Lewis J. Fields
Raymond L. Murray
Frederick E. Leek

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

Paul R. Tyler
William J. VanRyzin
William T. Fairbourn
Bruno A. Hochmuth
William R. Collins
Louis B. Robertshaw
Rathvon McC. Tompkins
Paul J. Fontana

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Paul J. Fontana
George S. Bowman, Jr.
Wood B. Kyle
Lewis W. Walt
Joseph O. Butcher
John F. Dobbin
Carl A. Youngdale
Ormond R. Simpson

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Charles J. Quilter
Donn J. Robertson
Lowell E. English
Alvin S. Sanders
Gordon D. Gayle
Melvin D. Henderson
William G. Thrash
Marion E. Carl
Arthur H. Adams
Frederick J. Karch
John W. Antonelli

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 6, 1963:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Bruce R. Thompson, of Nevada, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Nevada.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Kenneth T. Anderson, of Kansas, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring March 31, 1969.

Lorin T. Bice, of Florida, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring March 31, 1969.

## WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate August 6, 1963:

The nomination sent to the Senate on April 11, 1963, of Richard R. Conley to be postmaster at Rome City, in the State of Indiana.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 6, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Psalm 19: 8: *The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart.*

O Thou God of infinite and infallible wisdom, may we daily long and labor with confidence and certainty that our desires and hopes for the health and happiness of mankind shall someday be fulfilled.

Grant that the mind and heart of our confused and troubled world may be touched and transformed by the regenerating power of the love and light of Thy divine spirit.

Show us how, in the great adventure of building a nobler civilization, we may help all the nations of the earth cultivate friendship and fraternity.

Use us in lifting humanity unto that loftier spiritual unity where all feelings of hatred and hostility, of antagonism and antipathy, are transcended and supplanted by a relationship of peace and good will.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. 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, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 22, 1963:

H.R. 40. An act to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations; and

H.R. 2461. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Henderson, Nev., at fair market value, certain public lands in the State of Nevada.

On July 25, 1963:

H.R. 2998. An act to amend titles 10, 14, and 38, United States Code, with respect to the award of certain medals and the Medal of Honor Roll; and

H.R. 3845. An act to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766).

On July 26, 1963:

H.R. 5279. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 513. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning July 28, 1963, as Veterinary Medicine Week.

On July 30, 1963:

H.R. 1933. An act to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration; and

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed.

On August 5, 1963:

H.R. 2221. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.;

H.R. 3272. An act to provide for the free entry of an orthicon image assembly for the use of the Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, Ga.;

H.R. 3674. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that polished sheets and plates of iron or steel shall be subject to the same duty as unpolished sheets and plates; and

H.R. 4646. An act to declare a portion of the Benton Harbor Canal, Benton Harbor, Mich., a nonnavigable stream.

## HON. FRED B. ROONEY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FRED B. ROONEY] 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 in regard to his election.

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

There was no objection.

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

## RIVER BASIN PLANS

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6016) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HALL, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. GROSS, and Mr. DORN objected.

## EARTHQUAKE IN YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. CONTE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the earthquake in Yugoslavia last week was indeed a blow to the people of that country. I know that the American people extend to those in the earthquake zone who experienced this catastrophe their heartfelt sympathy. The U.S. Government and the U.S. people have responded quickly and generously to the obvious need of the sufferers of this natural disaster. I understand that deliveries of relief goods and supplies are underway. I know that the people of Yugoslavia will appreciate this generous gesture.

I am pleased to know that the U.S. Government has been able to respond to the emergency by providing transportation for shipments provided by U.S. voluntary agencies. This important and rapid response to human emergencies is, it seems to me, an essential part of the total U.S. foreign policy effort, one which draws deeply on the humanitarian instincts of the American people, and one which should at all times be encouraged. I do not know what funds will be used but I understand that the Agency for International Development may finance a portion of the costs involved.

It is of course clear that this is not assistance to the Government of Yugoslavia within the meaning of the restrictions of section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act and section 109 of the Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act. It is assistance through voluntary agencies directly to the people of Skopje who are suffering immeasurably as a result of this terrible tragedy. I understand that this distinction between assistance to nations and assistance to people has long been accepted under the Battle Act.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

I hope that the United States will in the future stand as ready to respond promptly and effectively to other emergencies as it has done at Skopje.

## MEAT IMPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, coming from an area which is noted for the production of prime beef I share with the farmers engaged in this industry their grave concern over the prospects of the cattle market.

The producers are finding it most difficult to adjust to the situation now facing them and projecting into the future the entire cattle picture looks anything but healthy.

In spite of managed news which tells us periodically how great the economy of agriculture is, and what great advances have been made under this administration, it is just a little hard for cattle producers to swallow this line. The fact is in the Chicago market prime steers averaged a little over $4 less per hundred than a year ago.

One of the causes of this situation has been the greatly increased imports of beef from foreign countries. In early April I introduced legislation which I felt would help. No hearing on my bill has been granted and from all indications never will.

When it became apparent this proposed measure would be stymied I then attempted to see if the matter could not be resolved by negotiation between the countries involved. I made what I felt was a helpful suggestion to Mr. Christian Herter that the matter be brought up at the Meat Conference held in Geneva.

As expected, the meeting was not very productive and members of the European Economic Community indicated they were not prepared to participate in negotiations or discussions relating to international trade of meats. Maybe, and I emphasize maybe, the matter will be discussed in 1964.

Are we to continue the policy of allowing other countries to call the signals instead of our leaders being positive and aggressive for the benefit of domestic industry and our own American taxpayers?

I fail to see why we should sit back and wait for some other country to make the first move. Why do we not show some initiative? Five years have already elapsed since the beginning of this rapid buildup in increased volumes of meat imports.

It does not seem reasonable for us to expect our domestic industry to wait indefinitely. I say the time for action is now.

Once more I am calling on Mr. Herter to take some positive action to see if an agreement for voluntary import quotas might be reached. Information I have been able to obtain leads me to believe both Australia and New Zealand are sensitive to the attitude of American beef producers. Because of this I believe some equitable agreement can be reached if only our trade negotiators will press to protect the interests of America.

## EIGHTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF HIROSHIMA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, today, on the 18th anniversary of Hiroshima, there are so-called protest marchers at the White House gates. I hope those who read about them and their emotional picket signs will pause to remember that the several tens of thousands of Japanese lives taken by the atomic bomb, regrettable as that may have been, ended the war and prevented the loss of several hundred thousand American lives. Since it is highly possible that my life was one of those spared, I am deeply grateful for the work of the Manhattan project which produced the nuclear weapons and ended the slaughter in the Pacific.

On this day 18 years ago I was serving aboard a naval assault transport. Our ship was in the Philippines, preparing with MacArthur's First Cavalry Division for the amphibious invasion of Japan. We had just taken part in the costly landings at Iwo Jima and Okinawa. With almost 2,000 souls aboard, we next were headed for a battle in which it was fully anticipated all aboard might perish before ever setting foot on the Japanese mainland. The estimated overall cost of the invasion was at least a quarter-of-a-million American lives.

Because of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, there was no bloody invasion. Instead less than a month hence, September 2, hundreds of American ships sailed peaceably past "Welcome U.S. Navy" signs into Tokyo Bay to receive the Japanese surrender. Not one American life was lost.

I do not regret that my country did in this instance what was necessary to preserve itself and its citizens. On the contrary, I am proud that America had the courage and wisdom to do so. Further, in light of the virulent aggressions of communism since World War II, I am wondering if the United States would exist today but for the protective strength our nuclear arsenals have given us.

It is well to remember that those who seek peace in a hostile world must have the power to command it.

## REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am transmitting herewith the 44th report to Congress on lend-lease operations. This report covers the calendar year 1962.

This report is submitted in accordance with the provisions of section 5(b) of the Lend-Lease Act of March 11, 1941.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 6, 1963.*

## PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the call of the Private Calendar.

The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

## OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2300) for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.

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

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

There was no objection.

## DR. AND MRS. ABEL GORFAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2706) for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain.

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

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

There was no objection.

## CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2728) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

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

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

There was no objection.

## M. SGT. BENJAMIN A. CANINI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 192) for the relief of M. Sgt. Benjamin A. Canini, U.S. Army.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, in the administration of section 2732 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to receive, consider, and act upon any claims of Master Sergeant Benjamin A. Canini, United States Army, of Tacoma, Washington, against the United States, filed within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, for compensation for damages and expenses sustained by him arising out of the malfunction of the heating unit of his Government-assigned quarters at Evreaux-Fauville Air Force Base, France, on January 30, 1957,

as if such claims had been filed in the time and manner provided in such section, the said Benjamin A. Canini having submitted a timely oral claim but having failed to file a timely written claim as a result of erroneous advice by Government agents. Nothing in this Act shall constitute an admission of liability on the part of the United States.

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

## BERNARD W. FLYNN, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 219) for the relief of Bernard W. Flynn, Jr.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bernard W. Flynn, Junior, of Alexandria, Virginia, the sum of $797, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of the expenses of travel and movement of dependents and household goods from Fort Worth, Texas, to Fort Belvoir, Virginia, in September 1961, the said Bernard W. Flynn, Junior, having accepted employment with the Fort Belvoir Research and Development Laboratories, Virginia, in reliance upon the erroneous advice of agents of the United States that he would be reimbursed for such expenses: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

## MIDDLESEX CONCRETE PRODUCTS & EXCAVATING CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1003) for the relief of the Middlesex Concrete Products & Excavating Corp.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Middlesex Concrete Products and Excavating Corporation, of Woodbridge, New Jersey, the sum of $1,600, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for additional compensation for work performed at the direction of the Department of the Army in excess of the requirements of contract numbered DA-30-075-Eng-8601 for the construction of permanent family housing site work (outside lease lines) at Fort Wadsworth, New York, the Department of the Army being unable to pay such additional compensation because of the limitation on the expenditure of funds for such site work contained in section 505 of the Act of September 28, 1951 (12 U.S.C. 1748).

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

## ESTATE OF GREGORY J. KESSENICH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1643) to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of Gregory J. Kessenich," approved October 2, 1962 (76 Stat. 1368).

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Act entitled "An Act for the relief of the estate of Gregory J. Kessenich", approved October 2, 1962 (76 Stat. 1368), is hereby amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"SEC. 2. The estate of the said Gregory J. Kessenich is hereby relieved from all liability for payment to the United States of the amount of any income tax imposed under the laws of the United States on the sum referred to in the first section of this Act, and the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate is authorized and directed to allow credit or refund to such estate of any amounts paid as income tax imposed on such sum.".

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

## RELIEF OF CERTAIN ENLISTED MEMBERS AND FORMER ENLISTED MEMBERS OF THE AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1545) to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members and former enlisted members of the Air Force.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the payment made by each of the following enlisted members and former enlisted members of the Air Force to Ronald L. Lorenz during the period June 2, 1956, through June 4, 1957, shall be credited to each such member or former member:

Julian L. Bandy, AF13475906; Orville Birge, AF18437236; Zoltan A. Csizmadia, AF12309779; Richard C. Difebbo, AF239376776; Rojelio M. Hernandez, AF16445321; Bobby L. Irvin, AF19312599; Stanley J. Janosky, AF13433024; Dick R. Johnston, AF15471378; Ronald C. Kiederling, AF12439963; Boyd J. Long, AF19472745; Web McPherson, AF20936236; Paul McShane, AF16417788; William W. Miller, Junior, AF17387668; William C. Mortensen, AF17386485; Thomas Peoples, AF26355133; Tommy R. Pugh, AF13449931; Luis M. Ramirez, AF38459323; Bennie Richey, AF18435176; Lewis Shaw, AF17084029; Mack Spurlock, AF18427589; James S. Stancil, Junior, AF13475621; James R. Stanton, AF16445602; Estil H. Vanover, AF15466591; Rayford O. Warren, AF38043180; James W. West, AF14443694; George H. White, AF34575392; Mason B. Woodby, AF13166578.

These payments were refunds of overpayments of accrued leave received by these persons as the result of the fraudulent transactions of said Lorenz, a civilian clerk in the accounting and finance office of the separation center at Manhattan Beach Air Force Station, New York, who appropriated the money to his own use.

SEC. 2. A person named in section 1 of this Act who made repayments both to the United States and to the said Lorenz, the total of which exceeded the amount due to the United States, shall be paid the excess, if otherwise proper.

SEC. 3. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount expended under this Act.

SEC. 4. Appropriations available to the Department of the Air Force for the pay and allowances of military personnel are available for payments under this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike "Ronald L. Lorenz" and insert "a former Air Force employee".

Page 1, line 10, strike "AF239376776" and insert "AF23937676".

Page 2, line 17, strike "Lorenz" and insert "former employee".

Page 2, line 23, strike "Lorenz" and insert "former employee".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

## R. GORDON FINNEY, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1761) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of R. Gordon Finney, Jr.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That notwithstanding the statute of limitations, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of R. Gordon Finney, Junior, (1) on the question of liability of the Government, and (2) on the question of the amount of recovery, for back salary lost as a result of an alleged improper application by the National Park Service of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 459), for the period following the date of his honorable discharge from the Army on January 27, 1946, to the date of the court's judgment.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within six months after the date of enactment of this Act. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from, and payment of, any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code: *Provided,* That the passage of this Act shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States.

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

## CHILDREN OF MRS. ELIZABETH A. DOMBROWSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1861) for the relief of the children of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Dombrowski.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each child of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Dombrowski, of Parma, Ohio, widow of Victor E. Dombrowski, of Parma, Ohio, the amount which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs certifies to him would have been payable to each such child under section 542 of title 38 of the United States Code for the period from July 1, 1960, to the date which each such child actually began receiving a pension under such section: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

## RAFAELLO BUSONI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2228) for the relief of the estate of Rafaello Busoni.

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

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

There was no objection.

## ERWIN A. SUEHS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2238) for the relief of Erwin A. Suehs.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the requirements in section 202(c)(1)(C) and 202(p) of the Social Security Act that proof of support be filed by the dependent husband of an insured individual within a specified period in order to qualify for husband's insurance benefits on the basis of such individual's wages and self-employment income shall not apply with respect to the application of Erwin A. Suehs, Pittsfield, Massachusetts, for husband's insurance benefits under section 202(c) of such Act on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of his wife Elizabeth R. Suehs (social security account numbered [redacted], if he files such application, together with such proof of support, within the six-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

## JOSÉ DOMENECH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2256) for the relief of José Domenech.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That José Domenech, of Niagara Falls, New York, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of pay and allowances for excess leave used while on active duty with the United States Army for the period from October 19, 1951, to November 13, 1957, and erroneous payment of fourteen days accrued leave on the date of his discharge, in the amount of $314.32.

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

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

## GEORGE R. LORE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2756) for the relief of George R. Lore.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George R. Lore, of Baudette, Minnesota, the sum of $6,889 in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for loss of or damage to his aircraft N4688A, an approved facility of the United States Coast Guard Auxiliary, Flotilla 28–05, while on a search and rescue mission. Due to emergency and holiday conditions, the mission had to be undertaken before orders authorizing it could be obtained: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

## MRS. JUSTINE M. DUBENDORF

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2770) for the relief of Mrs. Justine M. Dubendorf.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That Mrs. Justine M. Dubendorf, of Silver Spring, Maryland, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $686.41, representing an overpayment of compensation from March 12, 1956, through July 9, 1961, received by her while employed with the Army Command and Administrative Communications System, Washington, District of Columbia. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Mrs. Justine M. Dubendorf an amount equal to any sums which may have been withheld by the Department of the Army in partial satisfaction of the liability relieved in the first section of this Act: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

## ESTATE OF BART BRISCOE EDGAR, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2925) for the relief of the estate of Bart Briscoe Edgar, deceased.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

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

There was no objection.

## WALLACE J. KNERR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3843) for the relief of Wallace J. Knerr.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That Wallace J. Knerr, of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of $203.99, representing the aggregate amount of salary overpayments received by him from the United States Post Office Department during the period beginning June 28, 1958, and ending October 28, 1960, which overpayments were made as a result of administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Wallace J. Knerr, the sum of any payments received or withheld from him on account of the overpayment referred to in the first section of this Act: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in

connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

## SMITH L. PARRATT AND MR. AND MRS. LLOYD PARRATT, HIS PARENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4141) for the relief of Smith L. Parratt and Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Parratt, his parents.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the provisions of section 2041(b) of title 28 of the United States Code barring tort claims against the United States under the Federal tort claims provisions of title 28, United States Code, unless action is begun within two years after such claim accrues is hereby waived in favor of any claims of Smith L. Parratt and Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Parratt, his parents, of Upland, California, against the United States arising out of the mauling of the said Smith L. Parratt by a grizzly bear in Glacier National Park, Montana, on July 18, 1960, if suit thereon is commenced within one year after date of enactment of this Act.

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

## JOHN F. MACPHAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5145) for the relief of John F. MacPhail, lieutenant, U.S. Navy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

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

There was no objection.

## EDWARD T. HUGHES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5307) for the relief of Edward T. Hughes.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edward T. Hughes, of Concord, Massachusetts, the sum of $250.00. Such sum represents reimbursement to the said Edward T. Hughes for paying out of his own funds judgments rendered against him in the United States District Court, Boston, Massachusetts, as a result of an accident occurring when Edward T. Hughes was operating a Government vehicle in the course of his duties as an employee of the Post Office Department: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

## L. C. ATKINS & SON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5811) for the relief of L. C. Atkins & Son.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency is authorized and directed to pay, out of funds made available to it by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator pursuant to the provisions of section 106(f) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, to L. C. Atkins and Son of the District of Columbia, the sum of $150. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said L. C. Atkins and Son against the United States for expenses and losses incurred by the said L. C. Atkins and Son in vacating business premises at the municipal fish wharves in the District of Columbia at the direction of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

## QUALITY SEAFOOD, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5812) for the relief of Quality Seafood, Inc.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency is authorized and directed to pay, out of funds made available to it by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator pursuant to the provisions of section 106(f) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, to Quality Seafood, Incorporated, of the District of Columbia, the sum of $3,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such corporation against the United States for expenses and losses incurred by it in vacating business premises at the municipal fish wharves in the District of Columbia at the direction of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percentum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

## NORMAN R. THARP

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5814) for the relief of Norman R. Tharp.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That Norman R. Tharp, Falls Church, Virginia, a civilian employee of the Department of the Air Force, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the sum of $940.80. Such sum represents the aggregate amount of salary overpayments received by him from the United States for the period beginning August 24, 1958, and ending July 9, 1960, as a result of administrative error and without fault on his part. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

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

## CHIEF M. SGT. SAMUEL W. SMITH, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6091) for the relief of Chief M. Sgt. Samuel W. Smith, U.S. Air Force.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Chief Master Sergeant Samuel W. Smith, AF 35402624, United States Air Force, Headquarters, Third Air Force, APO 125, care of Postmaster, New York, New York; the sum of $4,362.11 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement in addition to the amount he received under section 2732 of title 10, United States Code, for household goods and personal effects that were damaged in shipment from Biloxi, Mississippi, to Cambridgeshire, England, in April and May of 1960: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

## MAJ. WARREN G. WARD ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6180) for the relief of Maj. Warren G. Ward, Capt. Paul H. Beck, and 1st Lt. Russell K. Hansen, U.S. Air Force.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to the following-named officers of the United States Air Force, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, out of any amounts not otherwise appropriated, the sums indicated after each of their names, respectively: Major Warren G. Ward, AO772612, $1,304.50; Captain Paul H. Beck, 65608A, $989.40; and First Lieutenant Russel K. Hansen, AO3065176, $723.20. The payment authorized in this Act is in full satisfaction of the claim of each of these officers against the United States for reimbursement in addition to the amount he received under section 2732 of title 10, United States Code, for household goods and personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire of undetermined origin on July 23, 1962, at the Boweil Storage and Transit Company warehouse, Dayton, Ohio, while the property was stored in a warehouse under a Government contract. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with any of these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9: Strike "Russel" and insert "Russell".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

## ROBERT L. NOLAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6373) for the relief of Robert L. Nolan.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $412.20 to Robert L. Nolan, an employee of the United States Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal property owned by him which through no fault of his, was lost while he was carrying out his official duties: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

## MRS. MARGARET L. MOORE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6443) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret L. Moore.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.) and the Act of August 3, 1950, as amended (5 U.S.C. 61f et seq.), Mrs. Margaret L. Moore, of Arlington, Virginia, shall be held and considered to be entitled to the sums of $2,233.95 and $657.59, representing the respective balances due under said Acts in the case of Muriel I. Moore, deceased former employee of the Department of the Army. Payments under this Act shall be a bar to recovery by any other person.

SEC. 2. No part of the money mentioned in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

## DR. HENRY H. COHAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6628) for the relief of Dr. Henry H. Cohan.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Doctor Henry H. Cohan, of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the sum of $6,010.59, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained by the said Doctor Cohan as a result of damage to and destruction of his personal property in the warehouse of the Christian J. Ludwig Company, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, by a fire that occurred on October 4, 1958: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon his conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

## LOUIS C. WHEELER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6663) for the relief of Louis C. Wheeler.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Louis C. Wheeler, doing business as Sun Valley Construction, East Greenwich, Rhode Island, the sum of $7,958.85. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of Louis C. Wheeler against the United States for amounts due such person as a sub-subcontractor to Maguire Homes, Incorporated, under the contract entered into by Maguire Homes, Incorporated, and the New England Division, Corps of Engineers, United States Department of the Army, for the construction of housing at the North Kingstown, Rhode Island, Nike site: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 2. Upon the payment to Louis C. Wheeler of the sum authorized by the first section of this Act, all rights and remedies of such person against Maguire Homes, Incorporated, to recover amounts due such person as a sub-subcontractor to such corporation under the contract referred to in such first section, shall be transferred to the United States.

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

## SHELBURNE HARBOR SHIP & MARINE CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6808) for the relief of the Shelburne Harbor Ship & Marine Construction Co., Inc.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Shelburne Harbor Ship and Marine Construction Company, Incorporated (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "company"), of Shelburne, Vermont, is hereby relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the principal amount of $19,793.76, together with all accrued interest thereon. Such liability of the company arose from an order of March 10, 1958, of the Renegotiation Board with respect to profits of the company from a contract between the company and the Department of the Navy.

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

## MRS. JOHNSON BRADLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7019) to provide further compensation to Mrs. Johnson Bradley for certain land and improvements in the village of Odanah, Wis., taken by the Federal Government.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Johnson Bradley, of Phoenix, Arizona, the sum of $583.33, representing the difference between the amount of $16.67 paid to Mr. and Mrs. Bradley and the value of the land and improvements which were taken by the Federal Government in 1940 through condemnation, civil numbered 41, The United States of America against 13.718 Acres in

Ashland County, Wisconsin, and which have since been administered for the use and benefit of the Bad River Indians.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, add: "No part of the amount appropriated in this act thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

## HERBERT R. SCHAFF

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1532) for the relief of Herbert R. Schaff.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Herbert R. Schaff of Altadena, California, the sum of $2,450. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Herbert R. Schaff against the United States for the value of a jeep which was purchased with money stolen from him and forfeited to the United States Government because the purchaser and registered owner were unlawfully using the jeep to transport narcotics in violation of the internal revenue laws of the United States: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

## DAVEY ELLEN SNIDER SIEGEL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2724) for the relief of Davey Ellen Snider Siegel.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That any application of Mrs. Lenore Siegel, of Plainview, Long Island, New York, for dependency and indemnity compensation benefits on behalf of her child, Davey Ellen Snider Siegel, daughter of the late David Snider (XC-3-830-330), filed with the Veterans' Administration within the one-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act, shall be deemed to have been filed on April 1, 1949. Such benefits were terminated on March 31, 1949, as a result of Mrs. Siegel's remarriage, and as a result of administrative errors were not reinstated until May of 1962.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after "for" insert "service-connected death compensation or for".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

## OWEN L. GREEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2790) for the relief of Owen L. Green.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to recompute the additional annual leave to which Owen L. Green of Rochester, Minnesota, would have been entitled as an employee of the Post Office Department in the years 1959, 1960, and 1961, had he been correctly credited with his time in the military service, and the Postmaster General is further authorized and directed to credit the annual leave account of the said Owen L. Green with the amount of the additional leave so computed to remain available until used.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, following line 11, insert: "The annual leave credited under the authority of this Act shall not form the basis for lump sum leave payment in the event that the said Owen L. Green is separated from the postal service."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

## CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4145) for the relief of certain individuals.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each individual listed in section 2 of this Act the sum specified with respect to such individual. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of the claim of each such individual against the United States for loss of per diem allowance for the period October 21, 1959, to February 29, 1960, both dates inclusive, due to the erroneous modification of his orders: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 2. The claimants and the amount of each claim referred to in the first section of this Act are:

Commander C. N. Mitchell, 389841, United States Navy, $1,402.00;

Lieutenant Commander R. F. Hale, 498196, United States Navy, $1,348.00;

Lieutenant Commander W. J. Cowhill, 493647, United States Navy, $1,502.00;

Lieutenant J. B. Richard, 555140, United States Navy, $1,502.00;

Lieutenant P. (n) Durbin, 519555, United States Navy, $1,502.00;

Lieutenant J. M. Will, Junior, 586645, United States Navy, $1,388.00.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 23, add:

"No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. ASHMORE: Page 1, line 11, through page 2, line 9 after "orders:" Strike out "*Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

## MRS. M. ORTA WORDEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4288) for the relief of Mrs. M. Orta Worden.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, notwithstanding the limitations contained in section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, or any other statute of limitations, the claim of Mrs. M. Orta Worden, of Broderick, California, based upon the injuries she received in a fall on April 25, 1958, at the class VI concession building, Nouasseur Air Force Base, Casablanca, Morocco, which was filed on June 23, 1961, shall be held and considered to have been timely filed, and said claim shall be considered and settled in accordance with otherwise applicable provisions of law.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. M. Orta Worden of

Broderick, California, the sum of $10,864.89. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. M. Orta Worden against the United States resulting from injuries sustained by her as the consequence of a fall on April 25, 1958, at the class VI concession building, Nouasseur Air Force Base, Casablanca, Morocco. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provision of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. ASHMORE: Page 2, beginning on line 11, after "Morocco", strike out "No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

## THEODORE ZISSU

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5822) for the relief of Theodore Zissu.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 33 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 33), with respect to the filing of claims and the institution of suits for the return of property or any interest therein pursuant to section 9 or 32 of such Act (50 App. U.S.C. 9 or 32), Theodore Zissu, a United States citizen, may within six months after the enactment of this Act file a claim for the return of certain property, namely, his interest as owner of 30 per centum of the stock of Industria Romana Mechanica si Chimica S.A., Bucharest, Rumania, the forge plant property and equipment of which latter corporation was vested by the Office of Alien Property under Vesting Order Numbered 46, effective July 6, 1942, and supplement to Vesting Order Numbered 46, effective May 11, 1943, and which forge plant property and equipment was subsequently sold by said Office of Alien Property; and that claim shall be considered on its merits in accordance with the remaining provisions of that Act. If no such return is made within a period of sixty days after the filing of such claim, the said Theodore Zissu shall be entitled, within one year of the expiration of such period, to institute suit pursuant to section 9 of said Act (50 App. U.S.C. 9) for the return of such property.



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

## SP5C. CURTIS MELTON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6377) for the relief of Sp5c. Curtis Melton, Jr.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of American in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Specialist Five Curtis Melton, Junior (serial number RA24977421), the sum of $1,800. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of the claim of the said Specialist Five Curtis Melton, Junior, against the United States for losses suffered by him as the result of damage to his automobile in December 1959 while it was parked in front of his off-post residence in Kirchheimbolanden, Germany, caused by an Army vehicle being driven without authority and not on an authorized mission by a member of the Armed Forces: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike "$1,800" and insert "$1,180.95". The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

## CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN MINERAL INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE RECORD OWNERS OF THE SURFACE OF THAT PROPERTY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4211) to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in property in South Carolina to the record owners of the surface of that property.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to those persons who, on the date of enactment of this Act, are the record owners of the surface right thereof, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property consisting of fifty-three and three-tenths acres and more particularly described in the conveyance entered into between Gus Loskoski and Olo Loskoski as grantors and L. T. Vaughn and Sheron K. Vaughn as grantees, which conveyance is recorded in the office of the clerk of court for Anderson County, South Carolina, in deed book A-9 at page 257. Such conveyance shall be made only if application is made therefor by a record owner of the surface rights within one year after the date of enactment of this Act and upon payment to the United States by such record owner of the sum of $200 to reimburse the United States for the administrative cost of the conveyance plus the fair market value of the minerals as determined by the Secretary.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1326) to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in property in South Carolina to the record owners of the surface of that property.

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

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to those persons who, on the date of enactment of this Act, are the record owners of the surface rights thereof, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property consisting of fifty-three and three-tenths acres and more particularly described in the conveyance entered into between Gus Loskoski and Ola Loskoski as grantors and L. T. Vaughn and Sheron K. Vaughn as grantees, which conveyance is recorded in the office of the clerk of court for Anderson County, South Carolina, in deed book A-9 at page 257. Such conveyance shall be made only if application is made therefor by a record owner of the surface rights within one year after the date of enactment of this Act and upon payment to the United States by such record owner of such sum as may be fixed by the Secretary to reimburse the United States for the administrative cost of the conveyance plus the fair market value of the minerals as determined by the Secretary.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 4211) was laid on the table.

## UNITED DAUGHTERS OF THE CONFEDERACY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5703) granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) a certain design patent issued by the United States Patent Office of date November 8, 1898, being patent numbered 29,611, which is the insignia of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, which was renewed and extended for a period of fourteen years by Public Law Numbered 220, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved August 18, 1941, is hereby renewed and extended for an additional period of fourteen years from and after the date of enactment of this Act, with all the rights and privileges pertaining to the same, being generally known as the insignia of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

(b) No person who has manufactured the design of such patent between August 18, 1955, and the date of the enactment of this Act shall be held liable for infringement of such patent by reason of the continued manufacture and sale thereof.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the United Daughters of the Confederacy have a rich, and glorious heritage. They are dedicated to perpetuating the memory of those gallant men and women who sacrificed their lives and their fortunes for a principle in which they believed. The United Daughters of the Confederacy never cease paying homage to the dedicated, courageous, independent, self-reliant men of the Confederacy who suffered untold hardships—these men who went hungry, were ragged and who were often barefooted, who suffered through the chilling winds of winter and the dust and heat of summer. They endured these hardships because to them a principle was involved—a basic and fundamental principle of government and political philosophy. The United Daughters of the Confederacy will always honor the memory of such gallant men.

