet Department would be headed by Robert C. Weaver who now heads the Housing and Home Finance Agency. A Negro, Dr. Weaver would have been the first member of his race to serve in the Cabinet. But a good many nonsouthern Democrats voted against it, too.

President Kennedy made the Weaver announcement immediately after the House Rules Committee had rejected the proposal in the form of legislation. At first blush, many felt it was a smart political trick which might bring approval of the reorganization plan but which at least would put scores of lawmakers on the spot both in Congress and in their next election campaigns.

With the lopsided vote against the proposal in the House—following a less clear-cut vote in the Senate against considering the plan—it now looks as if Mr. Kennedy's strategy won him scarcely a vote in Congress. On the contrary, there is evidence that some voted against the plan largely because of the way administration leaders had presented it.

So the question naturally arises as to what the results will be if Democrats brandish the record next fall.

Representative ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, of Bay City, State whip who lines up Republicans to vote with the party, said he felt the effect, if any, would be the reverse of what the Democrats had in mind. He said constituents largely would have recognized the fraudulent nature of the issue, and that many would be as resentful as were some Congressmen.

NOTHING TO LOSE

On the other hand, what of Republicans from marginal districts, where the Negroes may hold the balance of power? Well, most of them vehemently insist they weren't even considering the racial, political issue. They were just against the proposed new Department, per se.

When they do break down to talk about it privately, they are inclined to point out they have nothing to lose. Most of the Negroes in their districts have been voting straight Democratic anyway, and there was no reason to believe they would vote for a Republican incumbent because of the one rather clouded issue. In other words, such Republicans owed their Negro constituents nothing politically and could expect nothing under any foreseeable circumstances.

Moreover, such Representatives believe the smart political trick will be regarded by many as a smart aleck trick, especially since it didn't work. One aspect was that Dr. Weaver himself took to the air in behalf of the proposal and incidentally in behalf of himself. They feel this may have alienated some Negroes as well as white voters.

At any rate the Republicans are proud of the shellacking they gave the Kennedy administration—perhaps its worst—and they don't seem much worried about campaign results.

James Marlow, whose column appeared in the Adrian Daily Telegram on February 26, 1962, summarized the history of this proposal as follows:

DEMOCRATS IN HOUSE WRECKED KENNEDY'S URBAN AFFAIRS PLAN

(By James Marlow)

WASHINGTON.—His own Democrats wrecked any chance for President Kennedy to make a political issue out of the ruination of his plan for a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

The far-outnumbered Republicans in the House were against it but helpless to stop it without Democratic help. They got it in abundance, particularly from southern Democrats.

This doesn't leave Kennedy room for telling city voters in this year's congressional elections the Republicans did him in. The most he can say is that he was for it. That can't help his party much.

The Republicans' opposition was based on the argument that a new Department would only make the Government that much bigger and, since it would be concerned with cities, it would interfere with the rights of States to be concerned with cities.

It became clear that the bulk of southern Democrats would oppose the measure after Kennedy announced that he would appoint Robert C. Weaver, a Negro, to his Cabinet to head the new agency if the Department were created.

The idea for creating such a Department has been around for years.

Mr. Kennedy recommended it last year in a message to Congress.

He backed a bill to set it up. But the bill never got out of Senate and House committees to the floor of either House for a vote. The whole business began moving toward a fast climax last January 24.

Two things happened that day:

1. The House Rules committee voted against letting the bill come up on the floor. Southern Democrats and Republicans have dominated that committee, perhaps the most conservative in Congress.

Although the Democrats outnumber the Republicans in the committee 10 to 5, the vote against the bill was 9 to 6. Four southern Democrats joined the five Republicans in throttling the measure.

2. Kennedy decided to take a step which didn't require committee action at all. He told a news conference he was sending Congress, under his reorganization powers, a plan to set up a new Housing Department.

This meant the plan would go into effect in 60 days unless the House or Senate disapproved. That would require a wide-open vote on the floor so everyone could know who was for or against.

It was at this conference that he announced, in answer to a question, that he would name Weaver to head the new Department. Then he played a little politics.

He blasted those five Republicans on the Rules Committee who voted against the new Department bill without mentioning the fact that, being outnumbered 2 to 1, they couldn't have done anything to block the bill unless those four southern Democrats joined them.

As the days passed the Republicans repeated the arguments against a new Department, mentioned above, and it became plain southern Democrats were going to vote against the reorganization plan, too.

The vote in the House Wednesday was 264 against the Kennedy plan and only 150 for it. Those 264 were divided into 111 Democrats and 153 Republicans; the 150 for were made up of 137 Democrats and 13 Republicans.

Of the 111 Democrats against the plan, 94 were from the South. Seventeen Democrats from other sections went along with them.

After it was over Kennedy said, in effect, he'd try again. But it won't be this year.

The current issue of Time magazine, dated March 2, 1962, carries an article under the heading "The Congress" entitled "Big Backfire" as follows:

THE CONGRESS

BIG BACKFIRE

On paper, it looked like the perfect way to put Republicans on the spot in an election year. But last week, put into practice, the scheme blew up in the Kennedy administration's face.

At issue was the President's proposal to create a new, Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs, with Federal Housing Administrator Robert C. Weaver, a Negro, at its head. Republican Senators and Congressmen opposed the idea of the Department on grounds that it would merely add another cumbersome, costly layer to the Federal bureaucracy. Southern Democrats inevitably were hostile to Weaver's appointment.

Rubbing it in: Faced with all but certain Capitol Hill defeat, President Kennedy 5 weeks ago withdrew his request that Congress enact legislation establishing the Department, ordered its creation under his reorganization powers. Thus, if either the House or the Senate did not veto the plan within 60 days, the Department of Urban Affairs would automatically achieve status. Kennedy made it perfectly plain that if Congress did turn down the plan, he would blame Republicans for being (1) unwilling to help the Nation's cities, and (2) anti-Negro. And Weaver himself rubbed in the point. Said he on television: "There is a large segment of the population which will interpret a vote against this program as a vote against the concept of having a Negro in the Cabinet."

Thus the stage was set for 2 days of frantic maneuvering last week. White House strategists hoped to bring the proposal to a vote in the Senate—where it seemed more likely to win approval than in the House. The Senate's Government Operations Committee had completed its hearings, but Chairman JOHN MCCLELLAN (who opposed the measure) requested a brief delay before submitting the committee report. Since it then appeared that the House would withhold its vote until the Senate acted, Senate Democratic leader MIKE MANSFIELD graciously agreed: "I believe it is only fair and proper that the Senate observe the normal rules of procedure."

Upsetting the applecart: But just a few minutes later a House Republican upset the applecart. Michigan's Representative GEORGE MEADER, onetime staff director of the Senate Government Operations Committee, announced that he would force the urban affairs plan to a House vote 2 days later. In the Senate, MANSFIELD hurried back onto the floor and announced that he would move to discharge MCCLELLAN's committee and obtain a Senate vote before the House could act. It was a fatal move: tough old JOHN MCCLELLAN took it as a personal affront and began rounding up votes to defeat the discharge petition.

He did not have to look far for support. A discharge petition, taking a bill out of a committee's hands, is an unusual move, which is against Senate traditions. Arriving on the Senate floor to fight the petition, MCCLELLAN growled to a colleague: "I don't know if I'm a Democrat any more." Thundered he to the Senate: "The brightness of the legislative sky is clouded, the brilliance of statesmanship is dimmed, and the light of fairness and justice in this Chamber is darkened today by this deplorable action." For the first time in 20 years, every Member of the Senate was present to vote—and the rollcall was a stunning rebuke to the administration. The count against the discharge petition was 58–42. Among the naysayers were 26 Democrats, including several from Northern States. The next day the House administered the coup de grace, overwhelming the Department of Urban Affairs, 264–150. Among the 111 Democrats who voted for rejection were 18 from the North, Midwest, and West.

Despite lopsided majorities: In the flush of their victory, Republicans were quick to counterattack. Representative BOB WILSON, chairman of the House Republican campaign committee, fired off a telegram to the White House, suggesting that Robert Weaver be named to succeed Abraham Ribicoff, who plans to resign as Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary to run for the Senate. Senate Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN gleefully assured a press conference that if Weaver were named to the HEW post, "not a single Republican vote" would be cast against him.

At his own press conference, the President fought back feebly. "In regard to Dr. Weaver," he said, "I see now that various people who opposed the Urban Department are now ready to support him for any Cabinet position he wishes—Defense, State, Treasury, or anything else. * * * I'm sure he is grateful for those good wishes for a Cabinet position where there is no vacancy. Mr. Weaver will get along all right, but I think the question is the people in the cities are the ones who have been defeated."

All in all, it was a humiliating administration setback. Far from making Republicans look bad, the President had merely succeeded in losing—despite lopsided Democratic majorities in both the House and Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that President Kennedy has learned from this experience—

First. That he should study any proposed fundamental changes in the structure of our Government carefully to make certain that they are in the public interest before recommending them to the Congress;

Second. That he should treat the Congress of the United States, a coordinate branch of Government, with the respect and comity which are so necessary if our unique tripartite Federal system is to function smoothly and effectively and avoid unseemly conflicts between the elected representatives of the people and the people's Chief Administrator;

Third. That he should forget politics for awhile and start executing the vast powers of the Presidency in the public interest on the theory that service is the best salesmanship and that excellent performance in his high office is the best and surest means of meriting the approval of the American people;

Fourth. That if he must play politics, he play it at a high level.