I am very proud of my own forebears and their devotion to the cause which they felt to be just. I am proud that my grandfather was a soldier for 4 long years, following the leadership of Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson. My own home in South Carolina was built for a gallant southerner who gave his life on the field of honor at Antietam. My mother, for as long as she lives, will attend the meetings of the United Daughters of the Confederacy and cherish the principles and ideals so honored.

Mr. Speaker, the United Daughters of the Confederacy not only honor those who dedicated their lives to the Confederacy, but this magnificent organization is fighting today to preserve the principles upon which this Nation was founded. They are fighting today for the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and for freedom and liberty. They believe in this Congress as the true representative of the American people. They defend the honor and integrity of this great body. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Robert Hamilton Smith, of Philadelphia, Pa., is now the president of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. Mrs. Robert Bachman of Washington, D.C., is the immediate past president. Under the able and distinguished leadership of these great ladies, the United Daughters of the Confederacy is determined to play a major role in the preservation of our great country. It has been one of the happiest privileges of my life to be closely associated with these noble ladies in their endearing and dedicated efforts.

Mr. Speaker, on November 8, 1898, a certain design patent was issued by the U.S. Patent Office which was the insignia of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. This patent has been renewed and extended upon several occasions by the Congress. The bill before the House at this time, H.R. 5703, will revive and extend the patent rights of the United Daughters of the Confederacy for another 14 years.

In recognition of the outstanding leadership of Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Bachman, and the patriots whom they represent, I urge that the House pass this bill. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the patriotism and devotion to the ideas and principles of true Americanism of the great ladies of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, it is my earnest hope that the House will unanimously approve this legislation.

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

## MRS. ROZSI NEUMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2260) for the relief of Mrs. Rozsi Neuman.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a)(3) and section 212(a)(19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Rozsi Neuman may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided,* That, unless the beneficiary is entitled to care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "and section 212(a)(19".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

## ELIZABETH KOLLOIAN IZMIRIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2303) for the relief of Elizabeth Kolloian.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Elizabeth Kolloian, shall be held and considered to be the natural born child of Mrs. Baizer Ismirian, a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parent of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, a petition filed in behalf of Elizabeth Kolloian Izmirian, by Mrs. Baizar Izmirian may be approved pursuant to the provisions of section 205(b) of the act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "For the relief of Elizabeth Kolloian Izmirian."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## FIORE LUIGI BIASIOTTA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3648) for the relief of Fiore Luigi Biasiotta.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Fiore Luigi Biasiotta, shall be held and considered to be the natural born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Fiore Biasiotta, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status, under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Fiore Luigi Biasiotta may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Fiore Biasiotta, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

## ANNA KRYSTYNA CHMIELEWSKA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3762) for the relief of Anna Krystyna Chmielewska.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Anna Krystyna Chmielewska shall be held and considered to be the natural born alien child of Joseph and Cecylia Chmielewski citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna C. Chmie-

lewski may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Chmielewski, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "For the relief of Anna C. Chmielewski."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## NORIYUKI MIYATA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4075) for the relief of Noriyuki Miyata.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Noriyuki Miyata, shall be held and considered to be the natural born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Y. Miyoshi, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Noriyuki Miyata may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Harry Y. Miyoshi, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

## ETSUKO (MATSUO) McCLELLAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4863) for the relief of Etsuko (Matsuo) McClellan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill S. 280 be considered in lieu of the House bill.

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

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Etsuko Matsuo McClellan, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sergeant Curtis O. McClellan and Jewell McClellan, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Etsuko Matsuo McClellan shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 4863) was laid on the table.

## JANOS KARDOS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 752) for the relief of Janos Kardos.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Janos Kardos may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking approved by the Attorney General be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act: *And provided further,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

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

## MRS. EURINA P. RICHARDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1201) for the relief of Mrs. Eurina P. Richards.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Eurina P. Richards shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Mrs. Eurina P. Richards. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Mrs. Eurina P. Richards shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

## JAN OWSIAK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1280) for the relief of Jan Owsiak.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Jan Owsiak, shall be held and considered to be the natural born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Koss, citizens of the United States; *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jan Koss may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Koss, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Jan Koss."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MARGUERITE LEFEBVRE BROUGHTON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7022) for the relief of Marguerite Lefebvre Broughton.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Marguerite Lefebvre Broughton may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided,* That, unless the beneficiary is entitled to care under chapter 55, title 10, United States Code, a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

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

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with at this time.

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

There was no objection.

## BARBARA THERESA LAZARUS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 1518) for the relief of Barbara Theresa Lazarus, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 3, strike out sections 203(a)(3) and 205 and insert "titles I and II."

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this presently on the calendar?

Mr. FEIGHAN. This bill has already passed the House providing for third preference status for the adopted child of lawfully resident aliens.

It went to the Senate and the Senate amended it to provide that the beneficiary also be permitted to avail herself of the quota chargeability of her adoptive father.

Mr. GROSS. The minority is acquainted with the change made in the bill?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes, it has been cleared.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 469 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require; after which I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the privilege today of bringing to the House, by direction of the Committee on Rules, the rule making in order the consideration of H.R. 4955, which is a bill to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation. I support the rule and urge its adoption. If the rule is adopted we will go into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for 3 hours of general debate, which will be followed by debate under the 5-minute rule. At the end of debate the House will vote the bill, H.R. 4955, up or down. I shall support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Central Government has now for almost half a century recognized its obligation to support quality vocational education programs throughout the Nation. Perhaps only now are we beginning to recognize fully the correlation between our national social ills—and I refer to unemployment, economic distress, juvenile delinquency, crime—and our educational programs.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps only now do we see that the central paradox of our modern technological economy—the growth of hard-core unemployment combined with an increase in the demand for highly skilled personnel—can be approached most effectively by increased efforts in education. But, Mr. Speaker, we can take pride this afternoon that our predecessors who served in Congress were equally observant and were more constructive in their analysis of what they saw. They left a great challenge to us.

Over 50 years ago individuals and institutions petitioned the Congress for Federal assistance to public schools to meet the vocational training needs of a Nation that was beginning to grow rapidly in the industrial field. On January 20, 1914, Congress approved the creation of a special Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, with the responsibility "to consider the subject of national aid for vocational education and report their findings and recommendations not later than June 1 next." After exhaustive surveys, the Commission reported back to Congress that the economic growth of our Nation depended on the availability of a labor force adequately trained to perform the jobs being created by our expanding industrialization. That report stated:

There is a great and crying need of providing vocational education of this character for every part of the United States—to conserve and develop our resources; to promote a more productive and prosperous agriculture; to prevent the waste of human labor; to supplement apprenticeship; to increase the wage-earning power of our productive workers; to meet the increasing demand for trained workmen; to offset the increased cost of living. Vocational education is therefore needed as a wise business investment for the Nation because our national prosperity and happiness are at stake and our position in the markets of the world cannot otherwise be maintained.

Our predecessors recognized the force of these facts, and arguments. On February 23, 1917, Woodrow Wilson signed the Smith-Hughes Act into law. At the final vote in the House, only one dissenting voice was heard. With this act, Congress affirmed the Jeffersonian concept of Federal support for the vocational training needs of the Nation. Congress realized that industrialization was bringing about far-reaching changes in the labor market, resulting in new demands for workers equipped with new abilities.

Mr. Speaker, we of the 88th Congress are faced with problems comparable in every respect to the problems our predecessors faced in 1917. The facts are also clear. We can see the trends of our labor demands. We can read the newspaper advertisements—advertisements for skilled technical workers or trained engineers. We can read the unemployment figures—figures that vary but never vanish. We can interpret the statistical reports: Over 90 percent of our unemployment is among those with high school diplomas or less, yet 30 to 40 percent of youngsters now in the fifth grade will probably not graduate from high school; more than 20 million noncollege graduates are expected to enter the labor market in the 1960's; the loss of 1 year's income due to unemployment is more than the total cost of education through high school.

There is no need for further evidence that vocational education is a key to our national economic security and our citizens' personal self-fulfillment. The need today is for increased efforts in a field which the Nation long ago acclaimed an area of special concern to the Federal Government.

Times have changed since that first Commission made its report in 1914, but our underlying goals have not, nor have the Nation's needs. The task today is to modernize and expand the structure that was originally envisaged by the 1914 Commission—which was, incidentally, a congressional Commission composed of Members of both Houses of Congress as well as private citizens. Their report also speaks of social and technological change, of population shift from the farms to the cities, of the replacement of the craftsman by division of labor and the factory system. These trends, which are writ much larger today, were no doubt in the minds of many Congressmen as they enacted in 1917 that legislative landmark, the Smith-Hughes Act.

It is again time for us to fulfill traditional obligations in meeting the labor needs of a new age. There is no doubt that Federal efforts can mean a profound difference to individuals faced with the threat of unemployment but untrained for the specialized demands of our labor market. The achievements under programs of Smith-Hughes and George-Barden are matters of public record.

Our ability to deal effectively with the complex problems faced by vocational educators has been demonstrated by the success of the area vocational school

program provided by title VIII of the National Defense Education Act. In fiscal year 1962, 630 schools participated in the program; 148,920 citizens received training for jobs demanding specialized skills of one form or another. And of the 9,946 graduates of preparatory programs in that year, 83.5 percent of those available for employment were placed in positions directly or indirectly related to the fields in which they had been trained.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this record is dramatic and incontrovertible evidence that, in the face of the most difficult economic problems, we can save our Nation millions of dollars while making available to thousands of our citizens an opportunity to make their own way through a rapidly changing world of work.

In 1958 I had the privilege of being the author in the House of the National Defense Education Act. Title VIII—the vocational education title—was one of its keystones. It was one of its most important titles. It has accomplished everything that we envisioned for it, and more. I am proud today to have the privilege of reciting some of the accomplishments under this title.

For those who are able to look beyond the immediate future to, say, 10 years from now, it is obvious that every dollar we spend on vocational training programs will yield a tremendous return in savings to our economy. The returns will be twofold: Savings in reduced welfare cost, and increases in income tax returns. The unemployed person pays no taxes and consumes few goods; the underemployed contributes little more to our economic growth. An enlarged and comprehensive vocational education program will strengthen our economy as a whole by strengthening the capacity of individuals to produce, consume, and pay taxes. It is economic as well as commonsense that says we must invest now in vocational education, and invest heavily.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the success of the National Defense Education Act and other vocational educational programs, the impression may be generated that we are doing quite well—that we need only continue as in the past. I must emphasize that this bill, H.R. 4955, confronts the fact that our limited past efforts can by no means deal with the tremendous size of our present problem. Just as in 1917 Congress was faced with great new challenges to vocational education, so today are we faced with explosive new difficulties, demanding new approaches and increased efforts.

In 1961 the President requested the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to appoint a special Advisory Panel to review and evaluate the vocational education acts and make recommendations for improvement and redirection. The Panel reported to the President in November of 1962, reaffirming the view that education and training are sound investments in people: vocational education graduates do find employment in fields related to their training. The Panel also found that the local-State-Federal partnership provides the skills that are vital to the welfare of the entire Nation. This has been demonstrated dramatically by the training of defense workers in World War II, the practical nurse training program, and the technical education program of the National Defense Education Act.

The following recommendations of the Panel point out existing deficiencies in our vocational education effort:

1. Vocational education should be available to more people. Only about 4 million persons are now enrolled, more than half of whom are adults.

2. Vocational education must be made available in more types of schools. As specialized training and relatively expensive equipment is involved, the development of area schools would allow neighboring school districts to join forces in support of vocational programs open to all their qualified students.

3. Vocational training must be made available for new and emerging occupations. Under existing acts, funds are allotted only for traditional categories such as agriculture, home economics, trades and industries, and distributive occupation; if programs could not be confined to these restrictive definitions, then they were not eligible for Federal support.

4. More vocational education programs must be provided for young people who have special needs. This group includes the disadvantaged, the school dropouts and the youths who have physical or mental handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the traditional vocational programs. Restrictions in existing laws have prevented vocational educators from developing new programs to prepare these young people for jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before you is designed to make these recommendations a reality—just as in 1917 the Smith-Hughes Act followed the suggestions of another vocational education advisory group.

H.R. 4955 authorizes new appropriations for State vocational education programs amounting to $45 million for fiscal year 1964, $90 million for fiscal year 1965, $135 million for fiscal year 1966, and $180 million for subsequent fiscal years. The new funds would be expended for State and local vocational education programs without categorical limitation under a broadened definition of vocational education. Business and office occupations not now covered under existing law are included. The State administering agency would periodically review vocational education programs in the light of current and projected manpower needs and job opportunities. The need for cooperation between State vocational agencies and public employment offices is emphasized and student vocational counseling services are encouraged.

The bill authorizes vocational education programs for persons in high school, for those out of high school available for full-time study, for persons who are unemployed or underemployed, and for persons who have academic or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in regular vocational education programs.

While this bill requires the State to continue its current level of support for vocational education, it does not require a State to match new Federal funds for program operations in fiscal year 1964. For subsequent fiscal years a 50 to 50 matching grant basis is required. In addition, States must assure that Federal funds complement but do not replace local and State funds.

To assure that Federal funds may be used by the State to meet actual manpower needs and job opportunities, the bill authorizes a State to transfer funds allotted under George-Barden and Smith-Hughes from one category to another or to any occupational training covered by the new authority. In such cases the State must justify such action as being consistent with the purposes of the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

H.R. 4955 eliminates the "farm practice requirement" and broadens the definition of vocational agriculture in the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts so as to permit Federal funds to be expended in agricultural training programs for occupations related to agriculture in which a knowledge and skill of agricultural subjects are involved. Moreover, home economics training under existing law is now limited to preparation for work in the home. H.R. 4955 would permit the use of George-Barden and Smith-Hughes money in the home economics category for home economics training not directed to home activity but involving homemaking skills for which there were employment opportunities. For fiscal year 1966 and subsequently, 25 percent of the funds now authorized under Smith-Hughes and George-Barden for home economics training would have to be either expended by the State for training which is job-oriented or transferred to some other training program.

The area technical education program, authorized by title VIII of the National Defense Education Act, is made permanent with its present $15 million authorization. In addition, H.R. 4955 would permit the States to expend funds for the construction of area school facilities. Although matching of Federal funds is not generally required in fiscal year 1964, Federal funds spent in that year for area school construction purposes would be matched on a 50-50 basis. Because of the national urgency for area school training opportunities for out-of-school youths and adults, at least 25 percent of the new Federal allotment must be expended for the construction of such facilities or for the cost of operating programs of instruction for this type of student.

The bill requires the State administering agency periodically to evaluate vocational education programs in the light of "current manpower needs and job opportunities." An advisory committee is established by the bill to advise the Commissioner of Education with respect to policies in the administration of vocational education programs. In addition, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will appoint a National Advisory Council during 1966 to review the administering of all vocational education programs aided with Federal funds and to make recommendations regarding their improvement for transmission to the Congress. A similar council is to be formed by the Secretary every 5 years during the continuation of the program.

Finally, several provisions of the bill contribute to the improvement of quality in vocational education programs by authorizing expenditures for inservice teacher training, program evaluation, special demonstration on experimental programs, development of instructional materials, and State administration leadership. Five percent of the total funds appropriated are set apart for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner of Education to make grants to State boards, to colleges, universities, and other public or nonprofit private agencies or institutions or, with the approval of the State boards, to local educational agencies for developing materials, conducting research, carrying out pilot projects for the special needs of youths—particularly youths in economically depressed areas and youths having special academic or other problems.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not speak in greater detail concerning the various provisions of H.R. 4955. Others who follow are better qualified to explain its various sections. I shall make two or three general observations about this bill, however. In the first place, H.R. 4955 builds well on foundations already found trustworthy by time. By that I mean that these provisions strengthen ideas and goals already proved effective but overtaxed through limitations on funds or technicalities. The new provisions are new applications of basic principles that remain valid. Programs designed to meet the needs of 1917 can scarcely be expected to be adequate for the demands of 1963. New terms and new policies reflect our different dilemmas; there is the solid assurance, borne out by past history, that we can effectively meet our demands by increasing our efforts in the field of vocational education.

Second, I must point out that, in terms of cost, the proposals are modest in size. The President's Panel of Consultants recommended a Federal expenditure of $400 million a year to meet the immediate needs of vocational education. The Committee on Education and Labor agreed that this was a reasonably accurate measure of the need for activity, but a majority felt that it would be administratively impossible to immediately expand present programs to such a magnitude. Thus the bill calls for a graduated expenditure of only $45 million in the first year; then $90 million and $135 million in the next 2 years, respectively; and finally, $180 million in the fourth and following years. Mr. Speaker, these are modest proposals, in terms of immediate need and in terms of investment for the future of our economy and of our young people. These sums can by no stretch of the imagination be considered excessive.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I urge that the House of Representatives approve House Resolution 469, providing for 3 hours of debate on H.R. 4955, and making in order the consideration of a committee substitute amendment as the original bill as described in House Resolution 469.

All of us here today must realize that what we say will be meaningless unless we are able to pass this bill. I hope that no Member will kill, or jeopardize the life of this bill by offering the so-called Powell amendment to it. In my judgment, that amendment would hurt the bill. I believe it would kill it. It would make it impossible in this time of stress and strain for many true friends of vocational education to vote for the bill. I oppose the Powell amendment. This bill should not be made a vehicle of racial agitation. I shall vote against it in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union if it is offered. I shall vote against the Powell amendment if it is made a part of a motion to recommit the bill. I think we can all agree that people of all races, colors, and creeds will reap great benefits under this bill.

The addition of the Powell amendment will prevent both the minorities, and the majority of our population from obtaining the help that this bill will bring.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment and commend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] who will bring this new vocational education bill to the floor after the rule on it is adopted. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is the author and chief sponsor of the bill. He is a tower of strength in the field of vocational education, and in the field of education generally in this country. I had the privilege of serving 10 years with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] on the House Committee on Education and Labor, from 1951 to 1960. I know at first hand of his dedication to the interests of the people he represents and, indeed, of all the people of this country. I spent many years working on what became the National Defense Education Act of 1958. He and I worked side by side to bring about the passage of that act. We not only worked to pass the National Defense Education Act but we worked also to pass Public Law 565 which has meant so much in the expansion of vocational rehabilitation in this country; we worked side by side to pass the teacher training law for mentally retarded children. Now, today, I again stand with my friend, CARL PERKINS, in urging the adoption of this great piece of legislation which bears his name. This bill is a landmark in education. I think it may well be the most important piece of legislation this session of Congress will consider.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 114]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Green, Oreg. | Miller, Calif. |
| Baring | Griffin | Miller, N.Y. |
| Battin | Gubser | Minshall |
| Belcher | Jones, Ala. | Nedzi |
| Blatnik | Jones, Mo. | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Buckley | Kilburn | Rains |
| Colmer | Knox | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Cramer | Macdonald | Rogers, Tex. |
| Evins | Martin, Mass. | Roush |
| Fuqua | Meader | Schneebeli |
| Shelley | Van Pelt | Wilson, Charles H. |
| Sheppard | Vinson | Winstead |
| Thompson, N.J. | Wallhauser | |
| Trimble | Whitten | |
| Ullman | Williams | |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 392 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

## VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, we are considering House Resolution 469, providing for the consideration of H.R. 4955.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama, my colleague on the Committee on Rules [Mr. ELLIOTT], has very ably and very well described this legislation and the resolution which makes in order the consideration of H.R. 4955 with 3 hours general debate.

I shall not discuss all the details of this legislation. Instead, I will discuss it from a different viewpoint entirely.

Many of you who have served with me throughout the years know I have not been enamored of most of the Federal aid to education measures or bills that have been introduced in this House. Yet, I feel this is a type and a kind of an education bill that is entitled to full consideration by the House of Representatives and one that may prove to be the best and most necessary piece of educational legislation to come before the Congress in this session.

It is true it does contain certain provisions for Federal aid to State and local schools. But, it is also true, as has been so ably pointed out by the gentleman from Alabama, that for nearly 50 years—more than 40 years—we have had in this country a vocational education act, the Smith-Hughes Act, under which the Federal Government has contributed through the States to the various schools of this country, primarily to aid in training students in agriculture; and a little later on the Congress again approved the idea of Federal aid for vocational education in the form of the George-Barden Act. And, it is true, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] has explained to you, that this bill does call for an increase in the amount of Federal funds which shall be allocated to the various States for educational purposes.

At the present time, and for some time in the past, the Federal Government has been furnishing Federal aid, under the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act and the George Barden Act, about $57 million a year to the States to carry on vocational education under the provisions of those two laws.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would provide for the extension, the expansion, or the spread, of vocational education activities of the various States in their local school districts, at an expense to the Federal Government of some $450 million that would be authorized under this bill, but not necessarily actually spent, because as I understand it, the Committee on Ap-

propriations would still have control over the amount appropriated, based upon the showing which would be made as to the needs for the use of all the money. This would be some $450 million in addition to the present $57 million each year for vocational education used during the next 4 years in the various States, with the money going to the States, with the States to control the spending of such money over the broad field of vocational education.

Mr. Speaker, $450 million, my friends, is a lot of money in any language. Yet, sometimes when we stop to think for a moment as to what is done here at this Capitol and in this very chamber itself, $450 million is not as much as some of us think. Why, bless your hearts, this bill would provide $450 million for a vocational education program over a 4-year period to take young men and young women off the streets and give them an opportunity to learn a trade or to equip themselves to make a living, but not to send them out into the woods for 6 months has has been proposed in some legislation pending before this House, but to fit them for life's work. Compare that, if you please, with the $450 million that was included in the Area Redevelopment Act that was wanted for that purpose. To give what? About 25,000 jobs, I believe, temporarily. Compare it, if you please, with the $450 million that was spent in 1 year for the accelerated public works program—that much each year—to give less employment, and temporarily only. Compare it, if you please, with the amount that we pay in Federal unemployment benefits.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, let us stop and think a moment. Why, this very body I am addressing now just last week, according to the figures that have been furnished me, if they are correct, as I believe they are, voted overwhelmingly—not with my vote, but overwhelmingly—to authorize the expenditure of $2,087 million in a single year for a moon shot; to see whether or not we can put a man on the moon when we do not know now whether we can or we cannot, or what we would do with him if we got him there, or how much it might be worth to us, when we are told that it will cost a total of from $20 to $40 billion to do that. That is for a single year—$2,087 million in direct funds for that purpose, and not to count nor take into consideration, or add to, that huge amount of money that was spent, or is being spent, or being authorized to be spent, for supplemental efforts that would aid that moon shot program and, actually, not counting what is being done by the military that will be of benefit to it.

I am wondering how we fix values in our own minds. I am wondering how we decide just how taxpayers' money shall be spent, and whether we should or should not spend some of the taxpayers' money to do the things experience has taught us, because we have had over 40 years' experience with this vocational education thing, that prepares men and women to go out and earn a livelihood, to become self-supporting citizens, to contribute to their best society, to their government, and to the welfare of the people as a whole whether or not that is the best way to spend some of the tax money that has been allotted to us. We have not always done very good in husbanding the money of the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, it is for that reason I am going to support this legislation, if it includes by the time it winds its way through all legislative maneuvering on the floor, if it contains the amendments I feel it should contain and which I understand will be offered. I do not know of any reason why it should not contain certain amendments that will be offered. I believe it has the support of most Members of this House.

I believe what we spend on this program will be actually an investment of far greater concern than money we are spending on a great many other projects. I can name a great many of them for you, if I should take the time to do so. We are very liberal with about everything under the sun, and everybody under the sun, except perhaps the things right in front of our eyes that we now see here.

I am not interested in establishing a Domestic Peace Corps for sending a lot of people out through the cities and the countryside to try to tell the youth of America what they ought to do and how they ought to live. Instead I like the idea of giving our youth an opportunity to learn for themselves how to live by getting the opportunity to secure the training they need, by being urged to go to school, and to take job training or what have you.

Just stop and think for a moment. Unemployment rampant? Yes, and we have spent billions on it. Yet if you go out and try to find somebody to do a job of painting on your house or to repair your radio or television, or your automobile, you will find that we now have a shortage of skilled workers in this country. We need to take these young people and give them an opportunity to get an education, and if for nothing else, to learn a trade so they may earn their own living, and become self-supporting and perhaps even make more money than you or I, because many of those who become skilled in the various trades are highly paid. I am thinking of printers and other craftsmen, all in short supply because we have not had the technical schools, we have not had the local schools, the high schools and colleges, to prepare them. Somebody spoke about the Ph. D.'s, and that we may have too many Ph. D.'s, but not enough good craftsmen. Perhaps we had better start at the bottom and go on up from there. This is the way to start, right here by enacting legislation of this sort.

It is for that reason, believing as I do that great things start quite often with humble beginnings, that I am going to support this legislation, and I am going to urge everyone who is within the sound of my voice to give attention to the debate and discussion on it. I think you will find it worthwhile.

You will see it does lead to control of vocational education within the State and local communities, and I am rather proud of the fact I am able to stand here in the well of the House today to say that my own State of Ohio has been leading the way, and is one of the leading States of the Union, in furnishing vocational education and in giving technical assistance through many of our high schools staying open at night, along with many of our technical schools, and with industry sending their workmen to such schools so that they may better themselves by preparing for higher positions.

We have created a new climate in Ohio in the last year or so as a result of such cooperation. So I think I know from experience in my own State what can be done and what will be done if this kind of program is put into effect.

Remember, this money is furnished to each State under this bill on a matching basis; the State or local school district must meet its share of the cost with the exception of the first year. Together, through the Federal Government and the State and local communities working together, this problem of what to do with a great many young people who need to be trained in the various skills will be answered and will be answered promptly. It will not take 7, 8, 10, 15, or 20 years, as some people insist with regard to other legislative bills which come before us when they talk about how you want to send someone through 15 or 20 years of college. What most people need now is to learn things which may take 3 to 6 months to learn, and none over a year. Much of it will take far less time than that. It can be done, and will be done, if we have the right sort of cooperation and the right sort of supervision. I believe this legislation is at least a step in the right direction.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Rules [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is the vocational education bill. I am usually opposed to Federal aid to education largely because I believe there is a desire on the part of the bureaus administering those programs to get control of local education and the local curriculum, and that is something that many of us think should be left to the local communities, that is, to guide the curriculum and the method of educating the youth. However, vocational education is something that has been going on in this Government for many, many years, as you all know. This is a supplemental authorization for further aid for vocational education. This is a thing that is very much desired and is very much needed. We are contributing and the States and communities are contributing billions of dollars to educate people to do white-collar work. If we keep on that trend, the time is going to come when there will not be anyone left to draw the water and chop the wood and there are a lot of people who could be usefully occupied if they had the proper skills. This is what this program is designed to do and I hope to be able to vote for this bill. But there are features in it that I do not think ought to be in it. I think you will find them in every one of these educational bills and many other pieces of legislation where

the Federal Government is giving back to the States some little pittance of the money that they have taken away from them and where they want to keep their hand on the administration of it. There is so much redtape and there are so many reports to be made and so many conditions to be met by the States that it involves a lot of useless work. I do not know why.

I have never understood why Congress and the Members of Congress are unwilling to trust the States that elect them to the Congress. Why could we not have a little confidence in our States that they will do the right thing and spend this money in the way intended? But apparently we do not.

There are provisions in this bill that go far beyond the necessary policing of these programs. I am going to come to that in a minute, but before I do, I want to say this. Mr. Speaker, I am told that there will be offered what is commonly known as the Powell amendment to this bill. There are a lot of us who want to vote for this bill. To offer that amendment, if it is adopted, simply means that you are diminishing the chances of this bill passing the Congress, because there are a lot of people who cannot vote for it with that provision in it. But that is the responsibility of the people who are fostering that amendment.

There is not any use in offering that amendment because that same committee I am told, is prepared to report such a bill which incorporates the whole of the Powell amendment and you will have it, generally speaking, over everything.

There is a second reason why you do not need to put it on there. The President has issued an Executive order, as you all know, putting all housing under the Powell amendment, although Congress had refused to do it. And more lately the President issued an Executive order or had one issued, putting the Area Redevelopment Act under the Powell amendment, although Congress did not do it. Why not just have him issue the Executive order and say, "This is going to be the law from now on out; Congress does not have to pass it, I will pass it."

Why do you want to do it? Are you trying to defeat this bill? It does not seem to make sense to me.

There are one or two things I want to say about the bill itself, and then I am going to yield to my good friend from Louisiana. This is the only piece of legislation I ever saw where they have not only the Bureau that is going to exercise police powers over the program, but two advisory committees, not one, over the same bill. How many of you know that that is in the bill? What is the sense of it? If you have a copy of the bill before you, look at it and you will find on page 53 an Advisory Committee on Vocational Education, established in the Office of Education and hereinafter referred to as the "Advisory Committee." Then two or three pages later you find again that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, during 1966, appoint an Advisory Council on Vocational Education for the purpose of reviewing the administration of the act.

Now you have two advisory committees on top of the Office of Education and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Why throw that money away, I wonder? Because in each one of these you provide for the appointment of 12 commissioners, and each one of those receives $75 a day and any employee help they need; $75 a day for 2 commissions of 12 each means $1,800 a day as the money that is so badly needed for education that you are going to throw away in this kind of bill.

Why do we have to deal with that kind of foolishness, anyway? I hope the House will knock out those provisions. This bill is something that is needed and is well worthwhile. It supplements a program we already have. Why fill it up with a lot of gobbledegook and unusual expenditure of public money that could better be spent on the education of our people?

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding because I want to associate myself with the remarks that he has made, and with particular reference to the Presidential Executive orders. As a matter of fact, if you look at the history of what has gone on in Congress in recent years, it is really not necessary for us to legislate at all, because all the President has to do and is doing is to issue Executive orders negating the action of Congress and voiding the policies of Congress in every instance, and particularly in instances which funds are shared by a State.