In days where executive encroachment on legislative authority is the rule rather than the exception, it did my heart good to see both the Senate and the House forthrightly exercise their constitutional authority. I expressed these views in a letter to my constituents which I incorporate at this point in my remarks:

FEBRUARY 26, 1962.

DEAR FRIEND: Last week both the Senate and the House of Representatives displayed independence and determination in representing the views and aspirations of the American people by rejecting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 to create a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. That action made me proud of the Congress of the United States and proud to be a Member of it.

For years our House Government Operations Committee has had before it bills to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, but nobody took them seriously until the New Frontier decided to sponsor this proposal.

Last year the Democratic majority of our committee subserviently reported out a bill late in the session to create this new Department. But in January the Rules Committee, which had been stacked a year before through White House insistence and intervention, by a vote of nine to six refused to grant a rule. Thereupon the President, in a partisan political pique, announced that he would circumvent the legislative process by creating a department by a reorganization plan.

This was the President's first major attack upon the Congress. He sought, by improperly injecting extraneous issues such as the race issue (by announcing that he would appoint a Negro as Secretary of the Department) and by seeking to appeal to the big city vote (by claiming this proposal would be of benefit to the cities) to make a political issue out of a serious matter of Government organization and to intimidate the Congress into bowing to his will by threatening political reprisal at the polls.

The President's shoddy political tricks have backfired. He did not fool the American people by his attempted distortion of the issue. He did not intimidate the Congress of the United States.

The proposal had no merits. The Senate, by a vote of 58 to 42, forthrightly declined to discharge its Government Operations Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator MCCLELLAN, which had diligently pursued its inquiry into the merits of Reorganization Plan No. 1. And the House, by an overwhelming vote of 264 to 150, defied the President's efforts at political coercion and repudiated a proposal which never should have been considered seriously in the first place.

The President would have frozen into the fabric of our Government a small part of the Federal Government's activities in housing which the Congress has not yet seen fit to make permanent. The Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituent agencies are only temporary, with either dollar limits, unit limits, or time limits on the exercise of their functions. To freeze temporary agencies into a permanent Department with a Secretary, Assistant Secretaries, Counsel and all the trappings of bureaucracy would be the height of folly.

This resounding rejection by Congress of this phony proposal restores my faith in representative government.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

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

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman, of course, has made a statement that contains a lot of matter with which I am in full agreement. But if I understood his statement correctly he indicated he thought the President had used browbeating tactics, first by sending up the Executive order; and, second, by announcing that if this Department were established he would appoint Mr. Weaver as the first Secretary.

The gentleman knows full well that the method which the President used in this instance to try to establish another executive department in the Government is a method which has been prescribed by law and which was used by President Eisenhower when the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was established.

The President's response when a newspaper reporter asked him who would be appointed the first Secretary if the Department were set up, if I have the report correctly, was an honest statement that he would appoint Mr. Weaver, who had been a very successful Administrator of the Agency known as the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

If the information which I have read in the press is correct, essentially the same sort of preannouncement, that Mrs. Hobby would be made Secretary of Health, Education, and Labor, was made prior to the establishment of that Department.

The President in making this announcement and in using this method of trying to set up a new executive department was not departing from the precedents established by the previous administration, and he certainly was acting within the scope of powers given him by legislation enacted by the Congress.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, first I want to take up one matter. I happen to be a member of the House Government Operations Committee. It is not my intention to debate the merits of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 today.

I did debate the merits of this plan when it was before the House last Wednesday, February 21, and my analysis of the plan is set forth at length in that debate commencing on page 2634 and concluding on page 2637 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, And, I refer to that because in explaining the plan I called attention to the fact that the last Department which was created was the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on April 1, 1953.

The gentleman is correct that President Eisenhower did send up Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 to create the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and I believe the gentleman is correct in stating that the President may have announced his intent to appoint Mrs. Hobby in advance of sending up the reorganization plan.

But where the gentleman is slightly in error is that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare did not come into being by a reorganization plan but by a law passed by the Congress, House Joint Resolution 223 of the 83d Congress, Public Law 13, when it was signed by the President on April 1, 1953.

That House joint resolution was introduced by my colleague, the ranking member, and at that time chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations, the Honorable CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan.

The effect of the joint resolution was to incorporate the provisions of the reorganization plan in the joint resolution by reference and advance the effective date when it would come into operation. But, when that resolution passed the House and the Senate, and was signed by the President as any bill or joint resolution is, that Department came into being as a result of a law passed by the Congress. Now, I admit that probably is a technical difference, but it is of some importance.

Mr. ALBERT. I think the gentleman is correct. The point I am making, though, and if I recall correctly, is that there was no substantial argument at that time that the President did not have the authority to send up this kind of reorganization plan; that if action had not been taken to veto the plan, or if the matter had not been handled by the joint resolution to which the gentleman refers, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would have been established by reason of the President's reorganization plan. President Eisenhower used the same method of initiating this matter and he announced whom he would name as Secretary in advance—at least, I remember a newspaper article in which it was said that he intended to appoint Mrs. Hobby. I am trying to show the parallel between the procedure used by the two Presidents.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to answer the gentleman before yielding further. I might say that I appreciate the point the majority leader is trying to make, but I must confess that I see some slight difference between the situation which existed when President Eisenhower sent up Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 and when President Kennedy sent up Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962. And, primarily the difference is that the House Committee on Rules had acted upon legislation reported out of our Committee on Government Operations last August. The House Committee on Rules which, due to the President's insistence and intervention the year before, had been stacked so that the administration's legislative program presumably would get more sympathetic consideration in the Committee on Rules, had by a vote of 9 to 6 declined to grant a rule.

When this Rules Committee with four Democrats and five Republicans against it voted not to report a rule to consider the legislation our committee reported last August, the President immediately pointed out that the Republican members were to blame for the failure of the Rules Committee to grant a rule, when there were almost as many Democrats voting against it. He immediately announced he would create the Department by reorganization plan and said he was bringing out in the open the fact that he was going to appoint Dr. Weaver as the Secretary of the new Department.

I say he threw down a challenge to the Congress by saying:

> Since Congress has refused in its normal legislative process to act on this bill that the administration supports, I am going to use my unusual reorganization power to accomplish that end and defy the Republicans or the Democrats to vote against creating an office to which I can appoint a member of the Negro race.

I say that was a political bludgeoning of the Congress. It was the President's first attack upon the Congress, other than his intervention in the Rules Committee fight which, in my judgment, was a matter of internal housekeeping of the House of Representatives and should be of no interest or concern to the White House.

I think the Congress did what it should do under these circumstances, if it has any self-respect, by repudiating the reorganization plan proposal and the political White House strategy and by refusing to be intimidated. I am proud of it for doing so, and I wish I could enlist the support of the majority leader in standing up for the prerogatives of the House of Representatives, of which he is one of the principal leaders.

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

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I respectfully reply to the gentleman from Michigan that on that issue I certainly agree with the gentleman. I am as jealous as the gentleman of the prerogatives of the House of Representatives. But I think the gentleman is slightly in error when he states that the administration took any part in the vote on the resolution to enlarge the Rules Committee. If it did take any part. I had no knowledge of it.

Mr. MEADER. Well, perhaps the gentleman is better informed on that. He is much closer to the internal operations of his party than I am. But I must say that I have an acquaintance with a good many members of his party who indicated to me that the President, or at least some of his entourage at the White House, did discuss the matter with them on ocassion, and that he may have had some influence upon that very narrow margin by which the Rules Committee was increased.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for his statement this afternoon. It needed to be made by someone. It was hard for me to believe that the President in his press conference on the same day that the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing was defeated in the House of Representatives would display the rancor that he did. He pitted sections of the country against others and blamed his defeat upon those who he said voted against the appointment of a Negro to the proposed Cabinet position. This just does not scour. I am one of those who voted against that proposition, and apparently the President cannot understand this or did not want to understand it—who voted in opposition from the standpoint

of economy and the fact that this Cabinet position was unnecessary. Again, I say that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], has made a statement that badly needed to be made, and I agree with him entirely.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks made in the colloquy with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

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

There was no objection.

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. ADAIR, for Monday, March 5, 1962, vacating his special order for today.

Mr. BRUCE (at the request of Mr. HALPERN), for 1 hour, on Thursday, March 1.

Mr. HALPERN, for 40 minutes, on Thursday, March 1.

Mr. KING of California (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 30 minutes, on Monday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BARRETT.

Mr. MADDEN and to include a statement made before the Subcommittee on Public Lands.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALPERN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri in two instances.

Mr. HALPERN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BUCKLEY.