With the broad powers which are contained in these Executive orders, it does not make one tinker's dam about what we do about the so-called Powell amendment here. The Executive order would be immediately issued putting it into effect, as it has been put into effect in civil defense and many other areas, though the Congress has time, and time, and time again rejected this proposal. The Executive order supersedes the will of the Congress, and we may as well wake up to the fact that we are living under executive direction, Executive fiat, contrary to what the Congress proposes. It is about time we do something about it.

I hope as many of you Members as possible will be on the floor tomorrow when the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] discuss the Gesell report which puts into effect the very controversial Public Accommodations Act which is now before the Congress for consideration. It has already been put into effect by the order.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, after the very informative remarks of my colleague from Alabama and my colleagues from Virginia and Ohio there is very little I could add as to the basic provisions in the bill. There are, however, several side issues that have presented themselves and upon which I would like to comment. Viewing the legislative procedure perspectively, I want to make a comment, too, in reference to the bill itself.

I was called off the floor briefly during the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], but I am sure it has been stated that the amounts in this bill do not represent all the money that will be available for spending for vocational education.

I think the House should be reminded that there is a continuing authorization of $57 million a year for several existing vocational programs, and that the amount contained in this bill, whatever it might eventually be, will be not in lieu of, but in addition to the existing authorization.

Now that is academic. What I think should be stated, Mr. Speaker, is this, I have been advised that the other body has deferred further consideration of a similar bill to see what action the House will take on this vocational training bill. I am advised that some hearings have been held and some amendments offered to S. 580. Those amendments have been discussed, but no action has been taken on the amendments, pending the action of the House.

Now what do these amendments do? I can answer that very briefly. They simply double the amount of money being authorized in the bill we are debating today. What I want to say to the membership is this, as the gentlemen who have preceded me in this well today have already said, I am supporting this bill in its present authorization. However, if the other body, as it very well might do in view of what has been done in the previous session and what I understand is being discussed in the committee—if the other body doubles the amount of money that is going to be made available each year, I shall object to this bill going to conference. It will come back to the Rules Committee before it goes to conference. Now it may get a rule. That shall be determined later. Nevertheless, I want to state as clearly and as emphatically as I can, Mr. Speaker, that I think the amount contained in this bill is well justified. This program is in the public interest but the fact that $45 million is good now does not mean that $108 million for fiscal year 1964 will be better. I think the House should be cautioned in this respect.

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

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

Mr. GOODELL. I agree with the gentleman. I think there is grave doubt that they can use $45 million in the first year, but I think the program is important enough that we ought to give them at least that much leeway. But I do not think we ought to go beyond that, and I hope we will stand firm if, as I understand, the other body does add more money.

Mr. AVERY. I will say that my apprehension and caution go beyond fiscal year 1964. There are three additional fiscal years provided for in this bill, and I am advised that all of these amounts could possibly be doubled. I shall fur-

ther object, I may say to my friend, the gentleman from New York, if the other body proceeds in its judgment to double the amounts being authorized for fiscal years 1965, 1966, and 1967.

Mr. GOODELL. I agree with the gentleman on that too.

Mr. AVERY. I appreciate the gentleman's assurances.

Mr. Speaker, with reference to the other matter that has been discussed by the gentleman from Virginia and to some extent by the gentleman from Ohio—the possibility of an antidiscrimination amendment being added when this bill is being considered in Committee of the Whole—I do not know that such an amendment should be referred to as the Powell amendment. I do not want to subtract or detract any dignity from the gentleman from New York regarding the assignment of, or credit for, the amendment. I am sure that as this amendment is read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it will not be referred to as the Powell amendment. When this bill was before the Committee on Rules, I pointed out that I thought it was rather strange that we had both this vocational bill and a Federal aid for college facilities bill before the committee with no antidiscrimination amendments from the Committee on Education and Labor, and then we find that a simple extension of Public Law 874, a program that has been continually reauthorized by the Congress since 1946, has an antidiscrimination amendment in it. Regardless of which side of this issue you are on, you cannot help but agree with me that at least we have to be consistent. Either there should be an antidiscrimination amendment in this bill and in the college facilities bill on which we began hearings this morning—and I think there should be—or that provision should be taken out of the impacted areas bill.

Mr. Speaker, in one of the morning papers, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] was quoted as saying that if an antidiscrimination amendment were added by the House to this vocational education bill, such an amendment would have the effect of defeating the bill.

Now, I ask you very simply, What kind of a dilemma have we developed for ourselves? I am sure that every Member on this floor has received a request for an audience from a representative——

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

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Six minutes.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume, but not to exceed 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think every Member—I will repeat—I think every Member of the House has received a request for an audience from a representative of the NAACP organization in his State to ask support for the civil rights bill.

Now, how in the world can we justify leaving the antidiscrimination clause out of this bill with this entire issue squarely before Congress and being debated by two committees in the other body, and I think also by two committees in this body. How can debate on a simple bill like this prompt a strong advocate of civil rights such as the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], to say that if we tie that amendment onto this bill, we will destroy the bill?

Now, I am just not able to understand the logic of such a conclusion. Either a civil rights provision is right or it is wrong. It is just as simple at that. If it is right in the bill which is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary and if it is right in the bill which the President has sent to Congress, it is right in the bill we are debating today.

Mr. Speaker, may I go just one step further. My committee chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], is on the floor, and I reluctantly find myself in opposition or taking exception to some of the positions that are enunciated by him. I do not do this very often, but in this particular case I must, not on the issue of civil rights, but on a matter of legislative principle. Relative to the assumption of our responsibility, or the delegation of that responsibility to the Executive, I cannot agree with him that Congress does not need to take a position as far as an antidiscrimination amendment in this bill. As I understand his position, the problem will merely be solved by the Executive. This is clearly a responsibility of the House of Representatives and every Member should vote his or her conviction, whether he supports it or whether he does not. I do not believe that there is any logical reasoning whereby we can say we are "Pontius Pilates," and wash our hands of this, and let this issue be taken care of down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

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

Mr. AVERY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for his excellent presentation here today and I want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks in regards to the antidiscriminatory amendment. If we do what the previous speaker from Louisiana and the gentleman from Virginia advocate we would pass this on to the President to issue an Executive order—what we would be doing is shunting our responsibility to the executive branch of Government. We have a responsibility here today to act on this issue and if we do not put an antidiscriminatory clause in this vocational education bill which I stand 100 percent behind, what we are doing here today is telling the young folk in some parts of this country, If your skin does not happen to be white you are not going to benefit by this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend again the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a number of observers and commentators who subscribe to the big spending philosophy have criticized this body and the other body for not moving expeditiously. These observers further assert that the Executive was therefore prompted to take the initiative and submit various proposals to get the country moving again. We have been accused of not living up to our responsibilities. This is why the Congress has not been as effective and dominant as was intended by those who drafted the Constitution.

Here is the test today. Do we live up to our constitutional responsibilities or do we not?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the committee for bringing this legislation to the floor of the House today. The sum and substance of this bill is that hundreds of thousands of unskilled workers in this country today will be able to take advantage of this legislation and they will in future years fill hundreds of thousands of available skilled jobs.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4955, now under consideration, is much needed and too long delayed legislation to relieve the critical shortage of vocational education schools and facilities for millions of unemployed youths and adults throughout the Nation.

As far back as 1917 when the Smith-Hughes Act was enacted, the Congress recognized the need for vocational education in agriculture, trade, and industry, and also the training of teachers for such programs. Again in 1946, under the George-Barden Act, and also in 1956 and 1958, the Congress provided further financial assistance to the States for vocational education.

During the last 20 years, by reason of modern inventions and automation, and the terrific population increase, we find that one of the main reasons for unemployment throughout the Nation has been that many of our unemployed could be given work if they were equipped through vocational education and training to occupy some of the many skilled jobs and positions that employers are unable to fill because of the scarcity of skilled workers. The Nation today has a deplorable shortage of workers who are trained in skilled trades. The operation of this bill gives the control of the vocational schools to each State which takes advantage of the program.

On February 20, 1961, the President ordered the appointment of an advisory body drawn from universities, labor, industry, and agriculture, as well as the lay public for the purpose of reviewing and reevaluating the need for additional vocational education legislation. This panel recommended that vocational education should be provided in order to extend opportunities to about 20 million college graduates and adult unemployed who will enter the labor market in the 1960's. It also included training and retraining for millions of workers whose skill in work knowledge must be improved and also to aid those who lost jobs because of automation and other economic changes.

The panel also outlined that these educational opportunities must be equally available regardless of race, color, sex, scholastic abilities or place of residence. Today's labor market and our present unemployment is primarily

caused because of the rise in demand of skilled manpower when so many millions of unemployed and part-time workers do not possess the skilled training to take jobs which are now open for applicants.

During the last 50 years, science has progressed more than in all human history and 90 percent of all the scientists who ever lived are alive today. Our scientific production is held back because of the scarcity of skilled technicians and manpower to take part in the variety of new jobs and functions that are derived from modern scientific discovery. In engineering alone, it is estimated that we should be training 100,000 new technicians each year but all the present program is turning out amounts to only about 20,000 annually. The number of low-skilled workers is rapidly declining. There was a drop of 772,000 workers in these low-skilled categories in manufacturing between 1957 and 1962. It is also estimated that the professional and technical workers will rise about 40 percent in 1970's and jobs for salesmen, managers, and proprietors will rise above 20 percent. In health occupations, we have a great demand for skilled workers and this will continue for a long time unless the Government starts programs similar to that provided in this legislation.

Young Americans, to the number of 2½ million will be seeking jobs annually throughout the Nation for the next 10 years. This number added to the older workers who are idle on account of automation makes the future very dismal unless a vocational education program of this type is started at once.

Section 4 of this bill provides Federal funds may be used for the following purposes:

First. Vocational education for persons attending high school.

Second. Vocational education for persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market.

Third. Vocational education for persons who have already entered the labor market and who need training or retraining to achieve stability or advancement in employment; however, no person will be eligible for education under this provision who is already receiving training allowances under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Area Development Act, or the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Fourth. Vocational education for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program.

Fifth. Construction of area vocational education school facilities.

Sixth. Ancillary services and activities to assure quality in all vocational education programs. These may include in-service teacher training and supervision, program evaluation, special demonstration and experimental programs, development of instructional materials, and State administration and leadership.

This legislation under title 2 also extends vocational education for practical nurses training and for other skills pertaining to hospitalization and health generally.

I wish to commend the Education and Labor Committee for the outstanding work they have done over the past months in holding hearings to bring this legislation to the floor of the House. I hope this legislation is passed by an overwhelming vote and enacted into law.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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 the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

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 consideration of the bill, H.R. 4955, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4955, a bill to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation. I would like to inform this body that the bill comes out of the Committee on Education and Labor with bipartisan support.

Mr. Chairman, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to come before my distinguished colleagues today to present for debate and action our first major education bill for the 88th Congress. We are proud of the accomplishments of the Committee on Education and Labor during the 87th Congress when nine education laws were enacted. These laws related to some very important areas of educational need in our great Nation, including, first, extension of the Practical Nurses Act; second, establishment of a teaching hospital for Howard University; third, enactment of the first legislation in the area of juvenile delinquency, through the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act; fourth, preparation of teachers for the deaf and speech pathologists and audiologists; fifth, increased appropriations for the American Printing House for the Blind, and education of the blind; sixth, extension of the National Defense Education Act and Public Laws 815 and 874; seventh; amendments to title II of the National Defense Education Act; eighth, provisions for captioned films for the deaf; and, ninth, amendments to the National School Lunch Act.

In addition to these nine education laws which were enacted through the energies of the Committee on Education and Labor, nine other laws were enacted relating to labor legislation.

Needless to say, this was an outstanding record—18 laws in 18 months—and without a doubt, this committee worked over and above the call of duty in order to produce at such a high level. We are grateful to you, our colleagues, for the support you gave so that this record might be made, not only for the Committee on Education and Labor, but also for the Congress of the United States of America and for the people. The bill which comes to you today for your consideration would strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation. This is the first of three bills which we expect to have for your deliberation during the 1st session of the 88th Congress. The other two bills are the academic facilities for higher education and extension of the laws dealing with federally impacted areas. Other legislation to which we hope you will give your undivided attention and support are the youth employment opportunities; special education; adult basic education; library services; extension of the juvenile delinquency legislation; National Service Corps; amendments to the National Defense Education Act; and possibly some Federal aid to elementary and secondary education, and general university extension.

As you will note, these pieces of legislation deal only with education, and since my committee has jurisdiction over labor legislation as well, you may expect other bills concerned with these matters to come before you also during this session, as well as the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

Vocational education acts were first inaugurated 46 years ago by the Federal Government through the enactment of the Smith-Hughes Act.

Except for the introduction of the George-Barden Act, there have been few major changes in the vocational education laws in our land. And yet, as everyone present knows, no aspect of American life has changed as greatly as the vocational education opportunities and technical advances.

Therefore, vocational education needs no defense to a group of this kind. As automation advances in factories and offices there remain fewer jobs for unskilled workers and more unfilled jobs requiring higher levels of education. The importance of skill to the individual is obvious and paramount. The importance of high level skilled persons running throughout the population is equally important to the Nation.

Whether we are thinking of the technological abilities to design and manufacture missiles, whether we are talking of office and clerical skills, or whether we are talking of auto repairs and maintenance of the home, we are talking of skills needed in order to meet the demands of our scientifically oriented society.

Without a doubt Congress must assume its rightful role in the reinterpretation of the vocational education program to meet these changes of our society. In his message to Congress on February 20, 1961, President John F. Kennedy said:

The National Vocational Education Acts, first enacted by the Congress in 1917 and subsequently amended, have provided a pro-

gram of training for industry, agriculture, and other occupational areas. The basic purpose of our vocational education effort is sound. * * * However, the technological changes which have occurred in all occupations call for a review and reevaluation of these acts, with a view toward their modernization.

On the basis of this consideration, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was requested to convene an advisory body to study the needs of vocational education. This panel of consultants, chaired by Dr. Benjamin Willis, identified four groups of individuals for whom additional service is needed in vocational education:

First. The young people in high school who are preparing to enter the labor market or who become homemakers;

Second. High school young people with academic socioeconomic or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in a regular education program;

Third. The young people and adults who have completed or left high school and who, as full-time students, are preparing to enter the labor market; and

Fourth. The young people and adults who are unemployed or who have worked but who need training or retraining to achieve employment stability.

The panel also recommended that first, vocational education be made available to more people. Only about 4 million persons are now enrolled, more than half of whom are adults. Second, vocational education be offered in more types of schools. As specialized training and relatively expensive equipment is involved, the development of area schools would allow neighboring school districts to join forces in support of vocational programs open to all their qualified students. Third, vocational training must encompass the new and emerging occupations. Under existing acts, funds are allotted only for traditional categories such as agriculture, home economics, trades and industries, and distributive occupations; if programs could not be confined to these restrictive definitions, they were not eligible for Federal support. Fourth, more vocational education programs be provided for young people who have special needs. This group includes the culturally deprived, the disadvantaged, the dropouts, and youths who have physical or mental handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the traditional vocational programs. Restrictions in existing laws have prevented vocational educators from developing new programs to prepare these young people for jobs.

H.R. 4955, in implementing these recommendations, would update and revamp one of the most important areas of American life. I feel that the passage of this act would be a landmark in American education as important as the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

At the present time, through the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts and their amendments, and title VIII of the National Defense Education Act, the Congress appropriates funds for allotment to the several States to assist in the promotion and further development of vocational education. These funds are used primarily for the salaries of vocational teachers, teacher trainers, supervisors and directors for agriculture, trades industry, home economics, distribute occupations, fisheries, practical nursing, and technicians. The laws require that for every dollar of Federal vocational education funds expended, at least $1 of State or local funds must be expended for the same purpose. As you know, an appropriation is made for each of these specific categories and each State is allotted a fixed sum, by formula, for each category. It is the responsibility of a State board of vocational education to promote, develop, improve, and supervise vocational education programs within its State. The Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is responsible for administering the Federal acts in cooperation with the States, but it is prohibited from controlling the nature of these programs. There has been persistent growth in the program since its inception in 1917, following the passage of the Federal legislation providing funds for the promotion of vocational education. In fact, in 1918, the total expenditures in this area were $3,039,061.15, as against a total of $283,930,842.98 in 1962. Likewise notable is the fact that the Federal share has proportionately decreased as the State and local share has increased through these years. For example, in 1918, the Federal share was $832,426.82, as against $2,206,534.33 expended from State and local funds. In 1962, the Federal share equaled $51,438,073.90 as against $232,492,769.08 from State and local funds. To put it another way, State and local communities matched Federal funds by 4 to 1.

As a result, Federal funds have served as a stimulation for the development and expansion of programs in vocational education, as State and local funds have increasingly borne the responsibility for such progress.

However, even with such growth in program and expenditure of funds, it is obvious that the vocational education program has not kept pace with the new advancements in technological vocational driversification. As we view the statistics regarding projections in manpower needs for the future, it is noted that the only broad industry sector in which actual decline in employment is expected between now and 1975, even under conditions of generally full employment, is agriculture. The rise in output per farmworker which underlines the long-term decline in farm employment is expected to continue, as a result of the increased use of machinery, fertilizers, additive pesticides and other technological advances. The continuing decrease in the number of farms, particularly the small low-income producing units will result in a significant decrease in the number of farms. As a result of these and other factors, agricultural employment may decline from 5.7 million in 1960 to 4.3 million in 1970, and about 4 million in 1975. At the same time, nonagricutural employment will increase rapidly. The Department of Labor's projections show rise in nonfarm employment from 61 million in 1960 to about 76 million in 1970 and 84 million in 1975.

Advances in technology, the introduction of new productions, the emergence of new industries, and changes in the availability of natural resources and among the other factors that will influence the industrial composition of employment. Moreover, there has been a shift in the population of the United States from rural to urban since the passage of the first vocational education acts.

In fact, as one compares the percentage of urban versus rural *population* from 1920 to the present, he is immediately aware of the fact that urban population has increased from 51.2 percent in 1920 to 69.9 percent in 1960, while the rural population has declined from 48.8 percent in 1920 to 30.1 percent in 1960, again calling attention to the fact that the nonagricultural occupations are growing more rapidly and employment of professional, technical and kindred workers has increased proportionately. This increase in professional related employment is projected about 43 percent over the 1960 decade and another 16 percent between 1970 and 1975. In short, there is no future in this country for the unskilled worker. What has been his job is going to be done by machines. This is already happening. Between 1950 and 1960, total employment in the United States went up 11 percent. During this period, the number of professional, technical, and kindred workers increased 67 percent; and the number of craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers went up 12 percent. The number of laborers went up only 4 percent.

Over the past 15 years, the percentage of white-collar workers in the work force has risen from 35 percent—1947—to 44 percent—1962. The percentage og blue-collar workers has dropped from 41 percent to 36 percent.

In the past 10 years alone—1952 to 1962—the number of white-collar workers has increased by about 7 million. The number of laborers—again leaving out the farm and mine group—has gone down by 150,000.

This is a result primarily of all the developments we lump together under automation and technological change. The casual, and classical, view of automation is that it creates as many jobs as it destroys, even more. If this is right at all—and there is increasing question about it—what it leaves out is that the new jobs almost all require some skill, whereas this was not true before. There was a place in the old work force for the boy or girl who left high school, either dropping out or with diploma in hand, and entered the work force with no skill training. He or she could, and did, take an unskilled job and worked up from there. Now such jobs are vanishing. And so today there are over 700,000 16- to 21-year-olds out of school and out of work. Every American youngster has to be given today, as part of his education, some know-how about making a living—which means, for a great many of them, vocational education.

If then the vocational education program is to realistically meet these needs,

many changes must be wrought. In testimony presented by the Commissioner of Education regarding inequality among the races for educational opportunity and attainment, we learn the disturbing facts that nearly 75 percent of the young white population have graduated from high school, but only about 40 percent of our nonwhite population have completed high school. To put it another way, 25 percent of the whites and 60 percent of the nonwhites are "school dropouts."

Of our adult population, 25 years and older, 6.2 percent of whites and 22.1 percent of nonwhites have completed less than 5 years of school—1962.

Almost 12 percent of young white adults—age 25 to 29—have completed college, while only 5.4 percent of this age group in the nonwhite population have done so.

While 11 percent of the total population is Negro, Negroes make up only 3.5 percent of all professional workers.

Part of the difficulty presented in such statistics is due to the fact that vocational education has not always been available to the nonwhite population. We further discovered through testimony presented to the committee that there have been wide discrepancies in the nature of vocational offerings to Negro youth because of the restrictive language of present vocational education acts limiting training to the areas for which jobs are available. An ad hoc subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor under the chairmanship of Congressman DOMINICK V. DANIELS, during the last Congress, unanimously recommended that the Smith-Hughes and other vocational acts be amended so that Negro secondary school students would be given training in a wide variety of vocations.

The present bill would rectify these wrongs and make possible greater diversity of vocational training, since all moneys appropriated would be allocated to the development of occupations previously omitted. The bill would further authorize vocational education programs for persons who have academic or socioeconomic handicaps which prevent them from succeeding in regular education programs.

The President, in his civil rights message, noted that more education and training to raise the level of skills is needed:

> Although the proportion of Negroes without adequate education and training is far higher than the proportion of whites, none of these problems is restricted to Negroes alone. This Nation is in critical need of a massive upgrading in its education and training effort for all citizens. In an age of rapidly changing technology, that effort today is failing millions of our youth. It is especially failing Negro youth in segregated schools and crowded slums. If we are ever to lift them from morass of social and economic degradation, it will be through the strengthening of our education and training services—by improving the quality of instruction; by enabling our schools to cope with rapidly expanding enrollments; and by increasing opportunities and incentives for all individuals to complete their education and to continue their self-development during adulthood.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Studies show, moreover, that the loss of 1 year's income due to unemployment is more than the total cost of 12 years of education through high school; and, when welfare and other social costs are added, it is clear that failure to take these steps will cost us far more than their enactment. There is no more profitable investment than education and no greater waste than ill-trained youth.

The proposed vocational education legislation, which would greatly update and expand this program of teaching job skills to those in school would have the added money earmarked for those areas with a high incidence of school dropouts and youth unemployment.

This bill, H.R. 4955, proposes to authorize Federal grants to States to assist them in maintaining, extending, and/or in improving existing programs of vocational education, and developing new programs of vocational education so that persons of all ages in all communities of the State will have ready access to vocational training which is of high quality and which is realistic in light of the actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment. In every instance, the purpose of vocational education is to fit persons for useful employment, recognizing individual differences, interests, and ability. Specifically, the major provisions of this bill are:

First. Maintains the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts previously authorized by Congress. The allotments to States for Smith-Hughes for fiscal year 1962 totaled $7,266,455, and under the George-Barden Act, the total was $29,515,422. Both of these acts were permanent laws.

Second. Includes title VIII of the NDEA, related to the training of highly skilled technicians as a part of the act. Title II of the George-Barden Act, relating to practical nurses' training, would be expanded and developed under this act.

Nonpermanent allocations for 1962 under title III of the George-Barden Act and title VIII of the National Defense Education Act—area technical education—total $15 million—these acts expire in fiscal year 1964. Also, nonpermanent funds authorized for fiscal year 1962 were those for practical nursing, $5 million—this act expires fiscal year 1965.

Third. Broadens the definition of vocational agriculture to include occupations related to agriculture in which a knowledge and skill of agriculture subjects are involved.

Fourth. Broadens the definition of home economics education which is now limited to training for work in the home to permit funds to be used for vocational education in any occupation involving knowledge and skill in home economics subjects.

Fifth. Adds new occupational categories consistent with analysis of present and projected manpower needs and job opportunities, including such areas as business and office occupations. For instance we have been advised by the Atomic Energy Commission of the national need for trained radiographers. This is but one of the many new occupations emerging out of the atomic age. But the training facilities are not available.

Sixth. Encourages the development of area vocational schools. This term has been defined to mean a school (a) which admits as regular students, and is principally used for the provision of vocational education to, both persons who have completed high school and persons who have left high school, where such persons are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, and (b) which is available to all residents. This new feature introduced by this proposal would permit Federal funds to be used for construction of area vocational-technical schools, that is, schools that enroll students from an entire city or from several neighboring school districts. Every State has plans for expansion of such area schools and many of them have constructed new facilities in the past few years, but the greatest construction needs in vocational education remain for area schools that cross district lines, serving large numbers of people and offering a range of curriculum that reaches out to adults as well as youth.

Seventh. In order to meet these goals, appropriations are authorized as follows: $45 million for fiscal year 1964; $90 million for fiscal year 1965; $135 million for fiscal year 1966; $180 million for fiscal year 1967. These funds would be in addition to those already available through the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts. The new funds may be expended for State and local vocational education programs without categorical limitation under the broadened definition of vocational education to fit individuals for gainful employment, embracing all occupations not now covered under existing law.

Eighth. H.R. 4955 requires the State to match Federal funds appropriated for this act on a 50–50 basis. Specifically, the bill designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of the State plan, or for supervision of the administration thereof, by local education agencies. Great care is given to limiting the Federal supervisory responsibilities and encouraging each State to plan in terms of its specific needs and goals. This will allow for great flexibility in the utilization of the funds made available through this act.

Ninth. As in the past, the States participating would be required to present a State plan for the supervision and the administration of the vocational education activities.

Tenth. Provision is made for an advisory committee on vocational education, which shall advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this act. Such a committee would be composed of representatives from the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, and Labor, and 12 members appointed for staggered terms who are familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor. Such a committee would meet at least twice a year at the call of the chairman, who is the Commissioner of Education.

A second advisory group referred to as an advisory council—section 12—shall be appointed by the Secretary to review the administration of the vocational education programs for which funds are appropriated and make recommendations for improvement of such administration. This council shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Secretary not later than January 1, 1968. This council is a temporary one being discussed after making its report.

Eleventh. The most revolutionary aspect of this act is the change in definition of vocational education which is defined in the following terms: "Vocational education" is defined to mean vocational or technical training or retraining given in schools or classes under public supervision and control as a part of a program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment as skilled workers or technicians in recognized occupations including office and business occupations and including occupations for which there is Federal financial assistance under the provisions of the George-Barden Act as amended, and the Smith-Hughes Act. The term is defined to include guidance and counseling in connection with such training, the inservice training of teachers, teacher trainers, supervisors and directors for such training, travel of students and vocational education personnel and the acquisition, maintenance, and repair of instructional supplies, teaching aids, and equipment.

It must be made clear that this bill does not in any way overlap with the provisions of other existing or proposed legislation. For unlike the Manpower Development and Training Act, which is addressed to the hardcore unemployed adults, this bill centers its attention upon the training of young people during the high school years prior to their entrance into the labor market.

Unlike the proposed adult education bill, which is addressed primarily to adults who are functionally illiterate, this bill would not concern itself with illiteracy, but rather with vocational training.

In like manner, an analysis of the youth employment opportunities bill and this bill would call attention to the fact that H.R. 4955 is primarily directed to youth in school, whereas the youth employment opportunities bill concentrates on unemployed youth.

Therefore, we can no longer delay. We must come to grips with one of America's most important problems today. We must modernize and expand the structure of our vocational education program, woefully inadequate in its present form, to meet the needs of first, our social and technological changes; second, our population shift from the farms to the cities; and, third, the replacement of the craftsmen by new and ingenious, complicated machines. We must learn anew the wisdom of Booker T. Washington when he advised that "we put brains and skill into the occupations of life."

I urge, therefore, favorable action on H.R. 4955.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time and ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] if he will take over on this side of the aisle.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

It is a great pleasure to address you and my colleagues today on behalf of a bill which is of immediate importance to every citizen of our Nation. It is not often that legislation affecting so many lives has gained such overwhelming bipartisan support. There will be questions this afternoon on several items, and even heated debate over a few. There will be no debate on the fundamental issue raised by H.R. 4955 or the principles underlying its proposals.

That basic issue, Mr. Chairman, is the immediate need for expansion of our Nation's efforts in the area of vocational education. Automation and other technological advances have reshaped the labor patterns of the land. Only now do we begin to recognize the basic connection between our gravest social problems—unemployment, poverty, crime—and the educational achievement of our citizens. Only now do we understand that a complex technological society cannot survive unless it provides its citizens with educational opportunities sufficient to meet the new demands of its rapidly changing economy.

Vocational education is designed for one primary purpose: to fit individuals for a productive role in their society. To prepare people adequately for the labor market, vocational educators must understand what job opportunities are and will be available. That is why these specialists have long warned that our technological advances must be matched by advances in vocational education.

There is no easy solution to the paradox of persistent unemployment occurring simultaneously with rising demand for skilled manpower. Our vocational education programs, developed in another era because they were deemed essential to economic progress, fall far short today of meeting the greatly stepped-up needs of these times.

Ninety percent of the scientists who ever lived are alive today—but without the support of skilled technicians, the scientist is handicapped. We should be training at least 100,000 new engineering technicians each year—but all our present programs turn out only 20,000 annually.

There was a drop of 772,000 workers in low-skill manufacturing occupations between 1957 and 1962. But jobs for professional and technical workers will rise about 40 percent in the 1970's and jobs for salesworkers, managers, and proprietors will rise about 20 percent.

Young people will seek work in greater numbers—2.6 million of them a year, estimated for this decade alone. The number of older workers will also increase. Moreover, half the women between the ages of 35 and 54 are expected to be in the labor market by 1970. All these groups must face the changing work patterns of the times.

Where once brawn and will were sufficient to insure man a place in the world, now specialized skills are required—skills that change from year to year. In some fields, probably half the youngsters now in school will find jobs that do not even exist today except in the vision of scientists.

Where will young people obtain the continuing training necessary to keep pace with the life ahead of them? Where will today's workers find the retraining to escape eventual technological unemployment? It is the responsibility of this Congress to answer these questions in a positive manner—by providing the stimulus necessary to expand our Nation's vocational education programs.

This is a national concern, Mr. Chairman—for the state of our economy and the welfare of our citizens are always national concerns. Every State, every community, every crossroads is directly affected by the sweeping changes in our labor requirements. Faced with growing welfare and unemployment rolls, it is clear that we cannot afford to stand by while many persons, young and old, are forced into economic dependence because programs through which they might acquire suitable skills are not available.

The Congress has long recognized its responsibility to assist the States in meeting the employment and manpower needs of the Nation, beginning positively with the passage of the Morrill Act, July 2, 1862. In 1917 the Congress passed the historic Smith-Hughes Act, authorizing $7 million for assisting State programs of vocational education. Other legislative enactments, notably the George-Barden Act of 1946, provided further financial assistance to the States. Our historic responsibilities as well as our present emergencies demand that we take immediate action to meet our Nation's needs.

This administration has long been concerned with the failure to recognize the importance of increased vocational education opportunity.

On February 20, 1961, the President directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to appoint a special Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, representing the educational profession, labor, industry, agriculture, and the lay public. The Panel was charged with the responsibility of reviewing existing vocational legislation and making recommendations for improving and redirecting current programs. The Panel concluded its work on November 27, 1962. Their exhaustive analysis has been printed under the title "Education for a Changing World of Work." The report documents the efforts and accomplishments of vocational education specialists who have labored long under severe handicaps. It also points in vivid detail to the areas which demand immediate attention. The chairman, Dr. Benjamin C. Willis, and his fellow panelists which included an outstanding Kentuckian, Mrs. Mary Bingham, have performed an invaluable service to the Congress and to the Nation. Mr. Chairman, I want the RECORD to show my sincere appreciation for their outstanding contributions.

Mr. Chairman, rather than take time from the debate period to analyze the provisions of H.R. 4955, I refer my colleagues to the full section-by-section breakdown in Committee Report No. 393.

This act will prove a milestone in the history of vocational education, not merely because it meets a great crisis,

but because it meets this crisis with imagination and vision. It gives vocational educators sufficient flexibility to meet whatever labor demands the future might bring, as well as to remedy present imbalances. We should fail to meet our obligations if we ignored the lessons of the past—that failure to plan ahead leads to costly emergency situations. Let me call specific attention to three new features of this bill.

On January 29 of this year the administration again demonstrated its concern for vocational education by introducing a modest program fashioned to meet the Panel's recommendations. H.R. 4955 is based largely on that proposal, Mr. Chairman. It has been carefully designed to follow as fully as possible the recommendations of the President's Panel and the suggestions of many other specialists in the field.

Every section is the result of the combined efforts of representatives from the farm, business, manufacturing, and scientific communities, and spokesmen for all groups concerned with the startling changes in our labor market. The General Subcommittee on Education and the Committee on Education and Labor have devoted long hours to intensive analysis of the recommendations and legislative alternatives. H.R. 4955 represents a healthy compromise of varying views on how best to remedy the uncontested need for increased vocational education opportunity in this Nation.

I. AREA VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS

One of the most significant trends in vocational education has been the development of area vocational schools. Found in both urban and rural communities, these schools vary considerably in terms of the subjects of instruction offered and provide short-term or part-time instruction as well as full-time preparatory training. Many have developed programs in technical education under title VIII of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Some area schools are administered and financed directly by the State, others on a county basis or through the cooperative action of several school districts. The location is influenced by patterns of school organization, population density, and similar factors.

Perhaps the most pressing need in vocational education is the need for more facilities. State directors of vocational education report that a lack of facilities causes them to turn away students by the thousands. State boards have been forced to rent countless buildings for teaching purposes—buildings rarely suited for the specialized training required. A lack of facilities has also plagued the operation of the manpower development and training program.

The cost of equipment and supplies necessary to provide training for vocational students greatly exceeds expense requirements for traditional academic courses. For instance, it is estimated that $800 per student annually is required as a minimum for the training of technicians. Only by constructing area-wide facilities have many States been able to provide the training necessary to equip students adequately for employment in highly technical fields.

H.R. 4955 provides funds for construction of area school facilities by recognizing and encouraging State efforts to provide adequate facilities for all its residents. This bill helps insure the availability of diversified plants and programs to meet changing employment demands.

II. YOUTH WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

The provision reserving 5 percent of the appropriated funds for use by the Commissioner to make grants for "experimental, development, or pilot programs" for youth who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps preventing them from succeeding in regular vocational programs is especially important.

The President's Panel strongly recommended that special programs be provided for these young people and their wide variety of needs. These students cannot keep up with their classmates. Many have emotional or physical handicaps which create employment problems. Schools in all States must often provide remedial services in writing, reading, speech, and arithmetic for these people. They need some reasonable degree of assurance that, when aided, they can eventually join the labor force.

These disadvantaged students are found in many areas, both urban and rural, throughout the Nation. They are prime candidates for crime and vice. Out of school and unemployed, they have become the "social dynamite" of our Nation. Both the economic and social stability of many individuals are at stake, and the economic and social stability of our large population centers are at stake.

Vocational education has a responsibility to serve these young people. Experimental activities, marked by diversity and flexibility, are needed so that we might learn how best to serve their needs. Under H.R. 4955, the Commissioner of Education will make grants for special projects to colleges, universities, other public or nonprofit private agencies or institutions, to State boards of vocational education, and, with their permission, to local educational agencies to pay part of the cost of such research and developmental programs.

III. AMENDMENT TO THE SMITH-HUGHES AND GEORGE-BARDEN ACTS

The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 and the George-Barden Act of 1946 have served as the basic framework for providing Federal assistance to the States for vocational education. However, their restrictive language has often prevented States from providing vocational training for actual employment opportunities. Funds must be appropriated for specific occupational categories, and the definitions of these categories have remained quite inflexible.

When the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts were passed, it was relatively simple to define occupations in terms of four categories—agriculture, home economics, distribution, and trades and industries. However, as employment requirements rapidly continue to change, it becomes more difficult to fit actual jobs into narrow categories. By broadening old definitions, H.R. 4955 makes it possible to give training in fields which more nearly meet the needs of students and the demands of the labor market.

H.R. 4955 also provides for the transfer of funds among the occupational categories named in the earlier acts. The determination as to how funds will be spent is left entirely to the State boards for vocational education.

Mr. Chairman, the evidence documented in the committee hearings, in the report of the President's Advisory Panel, and in the newspapers of every city point to the urgent need for enactment of this legislation. The gentleman from Alabama made clear our historic obligation—the duty to assure our constituents that they and their children will find adequate programs when they require new skills for new jobs.

We are proposing nothing new today. We are dealing directly with new problems, through tried and successful means. We are warding off the spectre of future generations of unskilled, untrained Americans by correcting an imbalance which we have already allowed to reach emergency size.

In conclusion, I must read from the 1962 report of the President's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education:

> Americans hold that the manifold tasks of the world of work are all equally important and that the man dignifies the job, not the reverse. We believe that, in a democracy, everyone should have access throughout life to the education and training needed to develop to his highest potential.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come to accept our responsibility to our Nation. The time has come to enact legislation which will permit those in charge of our vocational programs to admit rather than reject thousands of applicants, to train rather than ignore the youth with special needs, to build now for a future that enables people to acquire new skills necessary for new jobs.

I submit that H.R. 4955 will provide these opportunities, and ask the support of every Member of Congress in enacting this urgently needed legislation.

Mr. Chairman, next I feel that I should make it clear that I am opposed to the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL]. In the first place, that amendment has no place in this legislation. This is a bill to expand and modernize vocational educational opportunities for all adults and young people desiring to learn an occupation. Only a few years ago the members of this committee had an experience which we all recall. I think it occurred in 1959 or 1960. That was on the elementary and secondary education bill. That was a bill which had passed both the House and the Senate, but the antidiscrimination amendment was on the bill and it never got to conference. This so-called civil rights amendment has deprived millions of young girls and boys of their educational opportunities, and those who are proposing to offer this amendment today know or ought to know that that amendment is only designed for killing this legislation. You can use any other

terminology you want here in this debate, but those who offer the amendment should know that it is designed to kill this legislation, and this legislation is too important to be killed by a maneuver of this type.

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

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

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman from Kentucky has used the words, "the amendment is designed to kill the bill."

Mr. PERKINS. That is my opinion.

Mr. GOODELL. By using such words, he is imputing a bad motive to the author of this amendment [Mr. BELL], and I think the gentleman in the well of the House would agree with me that Mr. BELL in the deliberations in our subcommittee and in our full committee's deliberations was one of the most conscientious, constructive advocates of this legislation throughout the entire proceedings and remains one of the most ardent advocates of this legislation today.

Mr. PERKINS. I certainly did not intend to impugn the motives of the gentleman from California, but I merely stated that those who were offering this amendment knew or ought to know that the purpose of it on many occasions, and the effect of it now, would be to kill this legislation, and I stand on that statement. I stand on that statement, because that has been the experience in the Congress without exception. And if you can give an exception in the case of a Federal aid to education bill, I would like for you to name that exception at the present time.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman from Kentucky has just admitted that an antidiscrimination measure was approved by this body in the general aid to education bill which passed the House in 1960. How does he reconcile this fact with his contention that a similar provision in this bill would endanger the chances of passage of this needed legislation today?

Mr. PERKINS. I recall distinctly in 1960 when many Members on your side of the aisle supported the so-called antidiscrimination amendment and voted against the bill on final passage and the legislation with the rider, the gentleman will recall, never became law. And that was carried by the press all over the country. My point is that the amendment, if adopted, in my judgment based on all past experience, will kill this bill and it has no place in this piece of legislation, a Federal aid to education bill.

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

Mr. PERKINS. Briefly.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman seems to be suggesting that if experience is any guide there may be some who will vote for an antidiscrimination measure and then vote against the bill, because there were some in that category in 1960.

Mr. PERKINS. I do not say that will be the case here, but I just relate what took place in 1960.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. GOODELL. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that what the gentleman from Kentucky is saying is that it is impossible for this Congress to enact a civil rights provision, an equal opportunity provision in any legislation that comes before us.

Mr. PERKINS. I agree that it should come in a social reform piece of legislation on civil rights and not on an extraneous bill; and you will have the opportunity in the near future to vote on that type of legislation.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman used the word "extraneous." Can the gentleman name any program in which the Federal Government is involved where it is more important that every one of our citizens, regardless of color, have an equal opportunity of access to facilities and access to the opportunity to develop himself than in this particular program?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the gentleman, in conclusion, that I believe in everyone having equal opportunities. But here you are trying to destroy the opportunities by an extraneous rider. And that is my analysis of this situation.

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

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

Mr. GOODELL. I agree with the gentleman on that point. I think this is very vital legislation, extremely important legislation for our country. I commend the gentleman for the bipartisan approach he took in the subcommittee in writing this legislation. We have tried on our side of the aisle to cooperate and make constructive suggestions that will improve the program. I believe the gentleman will agree we made many suggestions from our side, and his party made many from their side. But will the gentleman agree with me that the hearings show that we in our investigations ascertained unquestionably that there is significant and serious discrimination in this program which denies the opportunity of every citizen to have access to these facilities, and thereby materially discriminates against certain citizens of this country because of the color of their skin? Will the gentleman agree with me?

Mr. PERKINS. I certainly will not agree to part of that statement concerning the civil rights.

Mr. GOODELL. Does the gentleman deny that there is discrimination against Negroes in vocational educational programs today?

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] all made significant contributions to this legislation, but where we are disagreeing here is on the effect of the proposed antidiscrimination amendment.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman and agree with the gentleman on that point.

Mr. PERKINS. I still state that if we adopt this amendment in my judgment it will be the sting of death to this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like at this point to commend my distinguished colleague from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] not only for his lucid and pointed remarks in connection with the rule but also for the outstanding leadership and assistance he has devoted to fashioning this legislation. His leadership in 1958 on the National Defense Education Act bill paved the way for the great expansion area of the technical program provided in H.R. 4955.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think enough has been said already to demonstrate that there is substantial support both on the majority and the minority sides of the aisle for this bill. At the outset I would like to point out that the 1960 Republican platform has a reference which I should like to quote:

> Toward the goal of fullest possible educational opportunity for every American, we pledge these actions: * * * Stimulation of actions designed to update and strengthen vocational education for both youth and adults.

I might add also, Mr. Chairman, that yesterday the House Republican Policy Committee went on record in favor of this bill with, I might say, an antidiscrimination amendment.

I should like to make clear, as the gentleman from Kentucky just now did, at the outset of my remarks that I am very much in favor of an antidiscrimination amendment. I do not believe it is fair or correct to state that such an amendment is designed in any way to kill this bill. I do not believe the adoption of such an amendment would in any way be a sting of death. On the contrary, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] pointed out, the testimony before our committee indicates without any question, and I think the gentleman from Kentucky has tacitly agreed to this, that there is at present racial discrimination in existing vocational educational programs. As I understand his position, he is saying, we must vote against such an amendment even though we believe such an amendment to be right, and would correct the situation. He seems to feel if we do not, it will reduce the chances of favorable action in this area.

As I tried to say when I asked the gentleman from Kentucky to yield, we were considering a much more controversial bill in 1960 when we had up for consideration the whole aid for construction of schools program. We adopted at that time an antidiscrimination provision because it was obviously the feeling of the membership that such a provision was necessary. I feel it is at least equally necessary with respect to the problems that this bill is directed at. To buttress my point, I would like to read a few comments from the recent message by the President of the United States with respect to civil rights.

On June 19 President Kennedy said among other things, and it was a long message:

> The Negro—too often unskilled, too often the first to be fired and the last to be hired—is a primary victim of recessions, depressed

areas, and unused industrial capacity. Negro unemployment will not be noticeably diminished in this country until the total demand for labor is effectively increased and the whole economy is headed toward a level of full employment.

At a later point, and I quote again from President Kennedy:

A distressing number of unemployed Negroes are illiterate and unskilled, refugees from farm automation, unable to do simple computations or even to read a help-wanted advertisement. Too many are equipped to work only in those occupations where technology and other changes have reduced the need for manpower—as farm labor or manual labor, in mining or construction. Too many have attended segregated schools that were so lacking in adequate funds and faculty as to be unable to produce qualified job applicants.

If I had more time, I would read more of the President's remarks, since he analyzes better than I can the necessity to expand and modernize our vocational education system in this country. He feels, as do I, we should do more to protect the rights of all our citizens so that there may be firm assurance that all groups, regardless of their background and the color of their skin, may receive equal benefits.

Mr. Chairman, without any doubt there is general agreement that first and foremost among the areas which cry for improvement in the field of education is our vocational education system.

Existing vocational education programs have many friends—indeed, we individually may have benefited from them. Nonetheless, any objective critic will conclude that major changes are needed. This bill seeks to accomplish that goal.

What is involved here? Put in its simplest form, our committee proposes that the Federal Government put up far more money than has been the case—to modernize existing programs, and to finance new ones. The initial expenditure of $45 million will almost double the present Federal contribution. Annual contributions thereafter will increase so that in the fourth year the Federal contribution will be almost three times greater than we now make available.

How quickly this money will become available and under what conditions is relatively unimportant. What is significant is that the Federal Government will be moving vigorously to accept a responsibility which in theory at least it has had for many decades.

A proposal to increase sharply Federal expenditures to expand existing programs and to make possible new ones cannot expect to avoid criticism. How can we balance the budget, many ask, unless we hold down Federal spending? Unless economy is our watchword how can we prevent continuing, and eventually disastrous, raids on the Treasury? Can we not simply spend more wisely and forgo spending vastly more than we now do?

These words of caution cannot be ignored. The opportunity of spending money in the vocational education field is a tempting one. Indeed, the President himself has set an example which cannot help but serve also as a warning. Only 6 months ago he requested $23 million more money to be spent during the current fiscal year. Six weeks ago he recommended $108 million additional to be spent at once, with some $65 million more to be made available for allied programs.

Clearly then, the amount which the Federal Government might spend constructively if Congress agreed to help modernize and expand existing programs is considerable. This figure is capable of no easy definition or limitation. For purposes of comparison, it should be pointed out that the Federal share of existing programs is $57 million. In 4 years this contribution, if nothing is done, would total $228 million. This bill would add another $450 million in 4 years—virtually tripling the present Federal contribution.

A further note of warning. President Kennedy now—as of mid-June—considers it advisable to spend some $702 million in this same 4-year period. And if you look at the bill as it was originally introduced you will see that a 4-year Federal expenditure of over $800 million was proposed. Under this proposal the Federal share in a single year was to reach $340 million—a sizable sum even in today's Washington.

There exists a real possibility, therefore, that if this bill is approved today that we will be committed to support another vast Federal spending program. With such a prospect, the question remains, "What should we do?"

In my opinion vocational education is an area where we must act. This is a problem on which we have turned our backs too long. We have ignored the importance of keeping these programs responsive to today's needs. We have failed to realize how realistic and adequate programs might affect in a significant way some of the problems of youths and adults alike who are unsuccessful in seeking employment because of inadequate or out-of-date skills.

The answer about what to do is plain. We should approve this bill. If this bill is enacted into law—or even before it is enacted—proposals may be made to expand it. Some may argue that still more should be spent, or that still other programs than those contemplated by this bill, should receive benefits.

For example, the President, in his June message on civil rights, suggested that an additional $50 million be spent annually on work-study programs. In my opinion this suggestion should be ignored at this time. If this idea, or others, have merit they can be considered more appropriately at a later date. Such efforts to broaden still further the proposed vocational education laws may distract us from the importance of what we are presently proposing.

That those who take the trouble to read the views expressed by the President do not pursue his recommendations as aggressively as might be expected can be explained in a variety of ways. First of all is the fact, known to us all, that there are infinite numbers of ways—meritorious, defensible, and logical ways—to spend the taxpayers' money. The President too often has failed to differentiate between a bewildering variety of programs. He has established no priorities of need, though this would be most helpful.

In the field of education, for example, virtually nothing has been accomplished under the New Frontier. This may be attributed, at least in part, to a failure on the part of the President to establish any procedure to follow through on his recommendations. He has not said, as I believe he should, that certain specified areas are in great need. These bills should be "must" legislation.

What actually has delayed consideration by the House of any education bills this year has been the reverse of the procedure I have just advocated. For months the administration has been insisting on an omnibus bill, with 24 separate and distinct proposals all wrapped up in one huge and obviously indigestible package. Only now is the obvious occurring. The package has been unwrapped. The more palatable items are being prepared for your consideration.

Another failure on the part of the President is one to which I have already referred briefly. He indulges in an unfortunate shifting of his sights. In January he wants $23 million for vocational education; by June he wants $170 million. Too often, in my opinion, he seems to think that more money for a program will make the program better. In many cases what is needed are fewer programs but better programs. If the program has not been carefully thought out, both with respect to its own provisions and its effect on other activities, more money may simply confound the problem. More money will not make a poor program good. More money, however, can make a good program better.

Mr. Chairman, I urge favorable consideration of this bill.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, to me it seems appropriate at about this stage to talk a little about the provisions of the bill we are going to be called upon to vote on this afternoon.

In understanding the provisions of the proposed legislation, it is my feeling that it will be helpful to members of the committee to have a brief review of the history relating to vocational education. That, after all, is what this bill is about.

In 1917, to begin at one of the earliest dates of action by the Congress on vocational education, what is commonly known as the Smith-Hughes Act was enacted. Following that, in 1936, the George-Dean Act was passed. Then following that in 1946 the George-Barden Act was passed.

What do each of these acts do, and how much of a foundation do they furnish for the proposals that are here before us today? The Smith-Hughes Act was designed to promote vocational education in specific fields, namely, vocational agriculture, home economics, trade, and industry.

The George-Dean Act came along in 1936 and included, among other things, distributive education, which is now a part of the George-Barden Act that occurred in 1946. Its provisions enlarged

those of the George-Dean Act and increased the funds which the George-Dean Act authorized originally and, as a matter of fact, replaced the George-Dean Act. So the bill we have today has for its foundation and framework, the Smith-Hughes Act and the George-Barden Act. It is within the framework of these statutes that the Federal Government, the State governments and the local governments have been able to provide training for literally thousands of men and women in this country to take their place in industry, in agriculture and in society in general, and make a contribution.

The Smith-Hughes Act authorizes today an appropriation of $7.5 million for the three specific purposes previously named.

The George-Barden Act, that is titles 1, 2, and 3 of the George-Barden Act, authorizes $49.5 million, making a total in the two of $57 million, but this amount is restricted to training and occupational categories, as I said, of agriculture, home economics, trades and industry and distributive education.

What does H.R. 4955, on which we are called upon to act today, do? It amends these basic laws and permits State boards for vocational education to fix the amounts of this $49.5 million that are spent for such services and to interchange as between and among the various authorized activities any part of these sums not used for the specifically named industry. The State board then has at its discretion the use of these funds and can transfer from one to another or among them.

In the bill which is under consideration today, section 4 defines the expanded uses to which funds that are appropriated already under Smith-Hughes and George-Barden, and which will be additionally authorized to be appropriated under this bill, can be put.

Now I want to read from section 4 under "Uses of Federal Funds," to see exactly how we expand the area of vocational education training.

First, we can spend this additional money, in addition to what the State board might want to put in from these other funds for vocational education for persons attending high school.

Second, for vocational education for persons who have completed or who have left high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market.

Third, for vocational education for persons—other than persons who are receiving training allowances under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Area Redevelopment Act, or the Trade Expansion Act of 1962—who have already entered the labor market and who need training or retraining to achieve stability or advancement in employment.

Fourth, vocational education for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program.

Fifth—and this one is extremely important, although not to minimize the importance of the others—construction of area vocational education school facilities. It is extremely important that you pay attention to the provisions relating to the construction of area vocational schools.

Sixth, for ancillary services and activities to assure quality in all vocational education programs.

This amendment also provides that in the present vocational education program under Smith-Hughes and George-Barden the 6 months required for farm practice training be removed and that no longer will one be required in order to participate in the vocational education program to have at least 6 months in farm practices. That means this: We have expanded the definition of vocational education for agriculture to permit the use of these funds in training for related agricultural occupations and activities. There is still a great need for agricultural training, but with this restrictive use removed students may be given training in related fields, and that appears to be an extremely important thing today. That is likewise true in the field of home economics.

In the bill before you we have enlarged the definition of vocational education. You will find on pages 50 and 51 the definition, and I would like to read it to you:

(1) The term "vocational education" means vocational or technical training or retraining which is given in schools or classes (including field or laboratory work incidental thereto) under public supervision and control or under contract with a State Board or local educational agency, and is conducted as part of a program designed to fit individuals—

And this is important—

for gainful employment as skilled workers or technicians in recognized occupations (including any program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment in business and office occupations, and any program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment which may be assisted by Federal funds under the Vocational Education Act of 1946—

Which was the George-Barden Act—

and supplementary vocational education acts, but excluding—

Mind you—

but excluding any program to fit individuals for employment in occupations which the Commissioner determines, and specifies in regulations, to be generally considered professional or as requiring a baccalaureate or higher degree).

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this is a very important bill, if not the most important bill to come before this House so far this year. It is a good bill as it is written. It ought to be passed without amendment because if it is passed and becomes law without amendment it will provide opportunities for training that will reward the Members of this Congress many times over for the opportunity that we give the young people, the young girls, the men and women all over the country, to take up their rightful place in society.

Why is it necessary to make these changes? When the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts were first passed, it was relatively simple to define the occupations in the four broad occupational categories identified in those acts. However, as changes have occurred, and as they will rapidly continue to change and thus make jobs obsolete, it becomes more difficult to fit jobs into narrow and restrictive categories. The proposed amendments to these acts will make it possible to give training in these fields which more nearly meets the needs of students and the demands of the job.

The amendments are in agreement with the recommendations of the President's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, the Chairman of which is the very distinguished Dr. Benjamin F. Willis, of Chicago, Ill. If approved, these amendments will make it possible for enrollments in vocational education to greatly expand and will make it possible to train for employment in more occupations.

I want to emphasize again, Mr. Chairman, that this bill provides great freedom to the States to determine the kinds of vocational education they will conduct. I submit that this is right and proper.

When the first Federal act for vocational education was passed in 1917, it was the stated purpose to "provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education." The States have been stimulated, with the help of Federal funds, to promote vocational education to the extent that they now match Federal funds at the rate of $4.50 for every Federal dollar. It is now time for the Federal Government to substantially increase its support for vocational education if all our citizens are to have the opportunity to acquire skills and knowledge to make them employable.

This bill, H.R. 4955, is a sound bill and has been carefully prepared. It represents a reasonable approach to a solution of some of this Nation's education and employment problems.

Now if I may ask the indulgence of the House for just about 30 seconds, I would say to you, with a subject of this sort, dealing as it must with the education of the young and the old and the middle-aged, so they may be able to compete in a rapidly changing economy, let us lay aside the differences that go to make up the politics that we all enjoy and come together for once in a true bipartisan fashion to pass something good for America, not necessarily good for a party.

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

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset I want to commend the gentleman from Georgia for the statement he just made, a very full, complete, and competent description of some of the most significant features of this bill. I did not ask him to yield during his time to discuss the civil rights amendment. I did want to clarify a couple of points he was talking about in connection with the changes we have made in this bill.

I would say at the outset I do not intend to devote this time to the civil rights discussion, except with this brief comment. I hope that the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle will attribute to us on our side sincerity and earnestness of purpose with reference to

this civil rights issue. I would not participate in support of such an amendment if I did not feel from the bottom of my heart that it was necessary, that it would serve the purposes of this country, and that in the long run it would clearly serve the best interests of the very important vocational education program we have in this country. I likewise would not support such an amendment if I thought it would kill the bill.

Let me emphasize several points that I think as a matter of legislative history should be clarified.

First of all, one of the very significant changes we are making in this legislation is the changing, throughout the Smith-Hughes and the George-Barden Acts, of the words "useful employment" to "gainful employment." There is a very great significance to this change.

In addition, I would refer to page 51 of the bill, where we define vocational education, and in line 4 use this language:

> Any program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment in business and office occupations.

Therefore, we make it clear specifically that we are including business and office occupations. By pointing out business and office occupations there specifically, however, we do not mean to exclude other types of occupations.

I should like to stress, and I hope the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] will agree with me, that our specific reference here to business and office education does not exclude other types of occupations for which we want to have training. Will the gentleman agree with me on that point?

Mr. PERKINS. I regret to state that I was talking to the Speaker and did not understand the gentleman's question. Would the gentleman mind repeating it?

Mr. GOODELL. I was referring to page 51 where we specifically include business and office occupations. In making that specific reference, we do not by implication mean to exclude other types of occupations that are not named.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We intend to include all other gainful occupations not enumerated—all of them.

Mr. GOODELL. Actually, the reason we put this in here was a technical reason. We felt we had to clarify that business and office occupations were covered as well as all others.

Mr. PERKINS. Those words were used simply as an illustration and as an example.

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct.

Secondly, we have, and I think the gentleman will agree, embarked on a new type of approach and it is our intent that the vocational education program will increasingly be oriented to the job market. It is our desire that they prepare their programs with one eye on the end of the road, when the student gets out, expecting and planning that there will be a job available; this will involve taking surveys and giving attention to surveys to see that they are training in fields where jobs are available.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman has made a correct analysis and the legislation so provides in clear and unmistakable terms.

Mr. GOODELL. There is another point I think we ought to clarify in the legislative history, and I am sure the gentleman from Kentucky will agree with me. The gentleman from Georgia mentioned this point.

In section 4(a) we point out that a State's allotment may be used for specific named purposes and among them is No. 1, persons attending high school; and then for full-time study and preparation for the labor market; and the third one interests me particularly here. I quote:

> Vocational education for persons (other than persons who are receiving training allowances under the Manpower Development of Training Act of 1962, the Area Redevelopment Act, or the Trade Expansion Act of 1962), who have already entered the labor market and who need training or retraining to achieve stability or advancement in employment.

Now the implication might be read into this exclusion of the Manpower Act, the Area Redevelopment Act, and the Trade Expansion Act trainees, that we do not intend that they can use these facilities. I think our intention is precisely the opposite. We hope that the facilities that are constructed as a result of this act will be made readily available wherever they can be most usefully put to work.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to state that one of the chief purposes of this legislation is to make available more adequate facilities which today are lacking and which is one of the prinicipal drawbacks to the effectiveness of the manpower development and training program. We certainly intend that the youngsters and adults being trained under the Area Redevelopment Act, the Manpower Act and the Trade Expansion Act use the area vocational schools and equipment for which funds in this bill may be used. There certainly was no intent on the part of the committee to exclude any of these facilities. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GOODELL. Actually, and I think the gentleman will agree with me, the reason we had to write this exclusionary language here was to be sure we do not have an overlapping in the actual availability of funds.

Mr. PERKINS. That was the sole purpose of it.

Mr. GOODELL. I would point out to the Members we here are doing two things in broad outline. No. 1, we are adding a new vocational education program to the old Smith-Hughes and George-Barden programs. No. 2, we are making some changes in the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden present vocational education programs. Those of you who are interested may find, beginning on page 55 of the bill, the amendments that we are inserting to the present vocational education act. Among them, and very important, is the authority residing in the States to transfer funds from one category to another. At the present time the vocational education program has seven major categories to which Federal funds are directed, and they must remain in those categories and be utilized on such things as agriculture, home economics, trades and industry and so on.

We are authorizing by this legislation the States to transfer funds conceivably from home economics to agriculture or from agriculture to trades and industries, if they so desire. In other words, we are giving the States in this instance more flexibility and more option to pursue the programs which they think are most important in their particular areas.

Secondly—and I am on page 56 of the bill—we have broadened the definition of agriculture. This is an extremely important aspect. We now are including various related activities that are close to the agricultural economy. In the past we have had a requirement for vocational agricultural training that there must be involved work of the farm or on the farm home. That requirement is to be eliminated by this legislation.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, we also eliminate the requirement that there be directed or supervised practice on a farm.