Mr. ZELENKO.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 1, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

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:

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9097. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain public lands in Idaho; with amendment (Rept. No. 1393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9273. A bill to repeal obsolete laws relating to military bounty land warrants and to provide for cancellation of recorded warrants; with amendment (Rept No. 1394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 638. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens who are serving in the U.S. Armed Forces; without amendment (Rept. No. 1395). 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. DOLE:

H.R. 10470. A bill to promote safe driving and eliminate the reckless and irresponsible driver from the streets and highways of the District of Columbia by providing that any person operating a motor vehicle within the District while apparently under the influence of intoxicating liquor shall be deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test of certain of his body substances to determine the alcoholic content of his blood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H.R. 10471. A bill to transfer certain administrative responsibility for the operation of Washington National Airport and Dulles International Airport from the administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to a Washington Airports Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H.R. 10472. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the Graff House site for inclusion in Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 10473. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide increased tax incentive for individuals and corporations that manufacture or produce goods for export; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DURNO:

H.R. 10474. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to eliminate or modify certain Federal requirements that might otherwise prevent constructive reorganizations of the State agencies which are involved in the administration of the program under such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10475. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to eliminate or modify certain Federal requirements that might otherwise prevent constructive reorganizations of the State agencies which are involved in the administration of the programs thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10476. A bill to amend titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act to eliminate or modify certain Federal requirements that might otherwise prevent constructive reorganizations of the State agencies which are involved in the administration of the programs under such titles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 10477. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a gradual increase over a 12-year period in the personal income tax exemptions of an individual taxpayer (from $600 to $1,200) and in the surtax exemption of a corporate taxpayer (from $25,000 to $50,000); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10478. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a gradual increase over a 2-year period in the personal income tax exemptions of an individual taxpayer (from $600 to $700) and in the surtax exemption of a corporate taxpayer (from $25,000 to $29,000); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 10479. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Antidumping Act, 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 10480. A bill to reform the majority statutory salary systems of the Federal Government, to establish appropriate relationships among them, to adopt and apply the principle of government-private enterprise salary comparability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 10481. A bill to create an additional judicial district for the State of Florida, to be known as the middle district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 10482. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10483. A bill to prohibit the application of unreasonable literacy requirements with respect to the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10484. A bill to provide additional means of securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 10485. A bill to declare that certain lands of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 10486. A bill to provide that an honorable discharge from the Armed Forces will expunge convictions for misdemeanors from the record of the member; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 10487. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for family clinics for domestic agricultural migratory workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 10488. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 10489. A bill to amend section 613 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to require certain vessels to stop at ports in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 10490. A bill to amend title II of the Society Security Act to limit the deductions which would otherwise be made on account of outside earnings from the benefits to which an individual is entitled in the year in which he (or the primary beneficiary) retires or the year in which he attains age 72; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 10491. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor, and to afford an opportunity for the people of the United States to participate in the purchase of such bonds; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 10492. A bill to amend the Peace Corps Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H.R. 10493. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, section 4163, relating to discharge of prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 10494. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes," approved April 29, 1942, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 10495. A bill to amend the act of April 19, 1950, relating to the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians, to authorize certain additional highway projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 440. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the U.S. Mission to the United Nations should seek the adoption by the United Nations of a resolution condemning the recent manifestations of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 441. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United Nations Human Rights Commission should increase its activities and give greater publicity to instances of discrimination and persecution in order to focus world opinion upon these practices and nations engaged therein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. Con. Res. 442. Concurrent resolution to prohibit training military personnel or aiding Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Federal income taxation of the interest derived from public bonds, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 10496. A bill for the relief of Adriana Noferini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10497. A bill for the relief of Solomon Blumenfeld; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10498. A bill for the relief of Ghazaros and Makrouhie Kalfayan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 10499. A bill for the relief of Erwin A. Suehs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 10500. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. and Mrs. Raymond M. Schuler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H.R. 10501. A bill for the relief of Kenyon B. Zahner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H.R. 10502. A bill for the relief of James B. Troup; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 10503. A bill for the relief of Dr. William Quatico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 10504. A bill for the relief of Jewelie Louise Larry (Kwan Ai Yun); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 10505. A bill for the relief of Feliciano Caba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10506. A bill for the relief of George Mattar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10507. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Wadlow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

242. By Mr. McCULLOCH: Petition of Edward H. Becker, commander World War I Veterans Post No. 2406; William Eickenhorst, commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 3035; and H. H. Hesseling, commander, American Legion Post No. 268, and many members of their posts in Delphos, Ohio, urging favorable action on H.R. 3745; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

243. By the SPEAKER: Petition of James W. Hafey, executive director, Catholic War Veterans, United States of America, Washington, D.C., relative to the Catholic War Veterans paying tribute to the late Honorable Sam Rayburn, former Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and that a special prayer be said for the repose of his soul; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Little-People-to-Little-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I was very interested to read in the RECORD of February 15 the remarks of our good friend and distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] relating to his son's little-people-to-little-people program.

I think that Peter Rodino the younger should be complimented on his zeal and desire to help the statesmen of our day to solve the most perplexing problem our Nation has ever faced: the problem of achieving security, and peace with justice, in a world poised on the brink of a nuclear holocaust.

Although he is quite young, Peter's and other young people's preoccupation with this grave problem is certainly legitimate. The solution of this problem will determine what kind of a world they are going to live in. God willing, they have many years ahead of them, and they should be able to look forward to living them in a world which is not constantly threatened with global disaster.

I think it is important for our young people to become aware of world problems, to strive to understand them, and to determine to solve them.

One important task in this field involves understanding our own heritage, and the nature of the Communist force which threatens it.

I think that our schools could do better work in this area. I understand that there are many schools below the college level which do not provide any type of instruction about communism. Theirs is a shortsighted policy. I hope that it will be corrected before long.

Young people are anxious to know, and to understand. It is our job to help them, to guide them, to bring them to the truth. We need not, and should not, use Communist methods of indoctrination. True to the principles of our free society, our schools should stop at the point at which our people—young and old alike—can arrive at the truth. And it is in truth that our strength lies.

I hope that we can bring more facts about communism to our youth. This is important. And I commend efforts directed to this end.

Job Training for the Unemployed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in my annual legislative questionnaire mailed to citizens of western Illinois, I asked this question, among others: "Should the Federal Government pay for job training for the unemployed?"

Returns to date show this response: yes, 492; no, 2,685.

The folks back home seem to have clearer vision than some of us in Washington.

The proposed training program would mark the beginning of a new Federal activity. Eighteen States are already carrying out job training programs for unemployed, and the others have the opportunity to do so. In view of the fact that the Federal Government is already spending a million dollars an hour more than it takes in, a brandnew activity of questionable constitutionality seems doubly unwise.

No one seriously suggests that this program would last only 2 years. No one seriously doubts that it will grow in size year after year, and have much the same dangers and shortcomings ascribed to proposals for Federal aid to meet ongoing expenses in public education.

CSA Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues have received copies of the CSA Voting Index and I suppose that this index has been disseminated around the country. It was very difficult for me to understand the rationale behind the votes selected as key votes in this index and it certainly was difficult to understand the conclusions drawn from the compilation of these votes. Hon. BRUCE ALGER has written a letter to Mr. Kent Courtney, national chairman, the Conservative Society of America, New Orleans, La., making pertinent comments in regard to this voting index. Mr. ALGER, of course, was in a position to write this critical letter inasmuch as he had a 100 percent record according to their standards.

The letter is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1962.

Mr. KENT COURTNEY,
National Chairman, the Conservative Society of America, New Orleans, La.

DEAR MR. COURTNEY: Thank you for sending me a copy of the CSA Voting Index. I think you have done a fine job of compiling the voting records of Members of Congress on the most vital issues affecting our Nation and the freedom of the people.

I would be derelict in my duty to you, as a friend, if I did not point out that your conclusions in which you attempt to prove there is no difference between the parties contradicts the excellent job you did in the compilation. I am sure you are much too sincere in your efforts to protect our free enterprise system than to allow faulty reasoning to detract from your efforts. It is in this spirit and as a friend that I feel I must point out to you the fallacies proved by your own figures.

YOUR CONCLUSION

In your foreword you repeatedly attack the Republican Party for "trying to outdo the Democratic Party, in appeasing the Communists and outbid it in spending the taxpayers' dollar—a pale copy of the Socialist, Communist-appeasing Democratic Party." On page 14 you state, "It was members of the Republican Party which gave Kennedy his margin of victory on five key bills in the 1961 session of Congress."

THE ISSUES

Now, Mr. Courtney, let us take your own figures on the very next page on these five key issues. On area development 17 percent of those for were Republican and 83 percent were Democratic; feed grains bill only 2 percent of the Republicans voted for the bill; raise minimum wage, 30 percent of the vote was Republican and 70 percent was Democratic; cultural exchange, 40 percent Republican, 60 percent Democratic; foreign aid, 28 percent Republican, 72 percent Democratic. With those lopsided percentages, how can you possibly justify the claim the parties are the same or that the Republicans gave Kennedy his margin of victory?

THE CONGRESSMEN

On page 55 of your book you show 38 Members of the House voting from 70 to 100 percent conservative and only 3 of the 38 you list are Democrats. How can you then substantiate your claim that there is no difference between the parties, using your own figures?

On page 59 you list 47 Congressmen from big cities who vote 90 to 100 percent pro-Socialist and only 1 of these is Republican. On page 60 you name 81 Congressmen with a 100 percent pro-Socialist voting record and on page 62 there are 36 Congressmen with a 90 to 99 percent pro-Socialist record and not a single Republican among them. Take these three pages and your own figures show that out of 163 Congressmen with a 100 percent or nearly 100 percent pro-Socialist voting records there are 162 Democrats and 1 Republican and then you claim there is no difference between the parties.

THE COMMITTEES

Let's take your figures on the committees. In this area your findings are completely erroneous as a result of striking an average of the entire committee membership. By this method you prove nothing in comparing the attitude of the parties. The only way you can show a party comparison is to take the average of Democratic committee members as opposed to the average of Republican members. Comparing the averages of Democratic members and Republican members we find, as examples, Appropriations, Democrats, 25 percent conservative, Republicans, 53 percent; Banking and Currency, Democrats, 7.5 percent, Republicans, 46 percent; Labor and Public Welfare, Democrats, 2.4 percent, Republicans, 40 percent. These are Senate committees. Figures on the House side are equally lopsided.

If you carry out the party averages in your table on page 68 we find in the House the Democrats come up with an overall average for all committees of 14 percent conservative against a Republican average of 50 percent and in the Senate, Democrats 16 percent against Republicans 57 percent. Granted that 50 percent and 57 percent are far from perfect (and how happy all of us would be if we could attain perfection, but we know it is not possible) the difference between 14 percent and 50 percent and 16 percent and 57 percent certainly is enough to prove that the parties are not the same to any degree.

I could go on and on through your compilation. In every table you prove conclusively that the Republican Party is far more conservative than the Democrats, but you ignore your own findings in summing up. This is no brief for those Republicans who consistently vote the liberal way, but it is a plea to you not to jeopardize the great work you are doing by being blind to the facts. In the foreseeable future there is little chance that a third party movement would be successful. That means the conservatives have their best hope within the Republican Party. Your efforts to becloud the relative positions of the parties can only lead to confusion in the minds of the voters and result in the reelection of those who support the radically led Democratic Party.

I want to remain your friend and have you for mine because I believe we are both fighting for the same cause—the future of this great land of ours. We weaken this cause when we allow ourselves to become vulnerable as a result of juggling figures to prove some special point in which we feel we have a particularly personal interest.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE ALGER.

Entertainment Deductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the administration tax bill has aroused a storm of interest and concern. Its provisions are manifold, and I have strong convictions and reservations regarding several of them. In some areas it is fair and equitable, but in others it is far from desirable.

I have made my views known on many of the bill's proposals and intend to make my final decision on the legislation only after my full and complete study of all of its provisions and a careful review of the committee report.

There is one phase of the bill as submitted that has long been of especial concern to me. It affects a highly controversial phase of our tax law that is a perennial issue. I refer to the section dealing with entertainment deductions for business. Admirable as the objective may seem, I firmly believe that these provisions, if enacted, will do more harm than good. They defeat their own basic purpose.

It is my firm conviction, after full evaluation of every aspect of the bill's proposal on expense accounts, that it is inequitable, unworkable, unrealistic, unfair and—in plain language—ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I herewith submit the views that I have expressed on this phase of the bill to the Ways and Means Committee during its deliberations on the tax legislation:

Mr. Chairman, the President's proposals to restrict or disallow completely certain types of business entertainment and travel expenses do not represent the best possible means for dealing with expense account abuses. He has proposed that all entertainment expenditures, dues and fees to clubs, and expenditures made in connection with yachts, hunting lodges, etc., be denied as deductions. He would also limit business gifts to $10 per donee per year, limit meals and lodging while traveling to $30 per day, and limit food and beverage outlays on guests to about $7 per guest per day.

I strongly oppose this type of legislation for the following reasons:

1. The Internal Revenue Code presently provides appropriate standards for administrative solution of problems cited as reasons for legislation. In 1960 the Internal Revenue Service announced a threefold program of

stricter checking of tax returns to deal with abuses involving entertainment, travel, and similar expenses which included new reporting requirements and stricter checking of business returns. Moreover, the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1960 directs that the Treasury shall make a study of the effectiveness of the new administrative procedures. Since such a study has not as yet been released, at the very least, the President's legislative proposals seem premature.

2. Entertainment is an accepted legitimate business practice and tax legislation should not be used to destroy the practice. For instance, it is one of the major ways to promote business for those businesses that are restrained from advertising by ethical considerations, lawyers, doctors, and other professional persons. It is quite inequitable to use tax legislation to punish a method of doing business simply because some businessmen violate an existing enforcible law.

3. The President's legislative proposals are full of exceptions, interpretations, and examples. Much of the problem will still be left to administrative interpretation. The suggested rules and exceptions will be fertile territory for imaginative tax advisers. Moreover, the amounts specifically stated in the law as allowable for certain deductions do not take into account the differences in costs in certain locations. Nor the differences in the personal living standards of various business people who travel. A prominent business person in New York City obviously has different requirements from a book salesman in Keokuk, Iowa. Basically, in this field a large measure of justice can be achieved only through administrative procedures rather than through blanket legislative action. Abuses of expense accounts may be more properly corrected by proper audits and good administration.

For the above reasons I believe the President's proposals for outlawing and limiting certain categories of expenses as deductions in determining taxable income are unsound. They present drastic and arbitrary provisions that would needlessly hamper business. Present law, if adequately enforced, can easily cure the abuses of a few. The proposals, in sum, are an improper attempt to cure by statute problems which are essentially failures of administration.

Medicare Polls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, from time to time there have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the results of polls taken by various Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the subject of financing health care for the aged. This issue, being of importance at the present time, generally has a high place on the list in any questionnaire circulated by Members of the Congress.

A compilation has been made of the results of the polls on this matter which have been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The science of taking polls is, at best, in the exploratory stage. Nevertheless, some emphasis has been placed upon preference polls by those who support the social security approach to financing the health care of the aged and it would be interesting and quite helpful if more Congressmen who circulate questonnaires would place the results of these inquiries in the RECORD. At present, the polls which have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD show, as well as can be found in bringing them together, that only about 40 percent of those responding favored the social security approach. This is significantly below the support claimed by its backers. I urge that other Representatives and Senators who have polled their constituencies on this matter place the results of their polls in the RECORD to help us achieve a better understanding of this matter and the support which is given the varying approaches to the important question of financing the health care of our aged.

The compilation follows:

POLLS PRINTED IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Representative THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Republican, of Washington, April 24, 1961: Should medical and hospital care for the elderly be provided through the Social Security Act under a plan calling for an increase in the payroll tax? Yes, 64 percent; no, 33 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

Senator J. GLENN BEALL, Republican, of Maryland, June 12, 1961: Are you in favor of federally financed medical benefits under the social security system? Yes, 25 percent; no, 65 percent; no answer, 10 percent.

Representative JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Republican, of Ohio, June 12, 1961: Which more adequately reflects your position on medical care: (a) I support a compulsory Federal program of medical care for the aged under social security with the cost of program paid for by increased taxes on employees and employers, 16 percent; (b) I support a voluntary program of medical care for the aged with costs shared by Federal and State Governments out of general tax revenues, 29 percent; (c) I do not believe in Government participation in this field, 48 percent; and no opinion, 7 percent.

Representative DELBERT L. LATTA, Republican, of Ohio, June 20, 1961:

Do you favor a compulsory Federal medical-care hospitalization program for those receiving social security to be financed by increasing social security taxes? Yes, 21 percent; no, 79 percent.

If your answer is "No", would you favor such a proposal if it also included those not on social security but past 65? Yes, 26 percent; no, 74 percent.

Would you prefer that the Federal Government not enter the medical-care hospitalization field? Yes, 70 percent; no, 30 percent.

Representative SILVIO O. CONTE, Republican, of Massachusetts, June 19, 1961: Do you favor:

Compulsory plan, administered by Federal Government and financed by employer-employee increases in social security taxes? Yes, 796; no, 1,292; no opinion, 212.

Voluntary, State-administered plan, financed by State, Federal, and individual contributions? Yes, 1,192; no, 816; no opinion, 292.

Representative GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, Republican, of California, June 7, 1961:

Do you favor a compulsory medical aid plan under social security? Yes, 26.4 percent; no, 73.6 percent.

Do you favor medical aid for the elderly under a plan which would permit all elderly people to benefit, regardless of social security coverage? Yes, 54.1 percent; no, 45.9 percent.

Representative HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, Republican, of Pennsylvania, June 6, 1961: Do you favor Federal aid (a) to the aged by matching funds to the States (Kerr-Mills)? Yes, 31 percent; no, 39 percent; undecided, 30 percent. (b) To the aged by the social security method? Yes, 59 percent; no, 27 percent; undecided, 24 percent.

Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR. Republican, of New Jersey, May 24, 1961: Do you favor medical care for the aged tied to social security? Yes, 53 percent; no, 39 percent; no opinion, 8 percent.

Representative E. Y. BERRY, Republican, of South Dakota, May 3, 1961: Do you favor medical care for the aged under the social security program not based on need, pushing the payroll tax to 10 percent by 1969, applicable only to those covered by social security? This program has been proposed rather than the State-administered program covering any needy person enacted by Congress last year. Yes, 19 percent; no, 70 percent; not certain, 11 percent.

Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, Republican, of Ohio, March 22, 1961: Do you favor a health insurance program tied in to the social security system? Yes, 58 percent; no, 35 percent; no opinion, 7 percent.

Representative E. C. GATHINGS, Democrat, of Arkansas, May 8, 1961: Do you favor medical and health care for social security beneficiaries financed by increased social securiity taxes? Yes, 32 percent; no, 64 percent; no opinion, 4 percent.

Representative BURR P. HARRISON, Democrat, of Virginia, May 17, 1961: Do you favor legislation which would provide health protection for people over 65 years of age? Yes, 1,160; no, 178; uncommitted, 35. If so, should it be under the social security system? Yes, 859; no, 260; uncommitted, 254.

Representative TOM V. MOOREHEAD, Republican, of Ohio, May 22, 1961: Which one of the following do you support:

(a) A compulsory Federal program of medical care for the aged under social security with costs borne by increased taxes on employees and employers? Yes, 27.51 percent; no (blank); no opinion, 6.20 percent.

(b) A voluntary program of medical care for the aged with costs shared by the Federal Government from general tax revenues and the individual beneficiary? Yes, 39.84 percent; no (blank); no opinion (blank).

(c) No medical care for the aged involving Federal Government participation? Yes, 24.65 percent; no (blank); no opinion (blank).

Representative PAUL G. ROGERS, Democrat, of Florida, May 17, 1961: Do you favor the proposal to make a compulsory medical care plan for the aged part of the social security program? Yes, 55 percent; no, 45 percent.

Representative ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, Democrat, of New York, May 4, 1961: Do you favor legislation granting annually 60 days of hospitalization, nursing care and surgical expenses for retired pensioners under social security system in lieu of present law which provides that Federal Government will match State expenditures for programs for retired pensioners earning less than $2,500 annually or who are welfare recipients? Percentage results in entire district: Yes, 74 percent; no, 26 percent. Percentage results above 96th Street at East Harlem section: Yes, 87 percent; no, 13 percent.

Representative HAROLD R. COLLIER, Republican, of Illinois, May 29, 1961: Do you favor—

Assistance limited to social security recipients by increasing social security tax rates? Yes, 30 percent; no, 59 percent; no opinion, 11 percent.

Assistance to all citizens over 65, based upon criteria of need, with Federal Government and States sharing the cost? Yes, 55 percent; no, 35 percent; no opinion, 10 percent.

Representative MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, Republican, of Illinois, June 26, 1961: Do you favor a Federal medical care program for the aged? Yes, 40.8 percent; no, 32 percent;

no opinion, 27.2 percent. If so, do you prefer—

(a) Extension to all over 65, based on need, with Federal Government and States sharing the cost (present law)? Yes, 50.1 percent; no, 21.3 percent; no opinion, 28.6 percent.

(b) Increased social security taxes on employees and employers to cover social security beneficiaries only? Yes, 19.1 percent; no, 38 percent; no opinion, 42.9 percent.

Representative ROBERT J. CORBETT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, July 17, 1961: Should medical care for the aged be financed through social security (Forand plan) rather than some other way? Yes, 55 percent; no, 45 percent.

Representative GARNER E. SHRIVER, Republican, of Kansas, August 1, 1961. Do you favor medical care for the aged financed through: Social security—yes, 30.5 percent; no, 64.5 percent; uncertain, 5 percent. Federal grants to States—yes, 38.5 percent; no, 49.9 percent; uncertain, 11.6 percent. No Federal program in this area—yes, 4.9 percent; no, 45.3 percent; uncertain, 13.8 percent.

Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Democrat, of New York, July 20, 1961. Do you favor hospitalization insurance for retired persons as part of an expanded social security system? Yes, 70.7 percent; no, 22.7 percent; undecided, 6.6 percent.

Representative DAVE MARTIN, Republican, of Nebraska, July 5, 1961. Should we increase social security taxes to provide free medical care for pensioners, despite the fact that many are not covered by social security? Yes, 11.2 percent; no, 81 percent; not sure, 7 percent.

Representative WILLIAM G. BRAY, Republican, of Indiana, August 28, 1961. Do you favor increase in social security taxes to provide a compulsory Government program for medical care of persons over 65? Yes, 30 percent; no. 67 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, August 23, 1961. Do you favor a Federal program of medical aid for the elderly? Yes, 72.5 percent; no, 21.25 percent; no opinion, 6.25 percent. Through Federal aid to States, each State to administer the program on the basis of need? Yes, 50.5 percent; no, 49.5 percent; no opinion (blank). Through social security? Yes, 62.5 percent; no, 37.5 percent.

Representative CLARK MACGREGOR, Republican, of Minnesota, January 10, 1962. Do you favor medical care for the aged under social security? Yes, 33.7 percent; no, 50.6 percent; no response, 15.7 percent.

Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, January 23, 1962. Do you favor providing medical and hospital care to recipients of social security benefits and paying the cost by increasing payroll taxes? Yes, 33.3 percent; no, 66.7 percent.

Caribbean Cruise Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 613 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to require Government-subsidized U.S. passenger vessels, which have been given permission to operate Caribbean cruises, to stop at the ports of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands on each cruise.

Since the Merchant Marine Act already authorizes the payment of operating-differential subsidy for these cruises, it is only fair to require U.S. ships cruising the Caribbean to make stops at these U.S. ports. It would be indeed unfortunate if these beautiful parts of the United States were not seen by our cruising citizenry.

Needless to say, these islands have much to offer the tourist. In turn, our dollars would not be dissipated in foreign markets, but rather the American dollar would aid in the economic development of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, a responsibility which is largely ours to share.

This legislation is especially needed at a time when our Government is concerned with the flow of the American dollar and its effect upon the U.S. gold reserve, and has the personal support of both Governor Muñoz-Marín of Puerto Rico and Governor Paiewonsky of the Virgin Islands.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation and earnestly request that it be given early and favorable consideration by Congress.

Barter, Stockpile, and the Administration's Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, 1962, my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, the longtime chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, submitted a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD taking exception to statements which I made concerning the administration's position on the barter program insofar as it affects the stockpiling of lead. He apparently was championing the position of the Department of Agriculture in so doing.

I had previously questioned the consistency of the administration's expression of astonishment over the size of our stockpiling program in view of its failure to heed my request of July 13, 1961, to the President urging opposition to a proposed barter agreement. This barter agreement ultimately resulted in the acquisition of 100,000 tons of lead from Australia and Canada to be added to our already excessive stockpile.

I have carefully read my colleague's statement and noted particularly his comment that "he is not aware of the full details of the particular barter transaction criticized by Mr. HALL."

I regret that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture did not avail himself of the opportunity to become familiar with this particular transaction and study the correspondence which I had with the White House.

Had he done so, I am sure he would not have spoken so hastily as to my confusion, and with so little basis in fact. I refer in particular to the following statements which he made:

> Under this program our farm surpluses are exchanged for scarce metals and other storable materials produced in other countries.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am well aware of the need to maintain an adequate reserve of strategic materials such as beryllium, titanium, nickel, and so forth, which this country has trouble producing in sufficient quantities to meet national security needs. However, lead certainly is not a scarce mineral, a fact to which the thousands of unemployed miners throughout the Nation, and particularly in Missouri, will attest. The tragic plight of the mining industry is not due to any scarcity of lead, but rather to the depressed price conditions which prevail in the industry, a direct result of excessive importations from other countries, and possibly production costs.

Within the past few weeks, the price of lead has sunk to 9½ cents, the lowest level since price controls were removed after World War II. The lead obtained through the barter program has no market, but goes directly into the stockpile, thus creating a greater surplus and downward pressures on price. This situation continues in spite of the lead-zinc subsidy bill enacted in the last session which thus far has failed to solve any problems.

> The President did not refer to the supplemental stockpile.

The President's announcement made no distinction between the strategic and supplemental stockpile, and the dollar value of the stockpile which he quoted included both items. The President himself has expressed shock at the size of the stockpile, an observation which the gentleman from North Carolina apparently has overlooked in his zeal for bartering. It makes no sense to separate stockpiles obtained through barter from those obtained by other methods. The end result is the same no matter which "pile" we ignore:

> No part of our agricultural export program makes more sense than this program of exchanging perishable surpluses for nonperishable materials which we do not produce in sufficient quantity in the United States to meet our requirements.

In my opinion nothing makes less sense than to substitute one surplus for another whose economic results are as devastating to the lead-zinc industry as our grain surpluses have been to the farmer. In 1960 only 23 percent of our domestic lead was produced in the United States while imports accounted for 33 percent of consumption with the remainder coming from secondary sources reclaimed lead. This does not reflect any lack of domestic lead, but rather indicates the extent to which Government policies are dissipating the domestic industry in favor of foreign ores. According to the Emergency Lead Zinc Committee there were 1,346 lead and zinc mines in the United States in 1948 and this had dwindled to only 292 mines by 1960. Production of lead in the United States is down from 390,476 tons in 1948 to 246,667 tons in 1960. These fig-

ures do not reflect any lack of domestic lead resources. They reflect the drastic effect of excessive imports on our market. The amount of lead which the United States agreed to import from Canada and Australia under last year's barter agreement is more than one-third of the total U.S. production. Meanwhile our own mines stand idle, and workers remain unemployed. It is important to maintain know-how, pumps, cribbing, and avoid the deleterious effect of ionized salts of water and acid in our fields and mines for conservation alone.