Another item which Republicans and Democrats alike worked hard on with some of the vocational education authorities is the problem of home economics. We spend a great deal of vocational education money in the field of home economics. Many of us felt that this was legitimately a State function and if the States wanted to teach this very important subject of home economics they should. But that the Federal Government, to the extent we contributed to such a program, should insist that the home economics courses be directed to teaching skills whereby these trainees may acquire jobs. In other words, home economics skills such as dietitians and things of that nature, where when they get out of school they will find that their newly acquired skills are useful in getting a job. We could not write an across-the-board requirement that all funds in home economics be oriented to gainful employment. So, we finally compromised by requiring that 25 percent of the funds be used in this gainful employment type of training in home economics. Then we added an additional option, permitting the States, if they so desire, to use all of the home economics money in occupations involving knowledge and skills in the gainful employment field.

Mr. Chairman, these are some of the major changes. I think this legislation is going to make some revolutionary changes in vocational education. I believe sincerely it is one of the most important pieces of legislation that we shall have to come before us in this Congress. It is my opinion that in the long run it is going to serve very significantly the best interests of our country in updating the vocational skills of our citizens.

May I say that one of the problems we had when we gave this thorough review to the whole vocational education system is that in the past we have not

regularly reviewed the operations of this program. Actually, it has been 17 years since Congress has taken a good, hard look at how vocational education was operating in this country. Since 1917 we have had a permanent law, the Smith-Hughes law. Since 1946 we have had a second permanent law, the George-Barden Act. Then we added amendments of a minor nature since 1946. However, we felt that there should be a thorough and complete review of this whole field at least every 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, our first temptation was to simply make this a 5-year program, destroying the permanent aspect of the Smith-Hughes, George-Barden programs. However, the vocational education people felt this might imply that Congress was going to back off from its participation in vocational education. So once again we compromised and we set up a council which will be appointed every 5 years—at least every 5 years—and that citizens council will review vocational education and how it has been operating. It will make a report to the Congress and to the President.

Mr. Chairman, and I am sure the gentleman from Kentucky will agree, that this is a very substantial and important provision that we have put in here. We expect this to be adhered to very assiduously by the executive branch in seeing that this council is appointed and makes a competent study and report.

Mr. PERKINS. I agree with the gentleman that we directed the program here to gainful employment under provisions not in the legislation originally. I think the gentleman from New York is the author of the amendment which made this important aspect clear and unequivocal.

Mr. GOODELL. I conclude, Mr. Chairman, by thanking the gentleman from Kentucky for his courtesy, for his fairness, for the bipartisan approach he has taken to this legislation.

Mr. PERKINS. I compliment the gentleman from New York for his outstanding contribution. In writing the legislation we approached the whole matter from a bipartisan viewpoint.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4955, the Vocational Education Act of 1963. I want to echo the sentiments which have already been expressed here this afternoon to the effect that few bills this House will consider this year can have such a sound impact for good on the lives of so many Americans as the one we are considering. It is a soundly conceived bill, one that builds on the foundations of existing vocational education programs rather than tearing them down. It is, moreover, a bill that enjoyed overwhelming bipartisan support in the House Committee on Education and Labor.

I want to pay special tribute to the man who as much as anyone has contributed to the shaping of this bill, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS]. He conducted the hearings fairly and gave witnesses of every point of view an opportunity to express their viewpoint and also gave members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle an opportunity to offer their suggestions on how we could strengthen and improve the legislation.

It is fair to say that the result is a bill which if enacted will represent the most significant advance in the vocational education program that the country has seen in the last 17 years and perhaps since the original vocational education program came into existence during the Presidency of Woodrow Wilson.

This bill is the result of what is certainly the most thorough examination, as the gentleman from New York has said, the most searching examination of the vocational education program that Congress has made since the late 1940's. This bill owes a great deal as well to the reappraisal of the vocational education program which the panel appointed by President Kennedy in 1961, headed by the distinguished superintendent of schools of Chicago, Dr. Benjamin Willis. Indeed, this bill embodies most of the recommendations of the Willis report. I think that fundamental to an understanding of H.R. 4955 and the approach to vocational education that it represents is this basic fact in American life today: no job training will simply mean no jobs at all for millions of young Americans. The studies show that the very high rate of unemployment among young people in our country is directly related to inadequate education and training. For example, nearly half the total number of persons unemployed in the 16- to 24-year age group in late 1961 had not finished high school. They were dropouts. This lack of job training and education is the key reason that the unemployment rate in the United States last year, 5.6 percent, was nearly twice that high, 9 percent, for the 20- to 24-year-old dropouts and almost three times that high, 15 percent, for 16- to 19-year-olds.

In addition to the fact that education is essential to lowering the unemployment rates among new workers, it ought to be clear by now that at a time of very rapidly changing industrial technology, workers must have the basic education which will enable them to make successful adjustments to the several job changes that they will unquestionably have to experience throughout their working lifetime.

Mr. Chairman, before I discuss some of the major aspects of H.R. 4955, there is one particular aspect of the bill that I want to say a word about for the purpose of clarification, and I invite the attention of my colleague on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

It is my understanding that section 4(c) of the bill would permit contractual arrangements with, on the one hand, local educational agencies with the approval of the State vocational boards and, on the other hand, with colleges, universities, and other public or nonprivate agencies or institutions without their having to seek such State board approval in order to pay part of the cost of research, experimental developmental or pilot programs to meet the special vocational education needs of youth. Through this provision the Office of Education can engage the talent and the research facilities of institutions to pave the way for improved vocational education programs, developing special media and new methods which will be necessary to assist the development of appropriate programs for youths having special academic, socioeconomic or other handicaps. Such research and experimentation and development projects in various fields of educational effort are authorized under the Cooperative Research Act of 1954, Public Law 83–531 and, of course, under the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Public Law 85–864.

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I agree with the gentleman. I think it is our clear intention here that there is no necessity for approval by State vocational boards in the case of grants to colleges, universities, and other public or nonprivate agencies or institutions. The only instance in which we are requiring approval by the State board is in the cast of grants to local educational bodies.

I might also point out that there has been some question raised about this 5-percent category of aid. I think we all agree that there is a long history of Federal legislation in this type of project and for this type of aid all the way from the Atomic Energy Act to the National Defense Education Act and many other pieces of legislation. I think it served a useful purpose in the past in other fields, and I hope it will here.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I want to associate myself with the observation that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] made about the 5-percent provision. Likewise I certainly want to take this opportunity to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] for his untiring and capable work in helping to bring this legislation to the floor.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am glad to yield to my good friend from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to say at the outset I am for this bill. In my opinion, the expansion and development of vocational training is probably one of the best things we could do but I have had a great conviction that if we have such a program, it ought to be open to everybody without regard to race or color. Will the gentleman agree with me? And it ought to be so administered.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I hope very much, without getting into that particular issue, which I know has been the cause of a certain amount of heat here this afternoon, that the point of view which my good friend from Indiana expresses—and

I know how deeply and sincerely he is committed to this cause—will express itself a little later in the year when we have an opportunity to vote on the civil rights bill in general which President Kennedy has sent to Congress. In particular, I hope that that same conviction will be effectively translated, with the effectiveness with which I know my friend from Indiana has so long been associated, into Republican votes for the civil rights bill and especially into Republican votes for the public accommodations feature of that bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BRADEMAS. No. I will not yield any further, because I have yielded too much of my time already.

Mr. HALLECK. I wish very much you would yield.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am sure you do, but I do not care to yield further.

For, Mr. Chairman, I have really not had an opportunity to do what I rose to do, to review very briefly some of the major aspects of this bill, so let me go ahead. I think one of the first points that ought to be made is that the vocational education programs in recent years have been harshly criticized for what some have described as an overemphasis on agriculture and home economics at a time when, as we all know, the pattern of population in our country is shifting from the agricultural areas to the urban and suburban areas.

H.R. 4955 seeks to respond to these changing population patterns by permitting States to transfer funds from one category of vocational training to another to meet the changing needs of the labor market. The bill will not, I want to make clear, force State vocational agencies to shift, for example, their agricultural education funds to training for one of the fields such as trade and industrial occupations. But H.R. 4955 will permit States to transfer funds from one category to another in which there is clearly a need for trained persons.

Another example of the way in which we have sought in this bill to modernize the vocational education program is to broaden the definitions of both agricultural vocational education and home economics training. The definition of vocational agriculture, for example, would be expanded to allow the training of students for food processing, marketing, and farm machinery maintenance jobs, all now excluded by the present requirements in the law that training be for on-the-farm jobs.

Moreover, as you have already been advised, the bill would broaden the existing definition of home economics training, which is now restricted to preparation for work in the home, to permit George-Barden and Smith-Hughes funds earmarked for home economics courses to be used for home economics training which is not directed to activity in the home, but which involves homemaking skills for which employment opportunities exist.

Our bill also authorizes training for new jobs in addition to the existing programs. H.R. 4955 would, for example, authorize classes in business and office work.

In general this bill is a reflection of the determination of the members of our committee on both sides of the aisle to try to bring the vocational education program into a closer and more realistic relationship with the employment needs of the country.

For example, the bill requires State vocational agencies to relate their training programs to manpower needs and job opportunities in that State. For we felt that it was important, indeed essential, that vocational education programs should not be offered in a vacuum, but rather that they should be effective in providing people with the skills they need to find jobs.

For similar reasons, this bill, H.R. 4955, authorizes funds for the construction of area vocational schools about which you have already heard.

I said, Mr. Chairman, that the bill seeks to link job training more closely with job opportunities. Another instance of this approach is the requirement in the bill that the State vocational education agencies plan cooperative arrangements with the public employment offices in the State in order to be able to relate training courses intelligently to reasonable prospects of job opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, these are the major changes that H.R. 4955 would bring to the vocational education program.

The country needs this bill, and especially the young people of the country need this bill.

May I say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that H.R. 4955 represents a bipartisan effort to mount an effective attack on one of the major problems that America faces in the 1960's, providing people with the skills that they need to live useful and productive lives. I hope very much the bill passes with overwhelming support from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I addressed a question to my very good friend from Indiana who has just spoken, and as he expressed a high regard for me, may I say that I have a high regard for him.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that if there ever was a measure before the House of Representatives in which we should be sure that the advantages of this training program are open to everybody, this is it. This is the place and this is the time. As far as I am concerned I want to say here and now that I am going to support this bill, whether this amendment goes in or does not go in. And any talk about the amendment that is to be offered as some sort of move to kill the bill is without foundation. Let me just say to all of you that in my considered judgment this bill is going to be enacted into law.

Mr. Chairman, all that I say is that with this program, which involves the expenditure of Federal money through vocational training to make it possible for the men and women of this country to have jobs, to train them for jobs, that advantage ought to be open to everybody without regard to race or color. As far as I am concerned, I am going to see it through on that basis.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4955. I think the committee has put together a piece of legislation which we can all support and I am happy to be a member of the subcommittee which developed the bill. I think it is going to fulfill the needs of our country in a better way and a less expensive way than any other piece of legislation to assist those who have difficulty in finding jobs that this Congress will consider this year.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Yesterday in the Republican policy committee meeting I was privileged to make the motion supporting this legislation. Oftentimes we have been improperly accused of being negative in our approach to certain pieces of legislation. Our approach has been that if we are going to secure jobs and employment for people the best manner in which it can be done is through the manpower training and vocational education programs rather than through massive make work Federal spending programs.

The minority party has always had a deep concern for each individual citizen of this country. We feel that the funds that are going to be expended on this expanded vocational training program will be much more effective than massive Federal spending programs such as the ARA program and the accelerated public works program. Training is where the emphasis should be given if we are going to get America moving again.

Each Sunday the metropolitan papers of this Nation are making new records in the nuumber of help-wanted ads for trained individuals. In the New York Times, the Milwaukee Journal, the Los Angeles Times, the Chicago Tribune—every day are found long lists of job opportunities for trained individuals. This may well be the most important new legislation to be enacted in this session of Congress.

I commend the gentleman and his committee for bringing out this bill with bipartisan support.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin. He has raised a very important point, because if you look at what we have been doing in vocational education, studying the various documents I have in my hand, you will find that in one study made by Sar A. Levitan, entitled, "Vocational Education and Federal Policy," he said that in 1961 3,150,000 people received vocational education assistance in this country; evidently now it is over 4 million. At this point, I would like to quote Mr. Levitan from his study:

ENROLLMENT

In 1961 a total of 3,856,000 youths and adults were enrolled in federally supported vocational education classes in the United States. The enrollment was almost equally divided between day school programs at-

tended by high school youths, and extension programs serving adults and youths who had left school. But as table 1 shows, home economics accounted for more than half of the total enrollment of high school pupils of federally reimbursed vocational education. This program, useful though it may be as preparation for woman's family and home responsibilities, does not prepare youths for participation in the labor force. If these courses are not counted in the vocational enrollment tally, the other enrollees in 1961 federally reimbursed vocational education courses included less than 1 of every 10 high school students.

It is estimated that less than two-thirds of all public high schools in the Nation offered any federally reimbursed vocational education programs; preparation for agricultural work was offered in nearly half of the Nation's high schools, while only a tenth of the schools offered any courses to high school students in trade and industrial occupations; 1 out of 15 trained students for employment in distributive occupations; and only about 1 out of 25 offered courses which equipped students for technical occupations. Overall, it is apparent that the bulk of American high school students, only 20 percent of whom go on to college, are not offered any opportunity to enroll in vocational training courses which might help them to secure jobs after they complete their formal school training.

TABLE 1.—*Enrollment in federally supported vocational education programs, 1961*

[Numbers in thousands]

| Occupational category | Enrollment | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | High school students [1] | | Extension programs | |
| | | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| All categories | 3,856 | 1,863 | 100.0 | 1,993 | 100.0 |
| Agriculture | 806 | 463 | 24.8 | 343 | 17.2 |
| Trade and industry | 963 | 307 | 16.5 | 656 | 32.9 |
| Home economics | 1,610 | 981 | 52.7 | 629 | 31.6 |
| Distributive | 306 | 43 | 2.3 | 263 | 13.2 |
| Practical nursing | 47 | 29 | 1.6 | 18 | .9 |
| Technician | 123 | 39 | 2.1 | 84 | 4.2 |

[1] Includes also enrollment of post-high-school students.

NOTE.—Individual items in this and following tables may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, "Digest of Annual Reports of State Boards of Vocational Education, 1961," table 3, p. 7.

FINANCING

According to the best rough estimates, total expenditures by public schools in 1961 for vocational education amounted to about $750 million. About two-thirds of this amount was expended for construction of schools and for training in office occupations, for which no financial aid is provided by the Federal Government.

During 1961 the total Federal Government contribution to public school vocational education programs was $48 million; State contributions for programs to which the Federal Government contributed amounted to $89 million; and local government contributions accounted for the balance of $117 million. Thus for every dollar which the Federal Government contributes, the States and local governments contribute over $4 and an additional $10 for construction and other costs for which the Federal Government contributes nothing. Since 1940 Federal Government contributions to vocational education have increased by about 150 percent, while State and local government contributions for the same programs rose almost sixfold, exclusive of rising outlays for programs to which the Federal Government provides no contribution.

The allocation of Federal contributions to each State depends upon the State's share of the total U.S. farm population (agricultural programs), rural population (home economics), nonfarm population (trade and industry), and upon a combination of the above formulas (practical nursing and technical occupations). In 1961 the total Federal allotment for public school vocational education amounted to $50 million, but only $48 million was actually expended. Some States did not take full advantage of Federal contributions available for some programs.

In the fiscal year 1962 to 1963 the Federal Government put up $79.7 million for this purpose. Compare that about $80 million for 4 million people with what is proposed in the youth employment bill. The youth employment bill would cost $100 million the first year for 45,000 students or corpsmen.

The Federal Government never got more for its money than in what it put up for vocational education.

This has been pointed out by many people. I want to point out one by the Republican policy committee entitled, "Forgotten Youth," in which they indicate that vocational and technical training has been virtually neglected and ignored when you compare it with the needs of this country:

A partial solution to the problems of unemployed youth as well as those of the employer looking for skilled or semiskilled help does exist within our educational system—the vocational or technical school—but it has been neglected and ignored. In some cases it almost seems that our school administrators have taken the attitude that if they don't look maybe these schools will go away.

While vocational education is not offered as an absolute solution to all of our social and economic problems, it should be more vigorously pushed, better administered, and more fully financed.

During the past year, the American taxpayer, through local, State, and Federal taxation, paid a total public school bill of $18.1 billion. Of this, $5.6 billion was for secondary (high school) education. Only $254 million, or 4.5 percent, of this secondary school budget was spent on vocational education. Four and one-half percent of the budget was spent to supply the kind of skills needed by the 80 percent of our school population who will enter the labor force without a college education.

Although $254 million is a sizable amount of money, it must be remembered that this is divided among the 50 States and among the 9.6 million high school students who form the 80 percent. This averages out to about $28 spent for each of these pupils. This hardly seems adequate.

We need to do something right away about this problem. There are many people who have studied it and come to the conclusion that this is an area of Federal concern to the Federal Government and we ought to help in that area beginning with this legislation. I think this will point the way to new areas of assisting in vocational education.

I checked with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to determine how the $45 million—the first year's authorization—would be spent. The following is the information which they sent me:

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE BY THE STATES OF PROPOSED $45 MILLION 1964 FEDERAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FUNDS

1. Area vocational school construction (50–50 matching required in 1964): Based on a survey of all the States in spring, 1963, it is estimated that the States would need and use at least $25 million Federal funds for constructing and equipping about 50 new area vocational schools. The estimate does not take into account many millions of dollars for new construction to be expended by post high school institutions or local units of government. The total amount of new money—Federal, State, and local that would go into area school construction and equipment in fiscal year 1964 is estimated at nearly $100 million.

The facilities that would be provided by this new construction are badly needed to provide for the many additional Manpower Development and Training Act and Area Redevelopment Act projects as well as for the rapidly expanding trade and technical education programs for inschool and out-of-school youth and adults preparing to enter the labor market.

2. Obviously the additional facilities would require additional operating funds to carry on new training services. It is estimated that at least $10 million (matching not required in 1964) would be used by the States to help defray the additional operating costs of new trade and technical education programs that could begin operation in fiscal year 1964.

3. Another $5 million (matching not required in 1964) is estimated would be spent on the operation of new office education programs. This kind of vocational education has heretofore not been aided by Federal funds. It is a field of work in which employment opportunities continue to expand and for which high standard training is required.

4. The amount of $2.75 million (matching not required in 1964) is likely to be spent on the expansion of the practical nurse education program and for training in new occupational areas under the broadened provisions in the new legislation for agriculture, home economics, distributive, trade and industrial and technical education.

5. Five percent of the $45 million ($2.25 million) would be set aside for use by the Commissioner in providing vocational education for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps.

SUMMARY

| | *Million* |
|---|---|
| 1. Area vocational school construction | $25 |
| 2. Additional operating costs | 10 |
| 3. New office education training programs | 5 |
| 4. Expanded practical nurse education and new programs under broadened provisions in new legislation | 2.75 |
| 5. Vocational education for those with academic or socioeconomic handicaps | 2.25 |
| Total | 45 |

As you know, until this day the George-Barden, Smith-Hughes programs do not permit Federal assistance in Office of Education training, in expanded practical nurse education; and, lastly, vocational education for those with academic or socioeconomic handicaps.

I feel we have an insufficient amount of money. The percentage of money provided for the assistance of individuals with academic or socioeconomic handicaps amounts to 5 percent of the money or $2¼ million this coming year. I think this is an insufficient amount. It ought to be increased when we look at what has been done in the past, again using Sar Levitan's report, the Federal Government at the present time is spending no money for youths with these special needs. These are the individuals with less than median capabilities. And in the President's June civil rights statement, he summarized his new proposals for vocational education. Among these was the support for an increase to 15 percent in this category. I now quote from the summary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

> The House-reported bill, as well as the administration bill, sets aside 5 percent of the sums appropriated each year for Federal project grants to develop, demonstrate, and evaluate special vocational education programs for youths who, by reason of academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps, would not be able to succeed in the regular programs. The draft bill increases this percentage from 5 to 15 percent and broadens the purpose of the grants to include projects to meet the special vocational education needs of communities having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or who are unemployed.

I know that the vocational education people have been trying to upgrade their programs. They should be commended for that. In many of the programs that I have visited, the mathematics and physics courses are virtually college level and these students could, if they so desired, go on to college. They should be commended for their work in this area. However, we must not forget those students with less than median capabilities who need assistance in vocational education. Any study of the education level of the unemployed shows that the greater the education and the greater the training and vocational education, the less likelihood there is of unemployment.

We have a sound piece of legislation, I believe, here today, that all Members can support.

With reference to the expansion and broadening of the agriculture and home economics definition, it will enable the vocational education people to gear their training to the present day needs for gainful employment without being limited by the law. I think this is another big step forward.

But, the one thing I am concerned about in this legislation is that we are not making certain that all people regardless of their race, that is regardless of the color of their skin, can receive this additional opportunity in vocational education.

From the studies of the unemployment figures, you will note that unemployment among the colored people is about double that of the white race. Unless we do something about it to set our house in order on the Federal Government's part, how can we expect the State government and the local government or the employers or the unions to do it themselves. If the Federal Government continuous to condone unequal opportunity and unequal administration of these laws how can justice prevail? We did not realize the discrimination to be to the extent it is in vocational education until many of us on the committee met with representatives of the NAACP and other organizations in which they indicated very clearly to us that discrimination exists in vocational education more than in any other single education program where the Federal Government assists. That even compares with the impacted area aid laws where a nondiscrimination amendment is presently a part of the extension bill.

There was a study made by our committee, in Southern and border States, showing that 83 percent of all the construction money goes to segregated schools. The problem is not limited to the Southern or border States, however. The problem is also in the Northern States.

I have had individuals who have called on the phone from Minnesota who object to a nondiscrimination amendment being placed on this legislation. I can understand some people being concerned about the possibility of this legislation not passing, but I know full well that with strong support on this side of the aisle and on that side of the aisle for this legislation, it will be enacted into law with a nondiscrimination amendment in it.

Mr. Chairman, I also ask each Member to look at his own conscience when he decides how he is going to vote on the Bell amendment, because 1963 is the year. It is the year when the Congress is going to decide whether the Federal Government puts its house in order and prevent racial discrimination where the Federal Government is involved. If the Federal Government refuses to put its house in order, it looks as if the people of the colored race will have to wait another 100 years for equal rights. I believe human rights come before all other rights. That is why I believe this year we ought to set the pattern in vocational education so that all people might learn the skills they need with which to obtain employment in modern day America.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. GILL].

Mr. GILL. Mr. Chairman, I think it is probably true, as has been said many times here today, that this is one of the most important bills that this Congress will consider. I would agree that it is probably the most important that we have considered so far. I think it is also fair to say that job training as found in the vocational education bill of 1963 is a civil rights bill in and of itself, without amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly obvious to all of the Members of the House that it does very little good to open doors to employment unless there is the means to enter. I think it is obvious, based upon all the studies that we have had submitted to our committee, that the number of dropouts is highest and the level of education and training is the lowest among the Negro and other minority groups in this country.

Mr. Chairman, this particular bill, H.R. 4955, gives us a flexible job-oriented training program. It breaks down the existing inflexible categories. It leaves initiative to the individual States to tailor programs close to their own State needs.

We have noted already the widened definition of agricultural training. We have had the broadened definition of home economics called to our attention. I think we also know that the general definition of vocational education in this bill is aimed to prepare individuals for gainful employment.

I would also like to agree with some of the speakers who have preceded me when they said that the money authorization in this bill is minimal. In fact, I would say, in view of the needs we have observed, it is peanuts. It provides for $45 million in the first year, $90 million in the second year, $135 million in the third year, $180 million for fiscal 1967 and thereafter, which seems to be very little when compared not only with a $100 billion budget, but when compared with the gross national product of this country which runs well over $500 billion per year.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that we can continue to hope, even though the amounts we have supplied here are minimal, that the States will continue to overmatch money for vocational education as they are doing now, sometimes to the extent of $8 to $1. We can also take hope from the proviso contained in this bill that Federal money shall not replace State money under this act.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like the indulgence of the Members of the Committee for a word or two about the civil rights rider which will be offered in a few minutes.

I think that my colleague and I from the new State of Hawaii can say at least one thing that few others in this body can say, and that is this: We come here representing a constituency the majority of which are of non-Caucasian extraction. There are very few in this Chamber in a similar situation. There are extremely few on the Republican side of the aisle. I think that our people have no desire at all to see their tax dollars or any Federal tax dollars spent in areas where people are denied rights to an education because of racial discrimination, or because of any barriers based on race, color or creed.

But I think also that our people are perfectly capable of understanding political shell games. I think that they are all perfectly aware of the fact that when the time comes to vote on a civil rights bill we are going to be here with both feet, with both hands, and our hearts and heads. Our people know we are going to work for the toughest civil rights bill that can come out of this Congress. I certainly hope that the great ardor that has been displayed on one side of this House today for civil rights continues for a few weeks until

we get a chance to vote on a civil rights bill that means something.

This is a civil rights bill in its own right, and I hope you will bear with us to keep it separate from nondiscrimination riders, regardless of the sincerity of those who may offer them. It is not wise at this point to mix our legislative pots on this vote and confuse both the issue and our citizens.

If time permits, I will have more to say on this when the rider is offered.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, it is a great privilege for me to join in the discussion of the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Approximately 23 years ago, I, myself, graduated from a vocational high school in my home city of Pittsfield, Mass. Little did I know at that time that the smoldering fire of war would disrupt my life for the next 5 years. There was, to be sure, the feeling in the air, but many of my fellow graduates at that time felt confident for certain reasons. We were, for example, trained to meet an increasing technological age. Many of us, who went into the service at the outbreak of U.S. entry into the war, were able to play our small role in our victory because we were so trained. I, for one, will never forget or play down my vocational training, and while I am grateful that I later had the opportunity to attend college and law school, I think the practical experience and knowledge I gained at that time were essential to my future.

For these and many other reasons, Mr. Chairman, I am interested in this legislation. But even beyond personal considerations, there is a tremendous need in the United States for technological support in an ever increasing scientific era. For the most part, the United States has recognized this need in the passing of the Morrill Act in 1862, the historic Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 and other important legislation. The U.S. Government has long recognized the necessity of vocational training in America, and I am proud that my country has so acted.

In spite of this progressive and farsighted thinking on the part of Congress, the need increases. Automation and technology, while eliminating jobs, have had the paradoxical effect of increasing the need for even more skilled technicians at certain levels.

The technological revolution, which we are experiencing, requires the continuation, the extension, and expansion of this program.

I was certainly gratified in 1961 when President Kennedy named an advisory panel to study this program. Certainly much of the legislation being considered today is an outgrowth of that study. As the committee report so vividly states, there have been more advances made in the past 50 years than in all preceding history. Ninety percent of the scientists who ever lived are alive today. The point I am making is that without the supporting technician the scientist is handicapped and production is held back. While it is estimated that we should be training about 100,000 new technicians each year to meet our needs, we are training only 20,000 technicians annually.

Meanwhile, the number of workers in low skill occupations is rapidly declining. There was, for example, a drop of 772,000 workers in such categories in manufacturing between 1957 and 1962. Another startling fact is that jobs for professional and technical workers will rise about 40 percent in the 1970's, and jobs for salesworkers, managers, and proprietors will rise only about 20 percent.

It is estimated for this decade alone, that 2.6 million of our young people will be seeking employment each year. Many of these and others in various age groups will need training and retraining to obtain positions. Our schools must be geared to prepare these groups for employment more adequately than they presently do. Less than one in five of all high school students are enrolled in vocational programs, even through formal education will end in high school for most of them. This means that the present demand for funds for facilities, equipment, and teachers are severely limited in vocational education high schools, and area school programs.

With all of these facts so evident, Mr. Chairman, the importance of this legislation becomes manifest.

H.R. 4955 does not require a State to continue its current level of support for vocational education to match the Federal funds for program operation in fiscal year 1964. For subsequent fiscal years, matching is required on a 50–50 basis. In addition, States must assure that Federal funds complement but do not replace local and State funds.

I dare say that Massachusetts, which has an outstanding vocational system, will benefit from this program.

In concluding, Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote from the committee report:

> Much honor and distinction in the world of work for the technician, the craftsman, the officeworker, the salesman, the serviceman and the farmer who adequately prepares himself for his life vocation.

This is something that I know from personal experience, Mr. Chairman, and I think that the Congress of the United States would be making a significant contribution to the lofty economic ideals of this Nation by the passage of this bill.

We will all be victors in the end, and the country will know that we have not turned our backs on those who have already given so much to our Nation, and to those whose future depends upon it.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise my voice in opposition to those who are saying here today that there is not any need for a civil rights provision in this vocational training bill. I cannot accept the theory that is being bandied about here to the effect that a bill cannot be effective if it is designed for all people. This is certainly not a good argument and it just so happens that the civil rights amendment to this bill would greatly strengthen it.

Now in view of my strong support of this legislation, I do not want to see this bill pass by the wayside. As I have indicated, there is a pressing need for the bill, and the Congress would be making a significant contribution to the economic progress of the country by enacting the provisions contained in the bill.

There is the usual fear which I have heard expressed so often in these Chambers, Mr. Chairman, that an amendment of this type will kill the bill. I heartly disagree with that point of view in this particular instance. In some cases, such a point of view would have merit. It is often necessary, given the form of our legislative structure, to make slow gains rather than dump an entire program because of a controversial position.

I feel, however, that there is sufficient support necessary to pass this bill with a civil rights provision.

In this case, we have strong Republican support and with the support of the Members of the other side of the aisle, we should be able to enact legislation with additional teeth.

If this bill is designed for only a particular race of people, it loses its purpose. In fact, any discriminatory legislation at this point would lessen the faith that Americans have in their elected officials. We cannot overlook the desires of the great numbers of Americans, of all races, who desire equality—and indeed demand equality—in all phases of American life.

We cannot legislate discrimination, Mr. Chairman, and if we ignore the civil rights possibilities in this bill, we will be defeating the lofty ideals of our way of life.

Indeed, the people who might benefit—and by doing so, benefit the entire Nation—most from this bill would be left out. As the Republican members said in their supplemental views to the committee report—"We are disappointed and disturbed that this legislation—which will chart the future course of vocational education for many years—does not contain assurance that the federally financed programs will be available to all citizens without discrimination because of race or color."

It is crystal clear to me, Mr. Chairman, that such assurances are absolutely essential. If we fail to enact these additional provisions, we may wake tomorrow and find that the faith in this body has diminished greatly throughout the land. The entire country will take close account of this activity today, and the antidiscrimination provision would be the most meaningful thing that we could accomplish in addition to passing this bill. It is a responsibility that we are duty-bound to accept. It is a responsibility that we must accept.

I respectfully ask for the immediate passage of this bill. It is a good bill. It is a practical bill. It is an important bill. Let us make certain that it becomes a working principle of this Nation.

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

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this most important bill, H.R. 4955 designed to strengthen and improve vocational education in the Nation. This is not a new bill; it improves and strengthens existing programs. It is particularly needed today,

in the 1960's, when new kinds of unemployment have been thrust upon us. The pressures of automation and other advances in the sciences, coupled with an expanding population, contribute toward a dangerously high percentage of unemployment. This is particularly true in the crowded cities, and in those areas where ghetto living and slum conditions have smothered educational opportunities and vocational training advancement.

I have long maintained that among the best weapons against modern-day hardcore unemployment are manpower retraining and basic vocational training, designed to give new skills to persons who find themselves among the mass of unemployed through no fault of their own. Manpower retraining is a pinpointed method of attacking the problem. Massive outlays of Federal money to local communities, such as the mismanaged and floundering area redevelopment program, are not the answer to modern technological problems. The answer lies in giving people, particularly young people, an opportunity to learn and develop new skills in areas where there are labor shortages. Nowhere is this truer than in the case of minority groups. The great pressure and the chief passion today among Negroes seeking equal opportunities and recognition on the basis of merit is for job opportunities. I believe the country is beginning to recognize the necessity and importance of opening up the labor market—in management and labor alike—to Negroes and the training of Negroes. In the past, there has been little incentive for members of minority groups to take up vocations when the doors have been closed to later employment. If we can change this, and I have high hopes, it is all the more important that the training programs begin. Unemployment among Negro groups is 2½ times the rate of unemployment among whites. These tragic figures are directly related to inferior educational opportunities, both basic education and vocational education. Let us in part rectify this problem in this bill today. And in doing so, let us make certain that the benefits of this legislation are made available to all citizens of our society who are in need and who will benefit our society by the application of this training.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, in almost 11 years as a Member of this body I have patiently listened as my longstanding personal position with respect to civil rights, and I believe the majority position of Republicans, is consistently maligned as insincere. I cannot understand why advocating a civil rights principle as it pertains to an individual bill is maligned as insincere unless it is part of an omnibus civil rights bill which we are always waiting for and never seems to arrive. Principles can and should be as valid in single serving as in wholesale lots.

Had the Republican position on bills like medical facilities, HEW appropriations, housing, and others been adopted in a piecemeal fashion, then most of the pending civil rights bill would be unnecessary.

I have conducted a spot check on the Republican side of the aisle, and I will confidently predict that at least 130 Republicans will vote for an antidiscrimination amendment to this bill and then will support the bill as amended. Allowing for 20 absentees, a majority today would be 208 votes.

So when the gentleman from Kentucky says that the amendment of the gentleman from California will kill the bill, he must mean that the Democratic Party cannot muster a paltry 78 votes out of its membership of 277 to support vocational education without discrimination. If this is what the gentleman meant—and what else could he mean—then he has exposed the schizophrenic civil rights personality of the Democratic Party in all its nakedness for all the world to see.

And all the pious pronouncements from the "de facto" segregated village of Hyannis Port cannot erase the fact that the Democratic Party does not act big when it comes to civil rights—it only talks big from both the northern and southern sides of its mouth.

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

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 4955. I intend to support as a matter of personal conviction the antidiscrimination amendment to be offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, some idea of the primacy of civil rights over all other issues now pending before this Congress, can be gained from the fact that far more time has been spent during this debate discussing the so-called antidiscrimination amendment than the merits of H.R. 4955, itself.

We have heard often, from the other side of the aisle, the warning that the addition of such an amendment to this bill will "kill" the bill, though there is a certain amount of fuzziness over there as to exactly how or where this crime is to be perpetrated. But, let us take a look at the need for insuring—if we possibly can—that the benefits of this measure are made available to all citizens, as the President's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education urged—and I quote from the report on page 6—"regardless of race."

A few simple statistics ought to be sufficient to establish the stake that the American Negro has in this expanded program. As of 1961, the last year for which figures are available, per capita income for the Negro here in the United States stood at $1,100; that of his white counterpart at $2,450. More significant even than that, perhaps—at least for purposes of showing the need for upgrading the working skills of thousands of our fellow citizens who happen not to be white—is the further fact that, in the same year, the average wage of the employed Negro was $3,015, while that of his white fellow worker was $5,287.

Of equal pertinence, for the first quarter of 1963, unemployment among white citizens stood at 5.9 percent—but for nonwhites it was 12.7 percent. And—one more—since this expanded program is supposed to be especially aimed at helping our youth, we must note that for teenagers, as we usually refer to them, unemployed whites amounted to 13.4 percent in that category, but the percentage of unemployed Negro youths was 29.8 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that our present racial unrest stems, more than anything else, from this sort of economic discrimination—and that this will be a far tougher nut to crack than ending discrimination in places of so-called public accommodation. Most assuredly, education is the key to the solution, and I just do not think we will ever have a better place to start turning that key than in the bill now before us.

What I have been saying goes to the practical justification for supporting the Bell amendment. I believe, however, that we should also support it because, very simply, it is right—and, regardless of all the talk of political moves and countermoves we have heard about here this afternoon, all of us in our hearts must know that it is right.

Mr. Chairman, my friends across the aisle have time and again inferred that, if the Bell amendment carries, certain Members of this body will no longer support and vote for H.R. 4955. Well, there is another side to that coin, too; there may be a substantial number of us who will not vote for this bill unless it is perfected by the addition of the Bell amendment, and I count myself in that category.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time especially to say a word of commendation in great sincerity of my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE]. He has worked very hard and conscientiously on this legislation. He has done a masterful job, as usual, in making a contribution to the details and development of the legislation. It has always been in a constructive and friendly and sympathetic manner with reference to the entire vocational education bill. I think the record should be clear that Mr. QUIE is one of the very significant constructors of this legislation.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE]. I do not know of any member on the subcommittee who worked longer hours or more untiringly to make a success of this legislation than the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE]. He not only has contributed to the development of this piece of legislation but also the legislation embodied in the higher education bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, I, too, rise in support of this legislation and the Bell amendment. And, as was in-

dicated by the minority leader, I propose to support the legislation whether the amendment carries or not. But I have taken time to call the attention of the House to what I consider to be certain omissions in this bill. I have noticed that all of us have been talking here today about all Americans and all the youth of America. And yet when the Bell amendment is proposed it is going to speak only of race and color and it is not going to mention that third word that usually goes with race and color, and that is creed. I would call the attention of the House, as I read this bill, to page 43, when we talk of research and experiment, I believe we are talking about institutions entitled to aid who are nonprofit and nonpublic institutions. But when we come to page 50 of this bill and when we describe what is meant by vocational education, we say that this must be under public supervision and control or under contract with a State board or local educational agency.

I am convinced that both the proposer of the amendment and the committee inadvertently neglected to include those youngsters who do not go to public schools or publicly supported schools.

I would certainly think vocational schools like Boys Town and Moose Heart and the schools of all the religious denominations in this country who need Federal aid in this field more than any other would be included in this bill. So at the appropriate time I shall offer an amendment to permit Federal aid in vocational training to those nonprofit institutions. It is my hope that the Committee and the House will support the amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to commend the subcommittee, its staff, and the chairman for the zeal and diligence they have shown in the preparation of this legislation which is on the floor today.

I hope I shall have the opportunity if the Bell amendment is offered to make some appropriate comments as to what it might mean in the State which I represent, and which understands the full meaning of civil rights. As the amendment is now written, it may well mean that in the State of New York, one of the great leaders of the Nation in civil rights, by reason of the imbalance in the vocational schools, that very imbalance which is due to the fact that we are seeking to aid the man who is on the lowest rung of the ladder of education, that man we are seeking to assist may be denied.

This bill goes to the heart of disadvantage. This is a fine bill.

Some partisan comments have been made about the role of the Democratic Party in civil rights. I hope you will remember that the reason there was no elephant at the Boston Tea Party was because while he undoubtedly might have kicked the tea overboard he might also have sunk the ship. Let us not sink this ship. Let us give this advantage to those who need it in the vocational schools. I hope you will keep that ultimate goal in mind.

Mr. Chairman, the number of people entering the labor market without a college degree in this decade is estimated at 23 million. In addition to this number needing preemployment training, many workers require retraining in vocational programs to upgrade and update their skills.

Americans hold that the manifold tasks of the world of work are all equally important and that the man dignifies the job, not the reverse. We believe that in a democracy everyone should have access throughout life to the education and training needed to develop to his highest potential. Education is a continuous process, not an injection that thereafter makes the individual immune to ignorance and the need for knowledge. Expanded vocational education, apprenticeship and technical training are especially needed now to prepare both new workers and the unemployed to fill the job openings available for skilled or specialized workers.

The need is immediate, Mr. Chairman, when we consider that 67 percent of vocational graduates get employment and 17 percent go on to further schooling. The need is immediate when we consider only 1½ cents out of each dollar spent by U.S. public schools now goes for vocational education. The need is obvious when we realize that less than two-thirds of the Nation's high schools offer any vocational training.

The Vocational Education Act is a modernization of the Federal program which will enable more individuals to meet the greater demand for skilled workers.

In stressing the need for the action we are about to take in passing this Vocational Education Act, the President's Commission on National Goals said:

> A higher proportion of the gross national product must be devoted to educational purposes. This is at once an investment in the individual, in the democratic process, in the growth of the economy, and in the stature of the United States.
>
> Where reemployment within the industry is not possible, retraining must be carried out through vocational programs managed locally and financed through State and Federal funds.

Mr. Chairman, the scope and magnitude of the program to be effective for the Nation as a whole cannot be adequately financed by State and local school districts. Maximum effectiveness and efficiency are achieved when the local school districts, the State, and the Federal Government jointly finance these programs. In no other area have we the history of good Federal-State cooperation at the elementary and secondary level as we have in the Smith-Hughes Act and the George-Barden Act, where there has never really been any presentation of a substantial complaint of the existence of Federal control or interference.

The Vocational Education Act continues the work started by the Federal Government in this field. We now have an act which will enable more individuals to meet the demands for newer and greater skills in our changing economy. This bill provides the needed aid in the vocational high school; on the semi-higher level for those who can participate on a full-time basis; to those who need further training or retraining for improving their occupational competences; for the handicapped; for construction and for research programs in various areas of vocational education.

Mr. Chairman, the proposed Vocational Education Act of 1963 expands the scope of present vocational education and offers vocational education and training in more fields to more people. This new flexibility is in keeping with the rapid developments of our technology and changes in the labor market. I call for the passage of this important education bill as part of our overall responsibility in this area.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, naturally, at the appropriate time when the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] offers his amendment I will make certain remarks concerning the position of the amendment in this bill and its effect. I think it would be more appropriate for me to make such remarks when the bill is being considered under the 5-minute rule than now.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4955, and respectfully direct your attention to the first paragraph of the committee's report on this bill:

> It is the purpose of H.R. 4955 to redirect and expand Federal financial assistance to vocational education so as to assure vocational educational opportunities for all citizens which will be of high quality and realistic in terms of the Nation's actual manpower needs and job opportunities.

The succinctness of this statement in no way diminishes its import. The very foundation of our national economy, the factor which determines our rate of prosperity and growth, is the capability of our work force. Who would dispute that manpower is our greatest resource? And unlike our natural resources of water, timber, minerals, et cetera, it is not subject to depletion. Rather we find ourselves with a seemingly unexpendable supply, with increasing numbers of older workers and a steadily increasing volume of young people entering the labor market. At the same time, technological advances have radically changed our work patterns. The result is that at one time we have an extraordinarily high unemployment rate and yet lack qualified applicants for such jobs as do exist.

It is no secret that even in this land of plenty there are today hundreds of thousands of people who live in substandard housing, poorly clothed and ill fed, receiving inadequate medical care and little or no educational opportunities. These are the people who contribute least to our national productivity and require most of our national welfare costs. Workers who have been displaced because of automation become statistics on the unemployment compensation rolls. Many of those just entering the labor market are not properly equipped for employment in a country where the number of unskilled jobs continues to decline. The cost to our national economy both in terms of welfare and unemployment costs, and the

overall loss because of failure to produce, is, I would think, beyond the comprehension of even those Members of Congress who are accustomed to thinking and speaking in millions, and even billions, of dollars.

Thus, I think it is important that we redirect our thinking when we consider this bill and its authorization for appropriations. Today's demands have outmoded the question of whether we can afford this educational project. We can afford it. But more important we cannot afford to be without it. The real test is whether we will make it possible for our citizens to realize their true values and full capabilities. We are not just spending. We are investing—investing in our Nation's economic future, and assuring its stability by demonstrating our expectation of a greater return from and for our most valuable asset, our labor force.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, the Vocational Education Act of 1963 offers opportunities for solution of many of the most pressing problems of the day.

This act offers a modernized vocational educational program to supplement the outdated programs presently administered by the State and local school districts under existing Federal legislation.

School dropouts and juvenile delinquency reflect in large part the absence of programs for vocational training for productive service for which this bill offers a logical solution.

The problem of unemployment—especially our unemployed youth—can be alleviated by the operation of this proposed new Vocational Education Act. The demand for skilled employees is at an alltime peak. The opportunities for satisfying this demand are present here today in this legislation.

The bill recognizes the wisdom of that part of the National Defense Act of 1958 to continue training in such areas as electronics, mechanics, electrical, chemical, aeronautical instrumentation, data processing, and computer programing.

This legislation is also in the interest of job opportunities for all Americans. Our citizens, who represent racial minorities, have the greatest stake in this legislation. Accordingly, it is essential that the bill should provide specifically that the program shall be administered without discrimination. We should not permit the practice of segregation in our public schools to be encouraged by this important legislation.

The amendment to be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] to provide that the Federal funds authorized in this act shall be administered on a nondiscriminatory basis in nonsegregated schools, should be adopted.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, having long been interested in the field of vocational education, I am very vigorously in support of this bill. I feel that it is a phase of education that has been all too long neglected. I trust it will be passed, and that the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] will also prevail.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill now before the House, H.R. 4955, to redirect and expand Federal financial assistance to vocational education. Further, I wish to state my support of the amendment which would guarantee the application of these funds without discrimination.

I regard this proposed legislation as a necessary modernization of the responsibility borne by the Federal Government in assisting the States in providing trained and skilled persons for the employment and manpower needs of the Nation. Since Congress first acted in this field, with the passage of the Morrill Act more than 100 years ago, it has been found that such legislative improvements assure that vocational education opportunities are realistic in terms of the country's actual manpower needs and job opportunities.

This is an area where evidence of the stimulating effect of Federal funds on State and local expenditures abounds. While the Federal Government's funding for vocational education assistance has roughly doubled in the last 15 years, combined State and local spending has been tripled. In dollar amounts, the State and local governments are contributing nearly four and a half times as much to these programs as the Federal Government.

I wish to reemphasize, Mr. Chairman, the importance which I feel is attached to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentlemen from California [Mr. BELL] to protect the vocational education programs which this bill would support from the evils of discrimination. For every citizen denied the benefits of these programs because of his skin color, the value of this legislation will diminish.

The antidiscrimination amendment is a logical first step to take in our efforts to eliminate bias in hiring practices. Unless there is equal opportunity in vocational training, there cannot be equal opportunity in employment.

I think there is another feature which should be pointed out in this bill, and that is the stimulating effect that Federal money has had on the use of moneys by State and local governments. This is the way in which the Federal Government can very effectively assist in a program, by stimulating the use of State and local moneys to help in an area such as this. I think also it is very important for us to make certain that every American citizen has an equal opportunity to share in the benefits of this very important legislation. Therefore, I certainly support the Bell amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and also in support of the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] which I understand he intends to introduce.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this bill is extremely important. It deals with vocational training, an area where there is a clear need; it deals with the need for special skills in a time of automation. Further, it seems to me that the amendment that has been proposed is not "extraneous" but is rather central to the future of this bill. The legislation we are dealing with specifically says it is "to assure vocational educational opportunities for all citizens."

To the extent that any American might be denied an opportunity for vocational training because of race or color, it would be repugnant. The fact, Mr. Chairman, is that in the United States only 2 percent of those undergoing apprentice training are Negroes and that the unemployment amongst Negroes in the United States is somewhere between 11 and 20 percent. I believe this demonstrates a need for this amendment and I support it most wholeheartedly and equally, Mr. Chairman, I support the bill, with or without the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, as the last speaker on our side, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I support the expansion of vocational education, as provided in this bill. In fact, as a member of the subcommittee which considered this legislation, I am very proud of having made a contribution to its development. This legislation is important to California or any other State in helping to meet the complex and changing manpower needs. The purpose of H.R. 4955 is to help assure—through an expanded and modernized program of vocational education—that individuals can find a worthwhile and valuable role in a modern technological economy.

Mr. Chairman, I plan to introduce an amendment to this bill which will prohibit the use of Federal funds in vocational schools practicing discrimination.

For that very reason, the amendment I propose is a vital necessity. It is not a "rider" on this bill, but an essential part of it. The value of this legislation would be greatly diminished without an assurance of fair and equal administration. In fact, for millions of our fellow citizens, this bill has no value at all unless it contains such an assurance.

Racial discrimination in publicly-financed education programs is unconstitutional. It is a denial of the individual's chance to improve his own lot or to share in the abundance of America. Racial discrimination in federally-financed vocational education programs is unjustified, but commonly practiced. In fact, it is so commonly practiced that it is a basic element of a systematic denial of equal opportunity in many sections of this Nation.

On what basis is this amendment opposed? Well, first, some people say that it would "kill the bill." I do not believe this is true. I believe that this Congress can enact—will enact—a vocational education bill which assures against Federal support for racial discrimination. This is the education program in which

such assurance is most needed—because it is most vital to Negro citizens. We all know that unemployment is twice as high among nonwhites as it is among white citizens. A prime cause of this is lack of opportunity to acquire needed skills. I do not see how the Congress—or any Member of Congress from any section of the country—can ignore this fact.

Opponents of this amendment have said that if aid is cut off, Negro children will suffer most. I raised this question with one of the foremost national leaders of the Negro struggle for equal rights: He replied that the argument is not accurate because Negro children in many cases already suffer from a lack of opportunity to share in the benefits of this program, or to share equally in such benefits.

Finally, it will be argued that our committee is about to report a bill that would have the identical effect and also apply to several other education programs. That is true. I introduced such a bill myself and have supported it in our committee. What you will not be told is that this separate bill will most likely never get to this House for consideration. So, if we really mean to assure against continued racial discrimination in vocational education, now is the chance to act. There probably will not be another opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is necessary; it is not punitive in effect; it is reasonable in application; it would be an effective and positive encouragement to equal opportunity for high-quality vocational education.

This is time for action on civil rights not conversation. I support this bill. The Republican Party and the Republican policy committee of the House supports this bill. We support an effective assurance against continued discrimination in vocational education. I think it is now necessary for the proponents of civil rights on the other side to demonstrate their sincerity by supporting this amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN].

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to compliment the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee on their splendid work in preparing this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, it is a great pleasure today to support H.R. 4995. I had the privilege during the last session of serving as a member of the Education Committee. During that time the success of this particular program was daily called to my attention by people from all over the United States. Certainly, it has enthusiastic support from my own State where it has been most successful.

The vocational-technical schools in Washington had their early start through enactment of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917 during World War I for typically enough impetus is given to vocational and technical education during a period of crisis.

The seven vocational-technical schools in Washington were started during World War II. Since that time and during the post World War II era, vocational education has been passing through another crisis brought on by the cold war and by the swift movement to automate many of our manufacturing processes.

Despite the rapid growth of vocational-technical education in Washington, the State is simply unable to meet the manpower needs. In 1962 Washington's 20 post-high-school institutions enrolled more than 8,000 full-time vocational day students, employed 400 full-time day instructors, enrolled 60,000 part-time adult students, and employed 1,500 part-time instructors.

Total education facilities in the 20 schools have a valuation of $40 million, with $12 million in specialized equipment. Present planning calls for adding $12 million for vocational-technical facilities over the next 2 years.

Washington industries naturally would prefer to hire locally trained people. Yet, in 1962, were forced to go outside the State to hire approximately 50 percent of their technicians while many Washington youths went untrained and unemployed.

Presently most of the vocational-technical education is offered in Washington's three largest vocational-technical institutions. These and the other four vocational-technical institutions have substantial plans for expansion. In the next 3 years approximately a 200-percent increase in technical education programs in the community colleges is anticipated.

At present, post-high school vocational-technical schools and colleges are supplying one-third of the State's technical education needs—in 5 years, they should be supplying two-thirds of the needs. Last year the average starting salary for Washington's technical education graduates was $5,700.

The most recent major development is in the field of data processing. Ten data-processing programs were started, enrolling 180 full-time preparatory students with approximately twice that number enrolled in extension courses for employed workers. The instructional equipment in these institutions averages $200,000 per school and it is anticipated that five additional centers will establish data processing in the immediate future.

As of June 30, three-fourths of the 1962 graduates from vocational schools of Washington received jobs with wages varying from $4,800 to $8,000. The national average is $4,200. Just this morning I received a communication from the Battle Ground School District which has the largest Future Farmers of America chapter in the State of Washington. It reads:

> Vocational training is a great addition to our school and contributes to successful farming ventures, a major factor in our area economy.

In conclusion, may I urge the passage of this bill because young people are seeking work in ever-increasing numbers for modern business and manufacturing techniques requiring skilled workers and there is also the persistent need for retraining and readaptation.

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

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4955, a bill vitally important to the American labor force in general and to the unemployed and unskilled in particular. This bill will improve the quality of vocational education and certainly will expand the opportunities of providing a skill for hundreds of thousands of our unemployed and handicapped. Mr. Chairman, representing a coal mining area in southern Illinois, I have watched both young and old remain on relief, unemployment compensation rolls and other State and Federal subsistence programs because they found themselves ill equipped to find new employment when coal mining jobs disappeared. The young people particularly are eager to learn a skill but without financial means in many cases it has been an impossibility. This bill will allow those persons who are anxious to work but do not have a skill to find new hope and new employment.

This legislation will also allow our handicapped to become useful once again through a skill not possible without this kind of assistance. In many areas such as southern Illinois, we find changing work patterns because of mechanization in our coal mines, on our farms and in factories and the jobs that are displaced because of these changes will be added to the already high unemployment list if we do not find new means of training these workers for other skills.

Mr. Chairman, we are seeing our young boys and girls leave school and go into the labor market without the proper vocational training. This bill offers more hope to this group than any legislation that has been before Congress in the past several years. There are many valuable aspects of this bill that time will not permit me to discuss, however, I hope it will suffice to say that the enactment of this proposed law will in effect be strengthening the job opportunities of a growing America in a manner that will have lasting benefits.

Mr. Chairman, I have consistently voted for civil rights legislation during my five terms in Congress although the Negro population comprises less than 2 percent of my congressional district population, however, I can not support the Bell amendment that will be offered today because I feel it has no place in this proposal. The entire civil rights program will be brought to the floor very shortly in a separate measure and I have been assured by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], that the purposes intended by the Bell amendment will be covered fully in the omnibus civil rights legislation. Therefore it is my sincere hope that the Bell amendment be defeated and the legislation as reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor be approved. To do less will be a defeat for those who need help the most.

In closing, let me congratulate my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], and his colleagues on the subcommittee and full

committee for the great job they have done on this legislation.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], to close the debate.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the kindness of the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], in allowing me this time, and to show my appreciation I shall be brief in my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, rarely have I had the privilege of sitting through a debate on the floor of the House in which there was such unanimous agreement from both sides of the aisle as to the merits of a piece of legislation. It appears that the only controversy with respect to this legislation is whether there is perhaps enough money in it or, secondly, as to the merits of an amendment which has not as yet been offered. I think this is a real tribute to the work of the subcommittee chairman and the members of the Subcommittee on General Education.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to say only one or two things, particularly as this bill pertains to my own State and to my own district. California is a State whose economy and whose industry is geared to the space age. For the past several years, particularly since 1957 when the Russian sputnik alerted everyone to the needs of science and technology, California has been in the forefront of research in space and research of a similar nature. I feel that what has happened as a result has been an overconcentration, on training in science and technology to the neglect of basic requirements of that 80 percent of our population who are not going to become engineers and scientists, but who are going to perform the ordinary work of the community which needs to be carried on. This neglect has created a serious problem in my own district which is a low-income district. We have large numbers of minority students who drop out of school. I think they have missed the opportunity which they are entitled to as citizens of the wealthiest nation on the face of the earth. I believe this vocational education bill will do something to correct that. It is my opinion that it will give them the opportunity they have missed.

It will therefore, be of tremendous value to the people of my district.

Why could not California, a rich State, have provided this program itself? That is a question I am sure will be asked. Many of you followed what happened in the California Legislature this year. We were up against the situation where no new taxes had been pledged, where the actual needs of the educational program at our elementary and secondary schools were not able to be met because of this situation. Of course, the kind of program contemplated in this billl, has a low priority because it deals largely with persons who have dropped out of school or may have graduated and need retraining. This kind of vocational educational program receives little, if any, attention at all. So California does need the kind of help this bill can give.

More and more, also, we are finding in California that the kind of jobs that we have, are jobs which are constantly changing. This point has been brought out also, but it needs to be emphasized. Today education is a lifetime process. We cannot train ourselves for a job and expect we will remain in that job for 30, 40 or 50 years. We will probably find that we will have to be retrained more than once during our working lifetime. This is the kind of problem this bill is directed to. I think that the bill goes a long way in solving the problem, and I wish to give it my wholehearted support.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill but I would prefer it include the Bell antidiscrimination amendment. I cannot conceive how anyone can justify taking tax money from any citizen for a Federal program, yet deny him the opportunity to participate in it because of his color. This is not only unjust, it is downright immoral. In a few weeks we will be debating a civil rights bill on the floor of this House. On a matter of citizen rights, there should be no need to debate. There is no argument when rights guaranteed by our Constitution are involved.

I have stated on many occasions on and off the record that the responsibility of Government is to provide equal opportunity to all. Some will avail themselves of the opportunity, others will not do so. But we do have the obligation to provide opportunity on an equal basis to all, regardless of race or color. We cannot expect all our citizens to assume equal responsibilities as citizens consistent with their innate abilities and educated talents unless all have equal opportunities to develop their abilities and talents.

If this legislation fails it will not be because the majority Members of this House are not interested in this vocational training bill but because the majority of Members in this House are not interested in providing civil rights in this field.

The primary consideration before us is one of principle. It is this, Shall we deny one segment of our population equal opportunity to avail themselves of the Government program or shall we provide equal opportunity?

My vote for the bill if the Bell amendment is defeated, will be in the hope that this injustice of discrimination can be subsequently eliminated.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering today is of great importance to my State of Rhode Island and to the Nation. The needs of our country demand that vocational education be improved and expanded, and this legislation is a major step in that direction.

We live in a changing world. The intensity and character of these changes demand that we exert every effort to keep pace with them by adapting to new situations as they arise. It is no exaggeration to say that there can no longer be a status quo in the areas of domestic and international affairs. To stand still in these times is equivalent to moving backward.

Since job training is one of the most vital concerns on the domestic scene, it is necessary that vocational education be of the highest quality. Technological changes which lie at the root of much of the present unemployment, have dated our current programs of vocational education and demand a new and more forceful approach in finding a solution to chronic unemployment in the United States.

The State of Rhode Island has been doing a good job in preparing young people to enter the labor market. However, my State and other States need help and leadership in updating our programs and strengthening our efforts. In that regard, this act will be of welcome assistance. H.R. 4955 makes provision for the expansion of vocational education programs, matching Federal-State funds, a very practical transfer of funds between occupational categories, area vocational schools, periodic analysis of training in relation to the job market, and assurance of high standards in vocational education.

I am deeply concerned with improving the employment opportunities of the youth of Rhode Island and the Nation. Since more and more young people are entering the labor market with each passing day, it is especially important that the Congress act now to assure a lessening of youth unemployment and general unemployment by expanding the scope and improving the quality of vocational education. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill in the interests of America's youth and America's future.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, during my short tenure in the U.S. Congress, I have become an outspoken critic of the administration's domestic policy. Certainly, I have never challenged or criticized the motivation of the President, any member of the administration, or of the Congress. On many occasions I have been forced to vote against administration proposals, not because I opposed the program, and not because I failed to recognize the problem and the need for a reasonable solution, but because I had not been convinced that the proposed solution would in fact resolve the problem. Today I am happy that I and the Members of Congress have been presented with a program that can and will solve one of the most difficult domestic problems facing the Nation at the present time. That probem is unemployment. The President himself has characterized our unemployment problem, particularly among the young people, as one of the most pressing and difficult of all our domestic problems. With this I fully agree. His proposed Vocational Education Act of 1963 represents a straightforward, honorable, and realistic approach to this tremendous program. It seems almost paradoxial that at a time when unemployment is one of the greatest domestic problems, that we would have hundreds of thousands of jobs available in our industrial and technical economic society which remain unfilled because of lack of qualified personnel to do the work. It appears that in the face of this situation, the real problem that

confronts us is not creating jobs, it is not sending our young people to the forests to plant trees or creating makework projects. The real and the long-term solution very obviously lies in teaching our young people to perform the work and acquire the skills for which there is already a market. The long-term solution, and certainly consistent with our free enterprise system, is helping these people to help themselves. We can, if we desire, send our young people into the forest and temporarily take them off our streets and keep them occupied. But eventually the day will come when they must return from the forest, when they will in all likelihood become married, and be forced to assume the responsibilities of parenthood. It is for this time and for this occasion that we must be prepared. If these people possess the skills and the technical know-how to perform the work, labor, and services that are in sore demand in our economic society, these people can provide a livelihood for themselves and their families with honor and pride. The cost of such a program is obviously high, and we can reasonably expect that the cost will increase from year to year as the program moves forward. However, I am convinced that if we are going to resolve the problem of unemployment, the step must eventually be taken. We have many exceptionally fine vocational schools all across the country that have skilled personnel, modern equipment, and adequate physical facilities to assume this responsibility. The program is a good one. It deserves our attention, it deserves our support, and in the long run it will prove itself to be an effective and reasonable solution to an extremely difficult and complex problem. I trust that the appropriation of the necessary funds, and the implementation of the program, will receive a high priority by the Congress and the Administration, and that we will forthwith make funds available to the States so that they might commence their program without undue delay.