The Emergency Lead Zinc Committee further states:

It is imperative for the economy of mining States * * * and for the national economy and defense that we maintain a domestic lead-zinc mining industry that can continue to explore, and develop our mineral reserves and to mine a substantial part of our own lead-zinc needs.

There must be import controls to equalize present levels of low world mining costs compared to those under the higher living standards of the United States, particularly since our own Government has helped subsidize foreign production through barter purchases for our stockpile, and has provided development loans for foreign mineral exploration and plant expansion.

I am sure that if there were idle lead mines in North Carolina instead of tobacco and cotton, the gentleman from North Carolina would be more concerned over the administration's and Cabinet's actions. My real thesis in the first place was that in view of the President's admission of my being partially right—the left hand—Department of Agriculture—knoweth not what the right hand doeth—administration, Department of State, and the Department of the Interior.

I am further encouraged to believe that this position—barter—is supported by our Chief Executive.

This is contradictory to the letter which I received on July 19, 1961 from Presidential Assistant Lawrence F. O'Brien, in answer to my protest to the barter agreement. Speaking for the President, he said:

Certainly the domestic barter program suffers from some of the disadvantages to which you refer. * * *

Probably the most vulnerable statement made by the gentleman from North Carolina was his comment:

This [barter] agreement reduced surpluses of lead hanging over the market which were equally depressing world and domestic prices.

The lead-zinc industry is unanimous in its contention that the barter program has been an absolute and utter failure insofar as it was intended to reduce surpluses and improve prices. As stated previously, the present price on lead is 9½ cents, the lowest since 1946, and overall world production shows no signs of any marked decline, the barter program notwithstanding.

The huge quantities of lead in our stockpile continue to depress the market and the administration has indicated that lead from the stockpile may be moved into world markets, in an effort to decrease the size of the stockpile.

If further evidence is needed, I quote from the brief filed this month with the U.S. Tariff Commission by six companies engaged in the lead and zinc industry in the United States:

We join in submitting this statement * * * to emphasize the fact that the existing U.S. Government policy toward lead and zinc has failed. It has not significantly helped the domestic mines which it was designed to protect. * * * It has created conditions and sacrifice to foreign competition and markets of certain of the industries principal customers, the fabricators of lead and zinc.

It will be seen that for 14 years lead production has been in excess of lead consumption. This long continued imbalance has been possible only because the greater part of the material produced, represented by the gap between production and consumption, has been taken off the market, primarily by the U.S. Government for stockpiling or through barter transactions. For years, the acquisition of surplus stocks for stockpile has permitted world producers to operate without regard for the economic axiom that production cannot indefinitely exceed consumption.

While I am glad that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has appointed my colleague from Missouri to look into this question, I can assure him that there is little need for an investigation to determine the sources of opposition to the barter program. It comes from thousands of unemployed miners throughout the Nation whose ability to earn a living has been taken away from them by Government policy.

In order to further enlighten my colleague and so that in his well-secured position he won't have to "shoot from the hip," without warning at a "confused" freshman Member, I ask unanimous consent to insert the following correspondence on this subject:

Letter from HALL to President, July 13, 1961.

Letter from O'Brien to HALL, July 18, 1961.

Letter from John P. Duncan, Jr., October 3, 1961.

Letter from John H. Kelly, August 7, 1961.

The letters follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 13, 1961.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am disturbed by the recommendations of your administration within the past few weeks affecting policy toward the lead-zinc industry. I wish to call several matters to your attention, and to the attention of your advisers in the Department of Interior and the Department of State.

One cannot help but draw the conclusion that the Department of State and the Department of Interior are recommending a course of action which will be utterly disastrous for our domestic lead-zinc industry, and for the thousands of persons employed in that industry.

Specifically, I refer to the administration's recommendation for a system of barter and stockpile as the solution to the lead-zinc problem. More "solutions" like this and we will no longer have a lead-zinc problem—or a lead-zinc industry.

As a Representative of the Seventh District of Missouri, with a concentration of lead-zinc mines, I call attention to these recent developments:

1. Negotiations are nearing completion for barter of 100,000 tons of lead from Australian and Canadian mining companies. This metal will be added to the U.S. supplemental stockpile in spite of the unanimous objection of the domestic lead-zinc industry.

In essence, we are thus using our agricultural surpluses in a barter arrangement which will add to our lead-zinc surpluses and will tend to further depress the lead-zinc market.

2. The administration has recommended a new policy that would consist of a barter program to purchase $60 million worth of surplus domestic lead-zinc stocks now held by U.S. producers, to be added to the supplemental stockpile.

A review of our policy over the past 10 years will disclose that the major effect of stockpiling and barter has been to encourage more foreign production of lead and zinc. Foreign producers, many of them subsidized through our foreign aid program, have never failed to take advantage of opportunities to feed their production into the United States. The present quotas are so high that they offer virtually no restriction on these imports. Any temporary benefit from this proposal would not reach the miners who are the ones who need help, but would go to two or three large producers whose excess stocks, in many cases, has been refined from foreign ores, and who have large oversea investments.

The major cause of instability of price and stocks during the past 10 years has been and still is the import of excessive foreign supplies of these metals, largely the result of higher production costs here and economic assistance to oversea producers.

It might be added that other domestic programs implemented by the administration affecting wage costs, tax demands, and so forth, are hardly calculated to lower our own production costs.

It is an irrefutable fact that the State Department has been the major obstacle in efforts to grant relief to our lead-zinc industry through adjustments in tariffs and quotas—this in spite of the fact that several Tariff Commission determinations of injury with recommendations for greater tariff protection have fallen—and continue to fall—on deaf ears.

I contend that the State Department has virtual sole jurisdiction in an area affecting thousands of domestic jobs in the lead-zinc industry, and that responsible persons in that Department are resigned to the demise of this industry—this in spite of the fact that lead and zinc are strategic materials, the domestic production of which is absolutely vital to our defense needs in times of emergency.

I submit that the domestic miner should have at least a minimum of 50 percent of our U.S. market needs of lead and zinc ores and that it is time for this administration to begin paying more heed to the advice of industry spokesmen and less heed to officials in the State Department who seem to be wholly preoccupied with the creation of jobs overseas at the expense of domestic workers. Surely, we must realize that we cannot and should not curry favor or influence foreign loyalty with self-degrading and one-way trade agreements.

I believe that H.R. 3416 involving judicial use of tariffs and import quotas with less influence on subsidies, is at least a step in the right direction and is urgently needed if the lead-zinc industry in southwest Missouri is to survive. Do you recall your campaign promises in Joplin, Mo., while wearing a miner's hard hat?

I also urge the administration to reconsider its support of section 609 of the foreign aid bill which would permit the AID administrator to dispose of lead-zinc from our supplemental stockpile unless the Congress specifically disapproves the plan within a 60-day period. Such "vest-pocket approval" techniques have no place in a statesmanlike legislative program.

Aside from the constitutional question of whether Congress should abandon its authority in this area, it makes little sense for the administration to be seeking authority to unload our lead-zinc stockpile on the world market at the same time that it is negotiating an agreement with Canada and Australia to obtain their lead-zinc for inclusion in that same stockpile.

Nor do I believe that the administration should take such authority out of the hands of a domestic agency, OCDM, and place it in the hands of an agency primarily concerned with foreign affairs and having little regard for the effect of its actions on our domestic economy.

At the meeting with mining State congressional group on June 23 you indicated your intent to assign a task force to devote further study to the lead-zinc problem.

The last thing we need is a task force study to tell us what our problems are in the lead-zinc industry. We know what those problems are; we know what initial steps should be taken; and we certainly know that the situation will become steadily worse as long as policy is being dictated by the Department of State.

I hope you will see fit to reverse the administration's policy so that a sick industry will be given a chance for survival, and our internal economy may flourish again on principles which have made our Nation great.

Respectfuly submitted.

DURWARD G. HALL,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1961.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: For the President, I would like to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of July 13 commenting on a policy for the domestic lead-zinc industry. Certainly, the domestic barter program suffers from some of the disadvantages to which you refer, and I am bringing your comments to the attention of the Department of the Interior and the Department of State for consideration.

We expect that within a few days, the Department of Interior will be prepared to express its views on the pending legislation dealing with the lead and zinc industry. We appreciate your letting us have the benefit of your thinking.

Sincerely yours,
LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,
Special Assistant to the President.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HALL: Your letter of July 13 addressed to the President has been referred to this Department for further reply.

The proposed barter program is not being pursued actively at the present time. It is undoubtedly true that the Government's acquisition of lead and zinc, both by purchase for the strategic stockpile and by barter, over a period of several years did serve to perpetuate an overproduction of these metals. It was for this reason that in 1958 this Department requested the Department of Agriculture to remove lead and zinc from the list of materials eligible for barter. We did not suggest merely a resumption of the earlier program. We specifically proposed that it be limited to the acquisition of surplus stocks in the United States, and we had expected to obtain some kind of agreement with producers holding these stocks not to rebuild them. This proposal was never thought of as the solution to the entire lead-zinc problem. In fact, we believe that any single solution to such a complex problem is likely to create as many difficulties as it solves.

I am enclosing a copy of the statement which I presented to the Senate Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials and Fuels on July 25 concerning lead-zinc legislation. You will note that our reference to task forces is not a further study of the lead-zinc problem but a basic analysis of depressed community problems and a beginning of a program of basic improvement of the economic opportunities in these areas.

We welcome your interest and appreciate your continued cooperation.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN M. KELLY,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., October 3, 1961.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HALL: This is in reply to your letter of September 5, 1961, with respect to barter transactions involving lead and zinc.

The Department has not entered into any contracts for the exchange of zinc during the past 2 years. On August 23, 1961, the Department entered into contracts for the exchange of CCC-owned agricultural commodities for 100,000 short tons of lead from Canada and Australia, while the principal commodities are tobacco and feed grains, some wheat may be exported. The lead will be placed in the stockpile and will not enter commercial markets until such time as it is released. These contracts were entered into on the understanding that the producers of lead in Canada and Australia have taken steps to reduce their production.

This arrangement was designed to reduce supplies of lead which were depressing the market and it followed a recommendation made by the International Lead and Zinc Study Group at its 3d session held in Mexico City, March 20–24, 1961. A copy of a press release reporting on this meeting is enclosed.

The Department does not regard the barter program as a complete solution to the wheat and feed grain problem. We are administering the program in accordance with the laws passed by the Congress and regard it as one of the ways we can promote the export of agricultural commodities.

If you have any further questions about the barter program, I shall be glad to try to answer them.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN P. DUNCAN, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

Hon. Ralph Gwinn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great privileges I have enjoyed as a Member of Congress was the opportunity to serve with Ralph Gwinn and to enjoy a personal friendship with him which carried beyond our service together in the House. We shared a common philosophy of government, a philosophy to which he was completely dedicated. He believed, with all his heart, in the God-given freedom of the individual as set forth in the founding documents of this Nation. So dedicated was he to this principle that he gave up his seat in Congress because he felt he could render greater service to the people if he worked outside the limits set by congressional rules and procedure.

The Nation has lost one of its fine leaders, many of us have lost a valued friend, but the Nation, the people, and his friends are better because Ralph passed this way.

The Indiana Dunes and Harbor in Lake County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands is holding hearings on Senator PAUL DOUGLAS' save-the-dunes bill.

The following is a statement which I made before this committee on Monday of this week:

THE INDIANA DUNES AND HARBOR IN LAKE COUNTY

(Statement of Hon. RAY J. MADDEN, a Representative in Congress from the First Congressional District of Indiana, before the Subcommittee on Public Lands, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I represent the largest industrial congressional district in the United States. There are three major steel mills in the Calumet region of Indiana, the Inland, Youngstown, Carnegie Illinois, and a number of other steel fabricating mills. We have the refineries of all of the major oil companies and several hundred more industries, large and small.

Lake County, by the way, comprises the First Congressional District of Indiana. As Representative of that area I am very much alarmed from the standpoint of unemployment.

In 1946, and that was the first year after World War II, the manufacture of steel was at its height. At that time, the mills only occasionally would operate 100 percent.

In the last few years, the steel mills in my area have on occasion been down to 46 percent. Automation coming in, during the last 7 or 8 years has thrown thousands not only out of work but also on part time, 3 days a week, 2 days a week, 4 days a week. A man, at the head of the family, when he is working part time, is out of the purchasing market because his purchasing is confined to food, clothing, rent, and the bare necessities of life. I was interested in the telegram read by Senator DOUGLAS from Joseph Germano, director of the Chicago Northern Indiana Steelworkers Union opposing the proposed harbor at Burns Ditch.

Now, I am very much in favor of a harbor for northern Indiana, but I am interested in seeing that the harbor is located in a place where it can serve industry that is already operating.

I have already gotten a favorable report on my resolution from the Public Works Committee of the House authorizing an Army Engineers study and survey for a harbor located in the area of Whiting, and East Chicago, and Hammond in the northeast corner of Lake County.

Senator BIBLE. That would be Lake County and that would be west of Porter County. Is that correct?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. Right up near the Illinois line, where the port would be in close proximity there for shipping down through the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers to the Gulf of Mexico.

Senator BIBLE. What is the position of that particular legislation now, Congressman MADDEN?

You say you have made a request to the——

Mr. MADDEN. The Public Works Committee of the House has already favorably acted on the request for an engineers' survey and it is a matter now as to when the Appropriations Committee will authorize money for the survey.

I appeared in Indianapolis last August, when the Army Engineers hearings were held down there. I mentioned then, and I am going to repeat to this committee, there seems to be something rather mysterious about the report that the Army Engineers issued in October 1960 on this proposed harbor at Burns Ditch. For some reason or other that report was withdrawn. I do not know what pressures were brought to bear for the Army Engineers to recall and nullify that report. According to that report, the figures revealed from the Army Engineers are as follows, and, they are not RAY MADDEN'S figures.

I will read: According to the Army Engineers report 97.3 percent of the future benefits coming from this proposed harbor at Burns Ditch will go to two steel companies; namely, Midwest, a wholly owned subsidiary of National Steel and the adjacent proposed construction of Bethlehem Steel Co.

On page 19, paragraph 57 of the report—now, listen to this—it states that the estimated total average annual benefit will be $8,157,000. Of this amount, cargo or shipping, exclusive of the steel mill operation, will account for only $217,000.

Now, that is the Army Engineers report of October 1960. The shipping that would come from all of central Indiana and southern Indiana, would amount to $217,000 as compared with $8,157,000. The latter figure would be the shipping of the two proposed steel mills.

I fail to see, Mr. Chairman, the justification for the expenditure of millions of dollars of public money to provide a harbor and a port for the exclusive benefit of two wealthy and powerful steel mills.

Now, in Lake County—the Carnegie Illinois Steel, Inland, and Youngstown have their harbors and did not ask the Government or State of Indiana to finance them. Of course, I do not want to cast an aspersion but there seems to be some kind of powerful interest behind this situation.

In Congress, working along with other colleagues for several terms for the St. Lawrence Waterway project we had difficulty in getting results. Then in 1953, a very distinguished industrialist by the name of George Humphrey became the Secretary of the Treasury and it did not take long for favorable action to start on the St. Lawrence Waterway. Maybe Mr. Humphrey of the National Steel Co. might have something to do with this terrific publicity and organization behind the Burns Ditch Port project to provide a harbor to accommodate his and the proposed adjacent steel mills.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is good evidence to indicate that because of the character of the lake itself, this proposed port down at Burns Ditch might be a white elephant from the standpoint of sandfill and sand drift at the southern tip of Lake Michigan.

U.S. Senator Daniel Webster made a special trip from Washington in July 1836, to Michigan City to attend a big celebration on opening the original shipping harbor at this southern tip of Lake Michigan—the Congress had spent considerable money on way back 130 years ago for a port at Michigan City. For a period of 50 years thereafter Congress from time to time appropriated money to clean out the sandfill and drift at the Michigan City port.

Army Engineers report of October 1960 revealed there is a north-to-south windsweep down that lake of about 500 miles. Mariners or sailors on that lake will testify that there is no body of water where there are higher waves and more sand drift than into the south tip of Lake Michigan.

It would be a terrific expense to keep a port of that type operating at that particular location.

Now, somebody here stated this morning that there were trainloads of sand hauled from the dunes in to make beaches in Chicago. Yes. Why?

Right in that area, because of the terrific sand deposits caused by storms with a 500-mile sweep is the reason we have the sand dunes at the southern tip of Lake Michigan.

That is what made the dunes.

That is why there is not a spot in the world like the Indiana Dunes.

And it has been brought out in our hearing, in the Army Engineers report of 1960, that there would be a shifting back and forth, east and west, of the sand silt there. Imagine what that will do to the park that we have there now, Indiana Dunes State Park.

Steel mill waste and pollution would spoil the water and beaches for miles surrounding the Indiana State Park.

I happen to have experience, as far as parks on the south shore of Lake Michigan are concerned. Back in 1935 and 1936, I was city comptroller at Gary, and we had a public beach there, and still have it.

The citizens of Gary can hardly enjoy it because of the influx of people coming from Chicago. We are right in the shadow of six million people in the Chicago area. And I do think that the time has come when we had better start paying a little attention to future generations and people coming from some other place for recreation.

Now, they say that there are many miles of sand around that Lake Michigan shores; but the port that I am interested in, and the chamber of commerce at Hammond, and the chamber of commerce at East Chicago, and Whiting, and the mayor of Hammond, Gary, East Chicago, and Whiting—they are very much interested in the port right there where there is plenty of industrial business and shipping right now.

Why, we have a township relief loaf in Lake County of people working only part time and unemployed in our steel mills today. With automation, what is going to happen if two great mills start operating 12 miles east of us?