I can give this program my wholehearted and unqualified support.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, as the supplemental views to the committee report indicate, this bill is not flawless. There are a number of improvements which could be made, and hopefully, some—if not all—of these improvements, suggested by the Republican members of the Committee, will be made here. But whether they are or not, I am convinced that this measure, H.R. 4955, is well calculated to strike effectively at the source of some of the economic and social ills with which the Nation finds itself confronted today.

In company with most of the Members of this House, and with thoughtful persons across the country, I have long been concerned about the economic dislocations which often follow in the wake of technological advances and about the swelling number of unskilled workers who compete for a dwindling number of unskilled jobs. I know that it is unnecessary for me to rehearse at length the snarl of headaches stemming from the unemployment problem—increasing welfare rolls, increased crime and delinquency; reduced tax revenues, reduced buying power. And there is the threat of a nationwide rail strike which has its roots in precisely this problem. Indeed, there is scarcely a sector of the economy which has not felt the weight of the problem which industrial progress has brought in its wake. Until now, the question has been, What to do about it?

It is clear, I think, that we cannot turn our backs on this technological revolution—to attempt to do so would be wasteful, reactionary, and, in the long run, futile. Nor do make-work schemes, of the sort favored by the administration, seem to provide much lasting comfort: they treat the symptoms rather than the disease, and as a matter of fact, they are not very effective in dealing with the symptoms either. Our memories of experiments along this line in depression days are still too fresh to permit us the delusion of thinking that artificially drawn subsidy-type programs will provide an effective solution.

Obviously, if we are to taste the full fruits of the increased prosperity promised by technology, some way must be found to utilize in a meaningful, productive way the manpower which is freed. As I advised this House on July 26, 1961, this can best be accomplished by two interdependent processes. First, the institution of an effective training program to equip our so-called surplus labor force to fill more demanding positions in a dynamic economy. And second, the creation and maintenance of a climate favorable to the modernization and expansion of business, so that there will be a continuing need for these trained workers.

I earnestly hope that in the near future Congress will turn its attention to the second part of this program, but at the moment, I am delighted to see the first part incorporated in the measure before us.

Mr. Chairman, in my view there are three cardinal advantages to H.R. 4955 as a solution to the problem of technological unemployment.

In the first place, in focusing on education, it builds upon and extends the solid foundation of the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts, rather than on some ill-conceived and untried method of artificially priming the economy. Experience with the two older pieces of legislation has shown the soundness of this approach.

Second, though the price tag on the present proposal may seem to some of my colleagues to be prohibitive, it occurs to me that this program may in the long run be cheaper—as well as more successful—than the aggregate of present and proposed halfway schemes which have been advanced to deal with the problem. With the vocational education program successfully launched, we may be able to consider elimination of those projects which have enjoyed dubious success and which have in any event been superseded by this one.

And finally—my third reason for supporting this bill—the program which this measure would create is one jointly financed and administered by the States and the Federal Government. By casting the program in this form, we are able to avoid adding another block to the already outsized Federal monolith and at the same time assure protection to legitimate State and local interests.

I think that it is imperative that in adopting this legislation we unite in support of the antidiscrimination amendment to be offered by the gentleman from California. This bill is needed to provide the job training for our Negro citizens that will enable them to achieve the equality they are seeking. It is a well-known fact that the unemployment rate among Negroes is more than double the rate for white workers. Much of their economic disadvantage is due to the fact that they have not had the educational opportunities that would equip them for the skills needed in today's labor market. They deserve that chance. They deserve an unrestricted right to share in the benefits of this vocational education program.

Mr. Chairman, if we are sincere in our dedication to the principle of equal opportunity for all of our citizens regardless of race, color, and creed, this amendment demands our support.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I have long been a critic of needless Federal spending and of make-work programs that contribute little or nothing to the long-range future of our country. But today I want it to be known that I consider the measure before us not only a good investment but of the utmost importance to the United States and its future working force.

I have been vitally interested in the possibilities of vocational education for many years and sincerely believe that, if properly administered, the money we spend to further such education will pay untold dividends in the years ahead.

The youth of our Nation are pouring out of our schools in increasing numbers. The report on this bill indicate that 2.6 million young people are seeking work each year and that most will need training to obtain employment. The report further points out that even in the largest industrial and business centers, less than one in five of all high school students are enrolled in vocational programs even though formal education will terminate in high school for the majority of them.

This indicates that we have not placed the proper emphasis on vocational education in the past, and that in many instances we have concentrated on the wrong skills to be taught. Our society must realize that the role of the unskilled worker is decreasing in importance and that the future holds promise only for those who have been adequately trained to grow with a technical world.

The money we spend to train our youth in a vocation is infinitely better spent than the millions some have proposed to pour into other types of youth programs that do nothing but delay the day when the young person in question must face the reality of unemployment due to lack of working skills.

Our young people, of course, aren't members of the only groups affected by the promise of better vocational education opportunities. Our older workers need retraining. Women of all age groups are entering the labor market for

the first time and they need skills with which to find employment.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 surely does not answer all of the problems facing the education and training of our people, but it is definitely a start in the right direction, a step that at last recognizes the importance of vocational education in relation to our entire educational system. And if the program is properly administered it will provide needed training opportunities for every segment of population in America today.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Chairman, today's technological progress has brought about increased automation in almost every field, creating a need for different and greater skills. Specialization has become the rule rather than the exception.

In order to meet the demands of this technological progress and provide jobs for those displaced through automation, we must expand and improve our vocational education programs throughout the Nation.

H.R. 4955, which we are considering today, will, for the first time, provide for construction of additional area vocational schools as well as for continuation of the existing program. It is paradoxical that we are experiencing persistent unemployment during the period when the demand for skilled technicians is at an alltime high. More and more young people are entering the labor market each year upon graduation from high school. It is estimated that 2.6 million will be added to our labor force annually during this decade. We must provide vocational education opportunities for those not entering college in order that they may be equipped with the necessary skills to secure gainful employment.

Continued technological advancement in the United States is dependent upon skilled manpower and if we are to maintain our position as the greatest industrial Nation in the world, we must provide the technicians needed by industry and science. In the engineering technologies alone, we should be preparing 100,000 technicians annually, but under all present programs combined, only 20,000 are prepared to enter the labor market each year. And this is only one segment of our economy. Updating and expanding educational facilities to provide additional vocational training is essential to our economic and technologic progress. It is imperative that we prepare our young people more adequately for gainful employment. During fiscal year 1962, which are the latest statistics available at this time, 11,648 people enrolled in vocational classes in the State of New Mexico. This is not sufficient to meet today's need if we are to keep pace with scientific progress and solve our unemployment problems.

H.R. 4955 will provide an increased allotment for New Mexico in the amount of $239,955 which is almost double what my State is receiving under present programs. These funds are sorely needed to construct area vocational schools, improve vocational education facilities and train additional young people of New Mexico to successfully enter the labor market. This is the first major revision and expansion of the vocational education act since its enactment in 1946 and our changing economy clearly dictates the need for such revision.

H.R. 4955 broadens the purposes for which these additional funds may be used, making vocational training available to unemployed adults and out-of-school youth. This provision will assist in improving the economy in all areas of our Nation through decreased unemployment.

As Americans who are greatly concerned with the economic growth and development of our Nation as well as the welfare of our citizenry, I feel that it is incumbent upon us to act favorably upon this vital legislation. The only way we can accomplish our objective is to pass H.R. 4955.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, our Nation is today faced with a great and tragic paradox. At present, almost 6 percent of our labor force is unemployed. A high proportion of these people have been out of work for a year or more. Yet at the same time, throughout the country there is a crying need for highly skilled, highly trained manpower. This paradoxical situation is the offspring of our new technological age. The process of automation is rapidly making entire categories of workers obsolete. The demand for unskilled and semiskilled labor is fast declining. In short, then, we are faced with a situation in which a growing number of workers, because of their lack of needed technical skills and education, are denied the opportunity for gainful employment. The result: economic waste and social disaster.

If our Nation faces an unemployment problem now, it may face an even graver one in the future. By 1970, our full-time labor force will have expanded to 87 million. During this decade, 22 million young workers will have entered that labor force. Of these, less than 20 percent will have completed 4 years of college. A distressingly large number will never finish high school. Our economy is becoming increasingly more oriented around technology, and increasingly demanding of trained personnel. Unless we can provide the vocational training opportunities to help our young people meet these new manpower requirements, the present paradox will have become even more serious. We shall have an even larger percentage of our work force which will be unable to fill an even greater number of jobs.

Under the Employment Act of 1946, this Congress has assumed the responsibility for assuring high levels of employment throughout the Nation. In view of the changing manpower needs of our society, adequate training is playing an increasingly important role in assuring productive employment. The Congress has already acted in this area. The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, the George-Barden Act of 1946, the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Area Redevelopment Act—all of these programs have been aimed at increasing the opportunities and mobility of our work force. But now it is time to act again, and to direct our attention to the problems and needs of our youth in this area.

It has become exceedingly important for us to provide our young people with the know-how which will enable them to become productive contributors to the national wealth. We must provide the funds, the programs, and the facilities which will encourage our young people to stay in school, to get the education they will need to achieve steady, gainful employment. If we do not do this, if we do not channel the vigor and energy of our Nation's youth into constructive pursuits, their loss will be our loss as well.

In light of the information which has been submitted to the Committee on Education and Labor, it is quite obvious that the present system of vocational education is extremely inadequate. Figures presented to the committee indicate that only 5 percent of the public high schools offer distributive education courses, and that less than 10 percent offer trade and industrial courses. In many cases, whole categories of skills are neglected because of a lack of facilities and teachers. In addition, many of the courses which are offered are far below standard. Curricula and facilities are often out of date. A student may be trained to use tools and machines which have already become obsolete years ago. Moreover, low salary levels often make it difficult to attract competent instructors. Nor are these the only problems. Many students face special emotional or physical handicaps. Vocational guidance and counseling is often poor and in some cases nonexistent.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, H.R. 4955 will go a long way toward remedying the present inadequacies in our vocational education system. By providing substantially larger funds, it will greatly increase the number of people who will be able to participate in these training programs. And if past experience is any indicator, the expenditure of Federal funds will bring about a twofold, threefold, or even fourfold increase in State and local appropriations for this purpose.

H.R. 4955 will allow the States to pursue their individual needs. It will extend the scope of the Smith-Hughes Act and the George-Barden Act to increase the categories and scope of vocational education. It will increase the flexibility of such programs. It will enable the States to provide better training facilities, and to hire more qualified personnel. It will create a National Advisory Council to assist in coordination and to disseminate the latest techniques of instruction. H.R. 4955, then, will increase the coverage and flexibility of vocational educational programs, and will facilitate the development of better curriculums.

Mr. Chairman, unemployment is our No. 1 social problem today. By providing the vocational training which will lead to productive employment, we are striking at the very roots of the unemployment problem. We are making a necessary and desirable response to the demands of a highly technological age. For this reason, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this legislation.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, we have before us for our consideration an ex-

tremely vital piece of legislation namely: a bill to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education in these United States. As a representative of a community in which vocational education has for the past 50 years played an extremely vital role, I am a firm friend of this legislation.

It is unfortunate that vocational education legislation has failed to keep abreast with contemporary technology. What this has meant in many instances is that before a vocational education institution could open its doors, its facilities were deemed obsolete. Such conditions have placed many school boards at a distinct disadvantage because they have found that their vocational education programs were training students for areas of employment which no longer were vital to the interest of the community at large. Therefore, unemployment and personal discouragement displaced the useful and creative contributions which graduates from these institutions would normally have been able to make to their community.

This bill constitutes a commendable step forward in making this program more workable. In my opinion, one of the most vital provisions which I am gratified to see included in this bill is encompassed by lines 8 through 19 in section 1, "The Declaration of Purposes," in which it is clearly stated that this bill will help school boards to reach those persons in every community who because of circumstances beyond their control are in a position in which they have discontinued their formal education and must be aided in returning to school to upgrade or learn new skills. As is recognized in the declaration of purpose, this bill attempts to reach an area which has never been verbalized in legislation before, the area of special educational handicaps. It might be reiterated that such educational handicaps which include not only lack of manual training but functional illiteracy have helped to draw the very strength and life's blood out of this vital public vocational education program. I therefore urge the support of this important bill.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to confine my contribution to today's debate on this important measure to my congressional district of Luzerne County, Pa., where we have suffered serious unemployment for many years.

At the present time there are about 11 percent unemployed in my district, according to the latest figures that have been released. This totals about 13,000 unemployed. Many of these people would not be unemployed if they possessed the skills demanded by today's industry.

There are vocational training schools located in my congressional district but they need to be expanded to reduce the number of unemployed as well as to meet the needs of the local economy in the future.

Great interest has been shown over the years in this program and action has been taken to improve the program through the various industrial development committees of the chambers of commerce in my congressional district. Many of the boards of education have cooperated in furthering the vocational education program in their respective areas. Continuous action on a local level must be demonstrated if the full benefits of this training program are to be achieved. In my area, this is guaranteed based on past experience.

Today's action by the House is a real opportunity to greatly expand and bring up-to-date the vocational education act to fit the employment needs of our young people. It will also represent the first major changes since the enactment of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 and the George-Barden Act of 1946. There have been many, many changes in the vocational requirements made over the past 17 years.

Quite obviously, the training techniques of the 1940's will not meet the standards required in the 1960's. Automation currently is making serious inroads in the trades and technological fields and by bringing this vocational training program up to date, we can reduce the impact of automation in the future.

Much has been said and written concerning the serious national problem of school dropouts. Just this past week, school officials here in the District of Columbia disclosed that 4 out of every 10 schoolchildren do not receive high school diplomas because they drop out of school before completing the required curriculums.

On a national scale, when schools open next month something over a million youngsters will fail to return to school for the new term or will drop out during the upcoming school year.

It is true, men and women have succeeded brilliantly despite lack of early education but these, of course, are rare exceptions. Particularly in today's automated economy, these dropouts are candidates, at best, for ill-paid drudgery at common labor, at worst for dependence on public charity. When they drop out of school, they also drop out of the main stream of American life.

Statistics reveal that jobs filled by high school graduates increased 30 percent over the past 10 years while jobs for those with no high school education decreased 25 percent in the same period.

The ill educated are the last to be hired, in the least desirable of hard, menial, jobs and they are the first to be fired in any business recession.

This is a problem, therefore, which fully justifies the urgent attention of the Congress. We have the manpower training and retraining program for our adult citizens which has proved to be most beneficial in my congressional district where unemployed anthracite coal miners must be retrained in new skills and occupations because of the depressed state of the anthracite industry.

Now we have the great opportunity of improving the lives and the future for our younger generation by expanding and bringing up to date the vocational education program. This the Congress should not fail to do.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government is not responsible for jobs nor job training, that is vocational education. Such Government activity is unconstitutional, as I see it. Here is Federal aid to education in a big way. Here too is Federal control as the rules and regulations are specified by Federal Government. The rights reserved to the States and localities and to the individual citizens are out the window. The ultimate contradiction in the bill is the disclaimer of Federal control found on page 60. One must be very naive to believe such illogic. Federal aid and control is seen also in the Davis-Bacon provision, wherein the Secretary of Labor will set all the wages in construction—any and all State and local laws to the contrary notwithstanding.

True, there is Federal precedence. More than this, there is the usual Federal duplication. We now have vocational education under: First, the Manpower Training Act of 1962, second, the Area Redevelopment Act, and third, the Trade Assistance Act of 1962. We do not need another program.

As for the cost, here we are ready to authorize $450 million over 4 fiscal years, a staggering increase over the $23 million asked for by the President.

As for me, I repeat once again that this problem, like so many of today's so-called problems, can be solved locally without Federal intrusion. By injecting the Federal Government where it does not belong, the correct solutions locally are stultified, and we spend money we do not have as we blandly continue to deficit finance, charge it to our children, and endanger the value of our currency.

This is not the role for Federal Government, all the proponents' good intentions notwithstanding. What we really need to do is to unshackle the genius of the capitalistic system—by reducing the tax burden, by cutting spending, reducing the debt, and getting Government out of business. There will be plenty of jobs and job training if we free up the private enterprise system.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, over the next 10 years there will be a tremendous influx of young people, many of whom will not even hold a high school diploma, entering our national labor market. They will be competing for jobs in a market which has a high rate of unemployment and which is marked by rising rates of unemployment among their age group and among the unskilled of all ages. They will be entering upon their careers at a time when the job structure is changing rapidly and affecting profoundly every group in the labor market.

These youthful workers will be entering a labor world more complicated, more technical, more highly skilled, more mobile than any which has been known—even to this great industrial Nation—in the past. And for the most part these youngsters—like the unfortunate unskilled workers of today who are in their forties and over—will find themselves unequipped to become a productive part of that world.

Mr. Chairman, we must act now to help the technologically displaced workers of our contemporary society and to prevent a great American tragedy in the future—the waste of the brains, talents, and vigorous energies of the youth of

this Nation, who are its most precious resource. Even now, we are keeping men and women who would like to work on our relief and welfare rolls because we are not making provision for them to be retrained and to become productive again. As Senator HUMPHREY has pointed out:

> Not only are we keeping these workers from contributing to our gross national product—which is the index of our productive capacity and, therefore, of our employment and our prosperity—but we are forcing them to drain off money on which we get no return—in welfare and relief payments, unemployment compensation, and other costs.

We must halt this unconscionable waste.

I believe that the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is one of the most urgent and the most profitable pieces of legislation to come before the 88th Congress, because it is a step in the direction of minimizing this waste of manpower. This bill represents the first major review and revision of Federal aid to vocational education since the enactment of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917 and the George-Barden Act in 1946. And it comes not too soon, but almost too late.

According to the information received by the House General Subcommittee on Education when it was considering this bill, only 1 employed adult in every 35 is enrolled in a refresher or upgrading course in fields partially supported by Federal funds. Only about 13 percent—1 in 5—of our high school students are enrolled in federally aided vocational education programs. This latter is a frightening figure when we realize that only 30 percent to 40 percent will graduate from high school and 80 percent will enter the job market with only a high school diploma or less.

Yet, with the creation of new industries, new products, new jobs, the demand for types of job skills has changed—and will continue to change. What will become of these little skilled and little educated workers? The answer is evident. As President Kennedy indicated in his news conference last week:

> Jobs filled by high school graduates rose 30 percent, while jobs for those with no secondary education decreased 25 percent in the last decade.

As the unemployment statistics available today have already proved, the unskilled workers are the first to be displaced and the last to be rehired by industry. And there will be less and less places for these workers in the future. According to the President:

> The greatest growth in labor demand today is for highly trained professional workers with 16 or more years of education. The second fastest growing demand is for technical and semiprofessional workers with 1 to 3 years of post-high-school education.

Mr. Chairman, the President's remarks call our attention to the decided shift in the job market of today, a shift resulting from our advancing technology. We are only now beginning to understand and to evaluate the benefits and the burdens of our rapid technological progress during the past 50 years. We have seen that advancing technology improves the living standard of the Nation as a whole, but that it does so at a cost of unemployment, poverty, and hoplelessness to those few who get in its way and who are unaided during the process of change.

We have seen that many of the jobs requiring little or no skill have been eliminated and that there is an increased need for jobs demanding more education, greater skills, and improved training. We have seen that while many new jobs are created, they often come later in the pattern of change and are infrequently filled by the unskilled and uneducated workers who have been displaced—unless these workers have been able to qualify for advanced training. This trend makes it obvious that we must upgrade our entire educational system so that our children will be able to meet the actual manpower needs and job opportunities of the future.

We have, then, the statistics to prove that our youngsters who leave school with a bare minimum of education and training cannot possibly adjust to the current nor the future demands of a technologically sophisticated labor market. The shift from employment in the industrial and agricultural sectors of the economy to employment in the service industries makes it evident that more and more advanced training will be requisite for all workers. Many of our young people who are still in school today will leave school to find jobs which only exist, at the present time, in the vision of our scientists. And they will be jobs necessitating a high degree of education and skill training.

In the future, education is going to be a continuous, lifelong process for all. Labor Secretary Wirtz has estimated that the man who goes into a plant or a nonprofessional service job in the years ahead faces the prospect of having to change his trade or livelihood at least once and maybe twice during his life. And his training in each instance will be for a job completely unlike his previous one.

Private industry today is spending large sums on retraining its employees—sometimes for jobs not even in existence right now—and on finding approaches to the problems of a rapidly accelerated technology. But private industry cannot handle the situation alone. The problem is of great magnitude and must be solved through education—in a joint effort of industry and government.

Mr. Chairman, this brief background should be sufficient to illustrate the urgent need for an improved and expanded program of vocational education. I sincerely recommend H.R. 4955 as an important first step in the direction of utilizing our national manpower reserves. I urge my colleagues to vote favorably on its enactment.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in wholehearted support of this legislation. Education should not be regarded as a burden on the commonweal. Instead, education is a crucial investment in the future well-being of our Nation. Part of this necessary investment must be made in the field of vocational education in order to grant many of our future citizens the skills requisite for our ever-changing economy.

Everyone knows that the demand for workers in low-skill occupations is continually declining; everyone knows that the demand for workers with technical skills is continually rising. Our schools must be prepared for these changing work patterns. The present paradox of persistent unemployment—now over 6.8 percent in my Pittsburgh area—occurring simultaneously with the rising need for skilled manpower indicates our past lack of foresight. We had failed in the past to invest in the future. We have people on relief instead of on the job because of a lack of skills. We must not fail again to provide the necessary technically-skilled manpower to man our future industries.

The children of the 1960's will be the backbone of the labor force at the beginning of the 21st century. They must be given a 21st century education rather than the 19th century education most of them are now receiving. To accomplish this end, we must build on the knowledge we now have of job opportunities; and we must project this knowledge into educational programs which will meet the needs of the future. We must, therefore, increase our investment in vocational education.

The Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce has estimated that a continuous enrollment of from 158,000 to 165,000 pupils in vocational education programs is necessary to provide Pennsylvania's industries with trained replacements. The chamber also states that industries which are expanding or relocating are becoming increasingly critical of the skills and training of the labor supply. They are also critical of the scope of vocational education programs and their ability to cope with changing job requirements. The schools of Pennsylvania are not meeting this replacement standard. Currently there are fewer than 100,000 Pennsylvania students in vocational programs. The Federal Government must act to meet this vital deficiency. Vocational education programs must be expanded and updated. Federal funds are necessary to give our future economy the skilled manpower which it needs in order to function.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I believe that H.R. 4955 presents for the Members of this 88th Congress a unique opportunity. With our support and our vote we can add wise new tools to a program whose wisdom has been proven for over 50 years. We can encourage the greater employment of the States' experience in a program where experience has been amassed for over half a century. And finally, we can spread the benefits of this wisdom and experience to the thousands of additional youth who without it will be left untrained, unemployed, and uninterested in their future as well as that of the Nation.

I am particularly happy to support this piece of legislation because I take pride in the fact that a distinguished Springfield, Mass., schoolteacher, Miss Margaret C. Ells, retired assistant principal of Springfield Trade High School, is a member of President Kennedy's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, which made a study on vocational educa-

tion and recommended the improvements and redirection of the program which are embodied in this bill before us today.

If we accomplish little else in this Congress, I would suggest that we could take a great deal of pride in adding our names to the rollcalls of the past that have supported Federal cooperation in providing vocational education. As you all know, Federal participation began with the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. But I would like to point out that, unlike many Federal programs, the National Government entered this field not long after the States, and even before some of them.

My own State can take some pride in being the first of the Union to enact a statewide program of assistance to vocational education. That was in 1907, only 10 years before the action of the Congress. The Commonwealth's commission had reported to our State legislature:

> Whatever may be the cost of [vocational] training, the failure to furnish it would in the end be more costly.

The General Court of Massachusetts apparently agree, and so must have the consensus of the Congress, when in 1917 they joined the resources of the Federal Government with that of the States to eradicate vocational illiteracy among the Nation's youth and to promote the general economic welfare of the Nation.

I think that a realization of this historical partnership between the States and the Federal Government is important in assessing what we hope H.R. 4955 will accomplish. It is a partnership that even in its earliest days received the support of a wide range of interests. In the 62d Congress, Senator Carroll S. Page, of Vermont, noted with amazement the united advocacy of his Federal aid bill by Samuel Gompers, the president of the American Federation of Labor, and H. E. Miles, representative of the National Association of Manufacturers. And it should be emphasized that it is a partnership in which each party has faithfully performed their duties. It was the policy of the Smith-Hughes Act to encourage the States in providing vocational education by the then new means of the matching grant. The States have reacted to this stimulus in remarkable fashion. In 1918 the State and local governments exceeded the Federal expenditures by over a million dollars. In 1961 they exceeded the Federal outlay by over $150 million, and even that does not include their expenditures for buildings and equipment.

What we can now do with H.R. 4955 is to expand the terms of this partnership. We can bring the Federal level of expenditure up to a sum that more equitably balances the financial burden of the program. We can also make permanent the nursing and technical educational programs that have proven themselves, and have received such enthusiastic support in the last 5 years.

Finally, I would like to commend the authors of H R. 4955 for their incorporation of the provisions which will let a little new air into the program, and which will encourage the States to utilize their experience and knowledge in determining the training needs of their own people and industry. I am referring to the provisions of the bill which would allow the shifting of funds from the traditional categories, which would liberalize the definitions of home economics and agricultural education, and which would assure a periodic reevaluation of the program at both the State and the Federal level.

If the illustrious partnership has erred at all it must be conceded to be in this area. The historical necessities for specifying the fields of education to be assisted have dwindled, and today it is flexibility in dealing with the rapid changes of our technological society that is demanded. This is a principle that was recognized by the 1914 Commission which largely drafted the Smith-Hughes bill and whose report contributed greatly to its acceptance and enactment. That Commission said then:

> Vocational schools and classes will be successful in proportion as their organization, courses of study, and methods of instruction meet continously the changing needs and conditions of the vocations for which they give their preparation.

I have said little of the tremendous problems that face our teenagers today, for I do not think it is too necessary to dwell upon an illness so widely recognized. If the school dropout is not to become a symbol of our country's educational failure, a measure such as H.R. 4955 must be prescribed by this Congress this year.

Let me add my hope and desire that the 88th Congress will be added to that list of Congresses of the past which have placed their faith in the values of vocational education, and which have provided their alert support to the invigoration of this grand Federal-State partnership.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly urge my colleagues here to overwhelmingly approve this bill, H.R. 4955, before us and to reject all amendments, however well-intentioned, that would tend to cripple the effective provisions of this measure.

Even a brief examination of the statistics related to vocational education will clearly reveal that the need for this program is obvious and imperative in the national welfare. These figures show that the number of workers in the lower skilled occupations is rapidly declining each year. Between 1957 and 1962 there was a drop of 772,000 workers in these classifications within the manufacturing area. On the other hand, jobs for professional and technical workers will rise about 40 percent in the 1970's, and jobs for salesworkers, managers, and proprietors will rise about 20 percent. In health occupations at all levels the demand far exceeds the supply, and this situation will continue for a long time.

Young people are seeking work in greater numbers—2.6 million of them a year, estimated for this decade alone. At the other end of the scale, the number of older workers continues to increase. Moreover, half the women between the ages of 35 and 54 are expected to be in the labor market by 1970, some for the first time, some after long absence. Most will need training or retraining opportunities to obtain employment.

In our continuing appraisal of the need for expanding vocational education opportunities it is primarily important to bear in mind that perhaps 80 percent of our fifth grade students today will not graduate from any college and, if the present rate of dropouts goes on probably more than 30 percent of these will not even complete high school. It is particularly urgent upon us, in my opinion, to make provision, in the public and national interest, for these citizens of tomorrow.

In summary the problem here presented to us for solution is this. Technological and automation developments are eliminating many unskilled jobs and at the same time creating a greater need for different kinds of employment in which greater skills are required. If we mean to anticipate and prevent the unemployment and associated evils that will result from this technological revolution, and that is our job, then we must enable our young people to obtain the continuing training and retraining they must have to keep pace with the changing life ahead of them and we must give today's workers the chance for training and retraining, in new skills, that will help them escape threatening technological unemployment.

I suggest that this Government has shown considerable and continuing concern for the welfare of millions of people abroad and, I might add, at exceeding great cost to the American taxpayer. I believe the time has come to open our eyes to the difficulties and problems of our own people which is, after all, our primary and foremost legislative duty. We cannot better or more completely discharge that duty, in my opinion, than to approve this bill which will provide the extension, expansion, and improvement of our vocational education program throughout the Nation in a wise and prudent manner. Let me urge you, again, to vote for this bill in the national interest.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4955, to be known, upon enactment, as the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

There can be no denying that this is one of the most needed pieces of legislation to come before this body.

With our rapid advancement in technology, the demand for skilled workers has risen while unemployment among the unskilled has persistently been on the increase.

It is an accepted fact that science has made more advances in the past 50 years than in all preceding human history. Ninety percent of the scientists who ever lived are alive today. But paradoxically we have suffered a shortage of skilled manpower for the various new functions that have arisen from scientific discoveries. In the engineering field alone, it is estimated that we should be training 100,000 technicians annually, instead of the 20,000 which all our programs presently turn out each year. In the health occupations at all levels the demand far exceeds the supply, and this

situation is expected to continue for a long time. It is estimated, too, that jobs for professional and technical workers will rise about 40 percent in the 1970's, and jobs for salesworkers, managers, and proprietors will increase by about 20 percent.