Workers will flock in from all areas of the country to work in those mills. We are going to increase our relief roll problem.

I have received thousands of letters on this matter of the sand dunes. I received these letters not only from my area, but from Indiana and also from the Chicago district. They all ask that something be done in order to preserve the Indiana Dunes for future generations.

Before I terminate my remarks I think it might be well to read an editorial from James DeLaurier, publisher of the Hammond Times, in regard to what the Inland Steel had to say about the harbor at Burns Ditch. I will read part of this editorial.

And it says that one of the more significant voices opposing a port in Indiana at the Burns Ditch area of Porter County was unheard, although on the record—at the Army Engineers hearing in Indianapolis last August was the Inland Steel Co.

It opposes the site in Porter County, that is, Burns Ditch, and it was set forth in a written statement, submitted in behalf of the company for the hearing record, by Delmar W. Johnson, vice president of researching and planning.

It placed in the record, although not read at the hearing, and it said, to begin with, Johnson makes clear that Inland has a valid interest in the Porter County area.

Now, they own land there, where it is proposed to locate the port. Since 1919 Inland has owned more than 800 acres of land, including the mill shoreland from the Lake-Porter County line, east toward Ogden. This property has been held and has continued to be held for the purpose of building a steel plant with harbor connections, Johnson points out.

Actual maps locating the proposed port's future extension to the southwest show the harbor line touching the southeast corner of the Inland Steel property on U.S. 12. Inland's statement declares that the October 1960—that is the Army Engineers report—that, for some mysterious reason was recalled, Inland states, and Inland's statement declares that the October 1960, interim report, submitted by the Army Engineers, estimates that oversea general cargo would amount to only 160,000 tons a year by the 10th year after the harbor is built. That is after the proposed Burns Ditch Port is completed. And only 370,000 tons a year by the end of 50 years. Now, that comes from the Army Engineers report of 1960, as far as the future shipping down into central Indiana from a port at that particular is concerned.

In contrast, the annual water-borne tonnage for the steel mills, proposed to be built at the site, would run into 10 million tons per year. This, Inland says, would mean that the State and Federal Government together would be investing $74 million mainly for the benefit of two private steel companies, but even this tonnage, Inland says, will be negligible until blast furnaces and steel furnaces are installed. Inland says that they appear to be some distance away.

Inland states it takes note that Hammond, Whiting, and East Chicago, have urged Congressman RAY MADDEN to petition the Army Engineers for a study of what came to be known as the Tri-City Port, which would extend along the shores of the three cities and would be created of a long breakwater between existing breakwaters in south Chicago and the Indiana harbor.

That is the port I am talking about, which is now before the House of Representatives.

Furthermore, Inland points out the Monon Railroad is going ahead with plans to improve the harbor at Michigan City at its own expense, which would provide a port for handling bulk and general cargo.

That comes from the Inland Steel. Inland asked the Army Engineers to disapprove the Burns Ditch site until a study can be made of the Tri-City area. Somebody told me that there is an Army Engineers report coming out here in the next few days, pending this hearing.

Senator BIBLE. They will testify in full when——

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to have the Army Engineers defer until they make a study of the Tri-City Harbor where there is industry already established and where it could operate once we build a good harbor there with plenty of business right from industry that is operating in this locality already.

"This is the first time that Inland or any other major steel company in Lake County has taken a position on the recent proposal for building a port of Indiana at Burns Ditch. There is some feeling that Lake County steel mills have refrained from speaking out on the Burns Ditch site question in the past for fear it might seem they were taking a dog-in-the-manger attitude." End of quote from Hammond Times.

Well, the telegrams that were read here this morning from the leaders of the mill workers in the Calumet region, that they are against it because thousands of families are having a hard time making a living on 3 days a week and the three steel mills

operating iin Lake County today, all of this should be taken into account.

As I have said, I have received thousands of letters regarding this matter, and I am going to read one very briefly to you and then terminate.

This letter comes from Chicago and is dated February 21. I received it Saturday.

"To Congressman RAY J. MADDEN, House of Representatives:

"SIR: This is perhaps the last opportunity to save or lose one of nature's jewels, God's gifts to the American people, the Indiana Sand Dunes.

"Knowing how precious is your time, sir, I shall put my appeal to you as short as possible.

"1. I am pledging for conservation of the area along Michigan Lake eastern shore, Indiana Sand Dunes, not for my personal interests, having none and being too old to have any, just for the health, fresh air, benefit, and happiness of the future generations of millions of Americans in the Midwest.

"2. In my long life I have found only two such spots of natural beauty:

"One is the Kurish Neringa (Nehrung) or Little Sahara on the eastern shores of the Baltic Sea in Lithuania, alas now cut off from the free world by the Soviet Iron Curtain. The other one is the Indiana Sand Dunes, and the only one left for the free world. There is no other spot in this hemisphere like Michigan Lake shores. A large part of the dunes is spoiled and destroyed forever already by industry. Sand Dunes is the last piece of a jewel left intact, and being already destroyed in two vital places: at the Burns Ditch and in the Dunes Acres region.

"3. It took nature centuries to build one sand dune, yet it takes one day only for a bulldozer to destroy it, and dozens of bulldozers are at work there already. What the interested-in-destruction people say, is just bunk. Workers in Porter County would rather go by car, bus, or electric train a few miles farther and work in steel mills and come back to Porter County homes with fresh air and healthy happy families.

"4. Lots of people from other lands complain that Americans do not appreciate real beauty and are bent on destruction of nature. The ugly industrial sections of cities and towns tend to testify to it and the insistency of these interested in building their mills and factories exactly in the rest of unspoiled area, confirms it. However, the energetic resistance of people of the Midwest, the heroic struggle of the Save the Dunes Committee, and the sympathetic attitude of many Senators and Congressmen witness to it that Americans are not the nation of sheep as some author called them.

"5. Sir, it is so easy to spoil nature and spread blight and find arguments for such inglorious acts. Yet, I may assure you, the posterity will build monuments of gratitude not to those who have built factories and slums with accompanying foul air and diseases, only will build to those who cared for health and happiness of theirs and their children. Your CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS have stated that only one-half of one-third of an inch of sea and lake shores are left for every citizen of the United States, and, remember, population is growing fast, and sources for fresh air and recreation are rapidly diminishing.

"Let my weak voice be one in a choir of many thousands. Save the dunes."

I want to thank the committee for your attention.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Congressman MADDEN. I understand your position.

I have no questions.

Senator DWORSHAK?

Senator DWORSHAK. No questions.

Senator BIBLE. Senator LONG?

Senator LONG. No questions.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Congressman MADDEN. Let's withhold our applause until the hearing is completed.

Commemorating Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, this coming March 3, 1962, represents the 84th anniversary of the commemoration of Bulgarian Liberation Day. This date first came into being to honor the brave Bulgarian people on March 3, 1878, and has been observed ever since by all freedom-loving peoples.

Bulgaria is one of the smaller nations in the Balkan Peninsula but its impact on that immediate area throughout its long, troubled history has been an important one. The Bulgarian people over the centuries have been consistently in the forefront in the fight for freedom and the rights of mankind. This struggle goes back to the Middle Ages and the 14th century when the Bulgarians were subjugated by the Turks and forced to live under this rule almost 500 years. In 1878 peace came to the people of Bulgaria and in commemoration of that freedom the date of March 3 is celebrated annually as a Bulgarian holiday. This day has been properly set aside to honor those people of Bulgaria who have sacrificed their lives to keep aloft the true spirit of independence and to protect the sovereign rights of men. Once again Bulgarians lie suppressed under the heel of a new tyranny—communism. But like other tyrannies, communism will one day vanish and the people of Bulgaria will once again control their own lives and their own destinies.

I am privileged to salute the brave Bulgarian people on this their great Liberation Day and I wish them most fervently an early end to the dictatorship they now suffer under and the right that belongs to all men—the right to live freely and in a manner of their own choosing.

The Little-People-to-Little-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate my very good friend and colleague, Congressman RODINO, of New Jersey, on his excellent speech of February 15, 1962, on the little-people-to-little-people program; and to commend his son, Peter, for his initiative and forethought in giving birth to the idea.

We have all been reminded at one time or another of the verse from Psalms, "Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast Thou ordained strength because of thine enemies."

In our modern day world, out of the minds of our junior citizens a worthwhile crusade has started. It is a crusade to further peace among Nations and among the peoples of Nations. It is a noble cause endorsed by our future leaders of the United States. It is a program we adults should follow and encourage.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Warren F. Taylor, pastor, Smithfield Baptist Church, Smithfield, Va., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we thank Thee that we are living in these days when so much is demanded of us.

We thank Thee for those who seek to be equal to the changes of the times, and who respond with their best and not their worst.

We thank Thee for the leaders of our country, for their devotion to the people's welfare.

May not the many calls made upon them cause them to forget the call they had to become our leaders. May not the dailiness of their meetings cause them to forget why they meet. May not the drudgery of their work cause them to lose sight of its worth. May not our apathy or opposition cause them to be overly discouraged or openly cynical.

Keep them, we pray, brave and strong men of good will and good humor, that the work of justice and truth be more established on earth.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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