On the other hand, the number of jobs in the unskilled and low-skilled occupations is rapidly declining. In 5 years between 1957 and 1962, in the manufacturing industry there was a decrease of jobs in such categories totaling 772,000. It has been estimated that automation will continue to add 30,000 to the unemployed list every week in the next several years. These unemployed must be trained or retrained for available jobs.

In addition, 2,600,000 young people will be seeking new jobs every year for the next 10 years alone. If we keep in mind that probably 80 percent of the children in the fifth grade today will not graduate from college and that if the present trend of dropouts continues, 30 percent or more of them will not even complete high school, we begin to fully appreciate the great need for an expanded vocational educational program.

The great bulk of our unemployed are without skills for which a demand exists. Those are the ones who will benefit most by the passage of H.R. 4955. The Nation will benefit by having available more manpower for greater productivity. Let us vote for progress.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support H.R. 4955, the Vocational Education Act of 1963. This is a comprehensive, sound, and flexible bill. It has been carefully considered. It meets a pressing national problem.

The need for new and enlarged Federal action in this area is clear. One month after he took office, President Kennedy requested that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare appoint an advisory body "to be charged with the responsibility of reviewing and evaluating the current National Vocational Education Acts and making recommendations for improving and redirecting the program."

That advisory body, composed of representatives from the fields of education, labor, industry, agriculture, as well as the lay public, issued its complete and well documented study this year. Its facts are well known to us. Many are summarized in the committee report on H.R. 4955. I will not be redundant here by repeating the statistics. The studies demonstrate how vital vocational education is to our economy. They show clearly how one direct factor in unemployment is lack of job training. This is dollars and cents wisdom. It is wisdom related to the welfare and security of our Nation.

We must also be sensitive to the human factors of the mental and moral health of our youth. Striking to me are the correlations of school dropouts and juvenile delinquency with the lack of knowledge of any skill with which to work.

The bill before us, H.R. 4955, has absorbed the major recommendations of the President's Advisory Panel. It has met the requirements of the American Vocational Association, the professional organization for vocational education. The highlights of these are worth pointing out.

Youth in high school, youth with special needs, post-high-school youth and adults, out-of-school youth and adults at work or unemployed—these were the four major categories the Panel of consultants recommended for inclusion. The Panel also recommended provision for training of vocational teachers, development of new curriculums and materials, improvement in counseling and guidance services, research to help in evaluation of effectiveness, expansion of professional educational staff at the Federal level to provide consultative services through State and local vocational education authorities.

This is provided for. Also it is provided to construct area vocational school facilities, and, drawing from experience with the Area Redevelopment Authority as well as the Manpower Development Training Act, it provides for continued liaison between vocational education and employment service activities.

Existing categories of what constitute vocational education are too limited to cover the range of developments in our expanding technological society. This bill provides for a broadening of definition in some cases, as in agriculture and home economics. It gives the States the power to shift funds from one category to another, or to new categories, if it is established with the Commissioner of Education that the purposes of the act are being served. Such flexibility is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, it takes only a cursory look to see the problems—at the rate of population growth, the millions entering the labor market, the decline in need for unskilled labor, the shifting nature of the kinds of jobs required for a full employment in a productive economy, and the maintenance of a free and secure people.

The President's panel in surveying past action, rightly criticized the "legislature patchwork" which had grown up around vocational education. The Congress has never been unmindful of a responsibility in this area, and never inclined to be derelict when it saw a need. The Morrill Act of 1862 was a very far-sighted act, profoundly influencing the development of our country as well as education. The words of President Wilson's Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education in 1914, which led to the enactment of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917, still have, as Commissioner of Education Keppel has said, "the ring of truth."

There is a great and crying need—

The Commission said at that time—

of providing vocational education of this character for every part of the United States—to conserve and develop our resources; to promote a more productive and prosperous agriculture; to prevent the waste of human labor; to supplement apprenticeship; to increase the wage-earning power of our productive workers; to meet the increasing demand for trained workmen; to offset the increased cost of living. Vocational education is therefore needed as a wise business investment for the Nation because our national prosperity and happiness are at stake and our position in the markets of the world cannot otherwise be maintained.

Nothing has changed in the Nation's goals or its needs. Only the times have, and their pace has accelerated. We never had an option after World War II of "going back to normalcy." We were thrust into a jet age, a missile age, an atomic age, a vast application of new technology to every area of life.

Part of our patchwork—the George-Barden Act and its amendments—then the National Defense Education Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Area Redevelopment Act were part of our initial "catching on" to what was happening. Now however, the tempo is increasing. We are never going to walk again, figuratively speaking.

The President's panel study noted that the data we kept on both the quantity and quality of vocational education was inadequate. Steps to improve reporting have already been taken, and with the continual evaluations this bill provides we will have a good meter on the program.

Of great importance is the setting aside of funds to permit grants to any State board, or with their approval, to approved educational agencies to do research and establish pilot projects to get essential data that can help guide larger programs. Conditions vary widely in different sections of our country, and there are peculiarities even between large cities. What fits New York may not fit Arizona. H.R. 4955 presents a pragmatic and flexible approach to this area of experiment.

Mr. Chairman, I like to believe that we are concerned with more than unemployment statistics or the gross national product, important as these may be. I believe that this legislation will stimulate some creative developments in the area of general education.

A point of connection between this bill and its concerns with vocational education on one hand, and the larger whole of education, may well be the human youth who becomes the dropout. So much literature upon him seems to say that he drops out because he is not motivated to stay in. This does not tell us much unless there is a lot more said about what motivates.

I hope that we may be working upon this in this bill, however indirectly. Many young people will gain a tangible relationship to reality in terms of a craft.

We know too little for generalizations, but I find it plausible to believe that some who start to learn a trade will go on to areas of interest and concern of which they did not originally dream. Or if they do not necessarily pursue this in academic terms formally, they will pursue broadening interests the way they should be pursued in or out of school, because the individuals enjoy what they are doing.

Conversely, there may well be stimulated an interest in and a respect for the skill, logic, and clarity which may be equally demanded in nonacademic work. This may inform the whole body of education in a new way.

In this proposed legislation we are approaching a concrete problem. The bill before us sets up a structure so that a large number of our fellow citizens and a very large number of our youth may receive the concern and aid they have a right to expect from a government founded on the concept of serving their general welfare.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, today over 70 million Americans are gainfully employed and how pleased we are that this country is prospering. But unfortunately there are many who are not employed and of these there are those who are not employed because they are not trained to perform the jobs which are available. The committee's report indicates that 2.6 million young people are seeking employment; that the number of older workers continues to increase; that training and retraining opportunities are needed to obtain employment.

The fact is that we have had great changes in our employment picture. It is true that once brawn and will were sufficient to insure man a place in industry. Now special skills are needed for almost any job in the plant. These skills must be developed and training is necessary. Unfortunately, funds for facilities, equipment, and teachers are severely limited in vocational education high schools and area school programs.

This bill is a step in the right direction and it has my wholehearted support. The bill has strong bipartisan support, including the support of the minority leader, Mr. HALLECK. It is a recognition of a pressing problem. It is an effort to solve that problem. I hope the bill will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, under the rule the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment reported in the committee bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. It is the purpose of this Act to authorize Federal grants to States to assist them to maintain, extend, and improve existing programs of vocational education, and to develop new programs of vocational education, so that persons of all ages in all communities of the State—those in high school, those who have completed or discontinued their formal education and are preparing to enter the labor market, those who have already entered the labor market but need to upgrade their skills or learn new ones, and those with special educational handicaps—will have ready access to vocational training or retraining which is of high quality, which is realistic in the light of actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment, and which is suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit from such training.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $45,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $90,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $135,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each fiscal year thereafter, $180,000,000, for the purpose of making grants to States as provided in this Act.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 3. (a) Ninety-five per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the number of persons in the various age groups needing vocational education in the respective States as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year—

(1) an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the population aged fifteen to nineteen, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year bears to the total population aged fifteen to nineteen, inclusive, in all the States; plus

(2) an amount which bears the same ratio to 20 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the population aged twenty to twenty-four, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year bears to the total population aged twenty to twenty-four, inclusive, in all the States; plus

(3) an amount which bears the same ratio to 15 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the population aged twenty-five to sixty-five, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year bears to the total population aged twenty-five to sixty-five, inclusive, in all the States; plus

(4) an amount which bears the same ratio to 10 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the sum of the amounts allotted to the State under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) for such year bears to the sum of the amounts allotted to all the States under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) for such year.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which is less than $10,000 shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments to each of the remaining States under such subsection, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than that amount.

(c) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State's plan approved under section 5 shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use under the approved plan of such State for such year and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during such year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

(d) The population of particular age groups in a State or in all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the latest available estimates furnished by the Department of Commerce.

USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b), a State's allotment under section 3 may be used, in accordance with its approved State plan, for any or all of the following purposes:

(1) Vocational education for persons attending high school;

(2) Vocational education for persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market;

(3) Vocational education for persons (other than persons who are receiving training allowances under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-415), the Area Redevelopment Act (Public Law 87-27), or the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-794)) who have already entered the labor market and who need training or retraining to achieve stability or advancement in employment;

(4) Vocational education for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program;

(5) Construction of area vocational education school facilities;

(6) Ancillary services and activities to assure quality in all vocational education programs, such as inservice teacher training and supervision, program evaluation, special demonstration and experimental programs, development of instructional materials, and State administration and leadership, including periodic evaluation of State and local vocational education programs and services in light of information regarding current and projected manpower needs and job opportunities.

(b) At least 25 per centum of each State's allotment shall be used only for the purposes set forth in paragraph (2) or (5), or both, of subsection (a), and at least 3 per centum of each State's allotment shall be used only for the purposes set forth in paragraph (6) of subsection (a), except that the Commissioner may, upon request of a State, permit such State to use a smaller percentage of its allotment for any year for the purposes specified above if he determines that such smaller percentage will adequately meet such purposes in such State.

(c) Five per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 for each fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner to make grants to State Boards, or with the approval of the appropriate State Board, to local educational agencies, and to colleges, universities, and other public or nonprofit private agencies or institutions, to pay part of the cost of research, experimental, developmental, or pilot programs developed by such Boards, agencies, or institutions and designed to meet the special vocational education needs of youths, particularly youths in economically depressed communities who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education programs.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 5. (a) A State which desires to receive its allotments of Federal funds under this Act shall submit through its State Board to the Commissioner a State plan, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which—

(1) designates the State Board as the sole agency for administration of the State plan, or for supervision of the administration thereof by local educational agencies; and, if such State Board does not include as members persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor in the State, and a person or persons representative of junior colleges, technical institutes, or other institutions of higher education which provide programs of technical or vocational training meeting the definition of vocational education in section 8(1) of this Act, provides for the designation or creation of a State advisory council which shall include such persons, to consult with the State Board in carrying out the State plan;

(2) sets forth the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in allocating each such allotment among the various uses set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of section 4(a), and in allocating

Federal funds to local educational agencies in the State, which policies and procedures insure that due consideration will be given to the results of periodic evaluations of State and local vocational education programs and services in light of information regarding current and projected manpower needs and job opportunities, and to the relative vocational education needs of all groups in all communities in the State, and that Federal funds made available under this Act will be so used as to supplement, and, to the extent practical, increase the amounts of State or local funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available for the uses set forth in section 4(a), and in no case supplant such State or local funds;

(3) provides minimum qualifications for teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, directors, and others having responsibilities under the State plan;

(4) provides for entering into cooperative arrangements with the system of public employment offices in the State, approved by the State Board and by the State head of such system, looking toward such offices making available to the State Board and local educational agencies occupational information regarding reasonable prospects of employment in the community and elsewhere, and toward consideration of such information by such Board and agencies in providing vocational guidance and counseling to students and prospective students and in determining the occupations for which persons are to be trained; and looking toward guidance and counseling personnel of the State Board and local educational agencies making available to public employment offices information regarding the occupational qualifications of persons leaving or completing vocational education courses or schools, and toward consideration of such information by such offices in the occupational guidance and placement of such persons;

(5) sets forth procedures for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local education agencies) under this Act;

(6) provides assurance that the requirements of section 7 will be complied with on all construction projects in the State assisted under this Act; and

(7) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this Act, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve a State plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), and shall not finally disapprove a State plan except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State Board designated pursuant to paragraph (1) of such subsection.

(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State Board administering a State plan approved under subsection (b), finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Commissioner shall notify such State Board that no further payments will be made to the State under this Act (or, in his discretion, further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State under this Act (or shall limit payments to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

(d) A State Board which is dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under subsection (b) or (c) may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record the Commissioner may modify or set aside his action. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 6. (a) Any amount paid to a State from its allotment under section 3 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, shall be paid on condition that there shall be expended for such year, in accordance with the State plan approved under section 5 or the State plan approved under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, or both, an amount in State or local funds, or both, which at least equals the amount expended for vocational education during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, under the State plan approved under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts.

(b) Subject to the limitations in section 4(b), the portion of a State's allotment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each succeeding year, allocated under the approved State plan for each of the purposes set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (6) of section 4(a) shall be available for paying one-half of the State's expenditures under such plan for such year for each such purpose.

(c) The portion of a State's allotment for any fiscal year allocated under the approved State plan for the purpose set forth in paragraph (5) of section 4(a) shall be available for paying not to exceed one-half of the cost of construction of each area vocational education school facility project.

(d) Payments of Federal funds allotted to a State under section 3 to States which have State plans approved under section 5 (as adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner in advance on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditures by the States of the funds so allotted.

LABOR STANDARDS

SEC. 7. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing, as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a–5), and shall receive overtime compensation in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the Contract Work Hours Standards Act (Public Law 87–581). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 8. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "vocational education" means vocational or technical training or retraining which is given in schools or classes (including field or laboratory work incidental thereto) under public supervision and control or under contract with a State Board or local educational agency, and is conducted as part of a program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment as skilled workers or technicians in recognized occupations (including any program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment in business and office occupations, and any program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment which may be assisted by Federal funds under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, but excluding any program to fit individuals for employment in occupations which the Commissioner determines, and specifies in regulations, to be generally considered professional or as requiring a baccalaureate or higher degree). Such term includes vocational guidance and counseling in connection with such training, the in-service training of teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, and directors for such training, travel of students and vocational education personnel, and the acquisition and maintenance and repair of instructional supplies, teaching aids and equipment, but does not include the construction or initial equipment of buildings or the acquisition or rental of land.

(2) The term "area vocational education school" means a school (A) which admits as regular students, and is principally used for the provision of vocational education to, both persons who have completed high school and persons who have left high school, where such persons are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, and (B) which is available to all residents of the State or of an area thereof designated and approved by the State Board administering a State plan approved under section 5.

(3) The term "school facilities" means classrooms and related facilities (including initial equipment) and interests in land on which such facilities are constructed. Such term shall not include any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

(4) The term "construction" includes construction of new buildings and expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, and includes site grading and improvement and architect fees.

(5) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(6) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

(7) The term "State Board" means the State Board designated or created pursuant to section 5 of the Smith-Hughes Act (that is, the Act approved February 23, 1917 (39

Stat. 929, ch. 114; 20 U.S.C. 11–15, 16–28)) to secure to the State the benefits of that Act.

(8) The term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State, or any other public educational institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a vocational education program.

(9) The term "high school" does not include any grade beyond grade 12.

(10) The term "Vocational Education Act of 1946" means titles I, II, and III of the Act of June 8, 1936, as amended (20 U.S.C. 15i–15m, 15o–15q, 15aa–15jj, 15aaa–15ggg).

(11) The term "supplementary vocational education Acts" means section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U.S.C. 30) (relating to vocational education in Puerto Rico), the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 31–33) (relating to vocational education in the Virgin Islands), and section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (20 U.S.C. 34) (relating to vocational education in Guam).

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

SEC. 9. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of Education Advisory Committee on Vocational Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Advisory Committee"), consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be chairman, one representative each of the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, and Labor, and twelve members appointed, for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such twelve members shall, to the extent possible, include persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor (in equal numbers), persons familiar with the administration of State and local vocational education programs, other persons with special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to vocational education, and persons representative of the general public, and not more than six of such members shall be professional educators. The Advisory Committee shall meet at the call of the chairman but not less often than twice a year.

(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this Act, the Vocational Education Act of 1946, and supplementary vocational education Acts, including policies and procedures governing the approval of State plans.

(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently

AMENDMENTS TO GEORGE-BARDEN AND SMITH-HUGHES VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACTS

SEC. 10. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in title I, II, or III of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U.S.C. 15i–15m, 15o–15q, 15aa–15jj, 15aaa–15ggg), or in the Smith-Hughes Act (that is, the Act approved February 23, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114; 20 U.S.C. 11–15, 16–28)), or in supplementary vocational education Acts—

(a) any portion of any amount allotted (or apportioned) to any State for any purpose under such titles, Act, or Acts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, or for any fiscal year thereafter, may be transferred to and combined with one or more of the other allotments (or apportionments) of such State for such fiscal year under such titles, Act, or Acts, or under this Act and used for the purposes for which, and subject to the conditions under which, such other allotment (or apportionment) may be used, if the State Board requests, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, that such portion be transferred and shows to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that transfer of such portion in the manner requested will promote the purpose of this Act;

(b) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for agriculture may be used for vocational education in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in agricultural subjects, whether or not such occupation involves work of the farm or of the farm home, and such education may be provided without directed or supervised practice on a farm;

(c)(1) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for home economics may be used for vocational education to fit individuals for gainful employment in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in home economics subjects;

(2) at least 25 per centum of any amount so allotted (or apportioned) to a State for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1965, may be used only for vocational education to fit persons for gainful employment in occupations involving knowledge and skills in home economics subjects, or transferred to another allotment under subsection (a), or both.

(d) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for distributive occupations may be used for vocational education for any person over fourteen years of age who has entered upon or is preparing to enter upon such an occupation, and such education need not be provided in part-time or evening schools;

(e) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for trade and industrial occupations may be used for preemployment schools and classes organized to fit for gainful employment in such occupations persons over fourteen years of age who are in school, and operated for less than nine months per year and less than thirty hours per week and without the requirement that a minimum of 50 percent of the time be given to practical work on a useful or productive basis, if such preemployment schools and classes are for single-skilled or semi-skilled occupations which do not require training or work of such duration or nature; and less than one-third of any amounts so allotted (or apportioned) need be applied to part-time schools or classes for workers who have entered upon employment.

EXTENSION OF PRACTICAL NURSE TRAINING AND AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 11. (a)(1) Section 201 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U.S.C. 15aa) is amended by striking out "of the next eight fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "succeeding fiscal year".

(2) Subsection (c) of section 202 of such Act is amended by striking out "of the next seven fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "succeeding fiscal year".

(b) Section 301 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 15aaa) is amended by striking out "of the five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "succeeding fiscal year".

PERIODIC REVIEW OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND LAWS

SEC. 12. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, during 1966, appoint an Advisory Council on Vocational Education for the purpose of reviewing the administration of the vocational education programs for which funds are appropriated pursuant to this Act and other vocational education Acts and making recommendations for improvement of such administration, and reviewing the status of and making recommendations with respect to such vocational education programs and the Acts under which funds are so appropriated.

(b) The Council shall be appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws and shall consist of twelve persons who shall, to the extent possible, include persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor (in equal numbers), persons familiar with the administration of State and local vocational education programs, other persons with special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to vocational education, and persons representative of the general public.

(c) The Council is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out its functions, and the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out such functions.

(d) The Council shall make a report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this Act and other vocational education Acts) to the Secretary, such report to be submitted not later than January 1, 1968, after which date such Council shall cease to exist. The Secretary shall transmit such report to the President and the Congress.

(e) The Secretary shall also from time to time thereafter (but at intervals of not more than five years) appoint an Advisory Council on Vocational Education, with the same functions and constituted in the same manner as prescribed for the Advisory Council in the preceding subsections of this section. Each Council so appointed shall report its findings and recommendations, as prescribed in subsection (d), not later than July 1 of the second year after the year in which it is appointed, after which date such Council shall cease to exist.

(f) Members of the Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

FEDERAL CONTROL

SEC. 13. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 14. This Act may be cited as the "Vocational Education Act of 1963".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BELL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BELL: On page 46, line 17, Sec. 5(a), strike out the period and insert in lieu there, "; and", and add the following new paragraph:

"(8) Provides that after June 30, 1965, any program assisted with funds appropriated under this Act shall be operated, and

students admitted thereto, on a racially nondiscriminatory basis."

On page 60, after line 16, insert the heading "NONDISCRIMINATION" and the following new section:

"SEC. 13. (a) Section 8 of the Act of February 23, 1917 (relating to vocational education) is amended by inserting '(a)' after 'SEC. 8' and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) After June 30, 1965, each State plan shall require that any vocational education program assisted with funds appropriated under this Act shall be operated, and students admitted thereto, on a racially nondiscriminatory basis.'

"(b) Section 203(a) of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 is amended by striking out 'and' at the end of clause (4), by striking out the period at the end of clause (5) and inserting in lieu thereof '; and', and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(6) after June 30, 1965, provide that any practical nurse training program assisted with funds appropriated under this title will be operated, and students admitted thereto, on a racially nondiscriminatory basis,'."

On page 60, line 18, strike out "SEC. 13" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 14".

On page 61, line 2, strike out "SEC. 14" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 15".

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BELL was allowed to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, vocational training encouraged in the United States with funds authorized by Congress must be considered an aspect of the Federal response to the problem of racial inequality in our land.

Members of the two Houses will shortly be required to make far-reaching, perhaps painful decisions involving equal treatment for our citizens.

Today, in a small way, we anticipate the greater debate soon to absorb us.

Job training proposed in H.R. 4955 is designed to assist men and women who have found themselves in tragically limited demand in the Nation's employment market.

Government cannot avoid a measure of responsibility for the plight of much of our work force which is currently either unemployable or barely employable because of insufficient training and uncultivated talents.

Of the $14 billion we spend annually to sponsor research and development, the National Science Foundation estimates that 25 percent will eventually result in the upgrading of industrial technology.

By 1970 automation will have eliminated 22 million jobs in the United States, according to figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

All of us are aware of the downward pressures exerted on unskilled, inadequately prepared workers when new systems and refined machinery are installed by employers.

That this downward pressure, for a variety of reasons, is experienced more by our nonwhite citizens than our white citizens is usually conceded.

Whether or not it is conceded, however, the fact remains that vocational education is needed by an important segment of our nonwhite population.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare research shows a 5.5 unemployment percentage in the white labor force at this time.

Negro unemployment is exactly double this and totals 11 percent.

That terrible sense of losing ground in the competition for jobs is one of the things that racial strife in the United States today is all about.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the upgrading of the economic potential of minorities is a major justification for support of H.R. 4955.

I submit, further, that Members now being asked to vote for this bill, along with both white and nonwhite taxpayers who will have to pay for it, ought to be reassured that racial discrimination will not mar the program.

Before you is an amendment to provide that simple guarantee.

If the amendment is adopted, the Commissioner of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will be called upon to review the vocational education proposals of each State which requests Federal matching funds.

He will be expected to certify that the training is being offered in integrated schools and is of uniform quality.

Mr. Chairman, in the belief that many Members cannot cast their votes for a vocational training bill which did not include this built-in protection against the possibility of abuse, I urge passage of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. GOODELL. Clarifying what your amendment will do, it is my understanding, and as a matter of legislative history I think it should be clear, that you intend that in a given State where there may be 17 facilities or schools that are segregated and all the rest are not, it will be possible for the Commissioner to continue aid to that State provided that the State plan makes it clear that no Federal funds directly or indirectly, or matching funds, go to these segregated facilities.

Mr. BELL. That is correct.

Mr. GOODELL. A further caveat on this proviso is that also the State plan must make clear and be administered so that there is no subterfuge. The Commissioner must be satisfied that there was no subterfuge whereby the State in effect favored the segregated facilities or discriminating programs over the nondiscriminating programs, thus preventing the penalty of loss of aid from affecting discriminating programs.

Mr. BELL. That is correct.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, if I may clarify one further point; in other words, a State plan that was set up to move in the direction of integration may do so on a gradual basis provided there is good faith, provided that no Federal funds nor special institute State funds would go to the facilities and programs where there is discrimination?

Mr. BELL. That is correct.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, If I understand the gentleman's amendment, he makes an effort to make it applicable to Smith-Hughes and George-Barden as well as the present legislation; but if I have ever seen any amendment involving Federal control in my judgment this amendment will cast a cloud over the administration of the program by the State boards and make the administration of the act practically impossible. I am of the opinion that this amendment as written involves considerable Federal control. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. BELL. It does not involve considerable control. Certainly the Commissioner will have certain powers.

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

Mr. BELL. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, and I think I do understand it, it simply means that this expanded program of vocational education in which we are about to engage is to be applied across the country without regard to race or color.

Mr. BELL. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. In other words, any person who otherwise qualifies will be permitted to avail himself of the benefits of this program.

Mr. BELL. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] talks about controls. Of course, many of us have fretted about excessive Federal controls; but this is essentially a Federal program that we are about to enact and in my opinion it would be much less than fair, so far as our population generally is concerned, to deny to any person the benefits of this program by reason of race or color.

Mr. BELL. I certainly concur in that statement.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me further, let me just emphasize here to the gentleman from Kentucky that the language is designed after and is very close to the language of the so-called Gill bill that we voted for in our committee. It is designed to do exactly the same thing that the Gill bill would do, on a special basis applied to vocational programs only. It would do it for the manpower bill. It is designed to be moderate, to be reasonable, to permit the States within their own borders to aid with Federal funds those facilities that are integrated while the segregated facilities or discriminating facilities may go ahead with their own programs, provided there is no Federal aid, matching State aid, and no favoritism to discriminatory programs in the vocational system. I think it is a very fair and sensible proposal that the gentleman makes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I want to clarify what the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] just said, because if what he says is true he contradicts his own minority leader. For instance, in the State of Virginia it is possible for a school board, a State school board to come in and have two programs, one for segregated schools and one for nonsegregated schools. If that is so then what the

gentleman has said is that they can come in for Federal money for their nonsegregated schools and that would enable them to go ahead and have more money with which to run their segregated schools. I do not understand that kind of double talk.

Mr. BELL. The gentleman is not accurate.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment not because of its substance but because of the obvious fact that its adoption may have the effect of endangering the passage of this very worthwhile legislation.

Members are well aware that title VI of H.R. 7152, the so-called Omnibus Civil Rights Act of 1963, which I introduced on June 20, in my humble opinion contains adequate protection against discrimination in federally assisted programs because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Let me read that section, which is a part of the omnibus bill now being considered by the House Judiciary Committee, hearings on which have just been terminated. Next week we begin writing up the bill. Section 601 provides the following:

> Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in any law of the United States providing or authorizing direct or indirect financial assistance for or in connection with any program or activity by way of grant, contract, loan, insurance, guaranty, or otherwise, no such law shall be interpreted as requiring that such financial assistance shall be furnished in circumstances under which individuals participating in or benefiting from the program or activity are discriminated against on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin or are denied participation or benefits therein on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin. All contracts made in connection with any such program or activity shall contain such conditions as the President may prescribe for the purpose of assuring that there shall be no discrimination in employment by any contractor or subcontractor on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin.

That language is very broad. That language is most comprehensive. It encompasses the terminology and the substance and the purposes of the amendment now before you. It even goes further. The amendment before you is limited to the present bill. The language I read covers all legislation involving grants, aid, or anything of that character by the Federal Government. Certainly the language of this section covers the precise areas of the vocational education bill now being considered here today, making the additional amendment barring discrimination completely unnecessary.

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

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

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Any time that amendments like this have been offered it has been said that the whole purpose is to kill the bill. The gentleman spoke of endangering the passage of this particular bill. Let me ask the gentleman, Would he vote for the bill with or without this amendment?

Mr. CELLER. I am opposed to this amendment. Never mind what I am going to do directly on the bill. Every effort that has been made to graft on legislation of this kind heretofore has had the effect of torpedoing the bill which was under discussion.

Mr. HALLECK. Now, will the gentleman yield to me for a brief observation?

Mr. CELLER. I have answered the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. No, you did not answer the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. Will you get me more time?

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot give you any time. The Committee is operating under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. CELLER. Yes, but you are using my time, sir.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say, as far as I am concerned I shall vote for this bill whether this amendment goes in or not. I would remind the gentleman that a similar amendment went in on an education bill and the bill went on to final passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has expired.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know for whom the gentleman speaks; that is, the gentleman who just addressed us. He may only speak for himself. I do not know whether he questioned every Member on the Republican side. I do not know what the response would have been had he done so. I do know that an amendment of this character has had the effect heretofore of vitiating and rendering abortive all our efforts to get worthwhile legislation on the statute books and has had the effect of destroying and rendering a nullity the bills that were being considered by this House.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I might point out to the gentleman that in a very small measure, the statement of the minority leader was accurate, that the bill did pass the House. I was the author of the bill, which was H.R. 10128; and when it went back to the Committee on Rules not one single Republican vote could be obtained to take it to conference. Because of the failure of those Republicans to provide a single vote the bill did not become law.

Mr. CELLER. I do not want to indulge in partisan argument here. This bill that is before you members of the Committee is a worthwhile bill. It would be a sad day, indeed, if we were to graft on to it any kind of an amendment that would have the tendency to destroy it. I will make further statement with reference to the purport and substance of this amendment.

I shall be most pleased when we write up the civil rights bill to entertain a motion to include and add to the ommibus civil rights bill the import and even the language of the amendment now before this Committee. I cannot guarantee that the members either of my subcommittee considering the bill, the civil rights bill, or the full membership will embrace the idea of the amendment, but I sincerely and genuinely express to you that we will fully and carefully consider this amendment, and I will support it personally and will do all and sundry to have the substance and purpose of this amendment included in the Civil Rights Act. Now I am sure you cannot ask from me more than that. I hope that this language, as I am expressing it to you today, will have the effect of discouraging any votes for this amendment now before you.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman is chairman of the committee considering civil rights legislation and I assume the gentleman is doing so with the feeling that the bill, or whatever he reports to the House, is going to pass. That being the case, how can a civil rights amendment on this legislation jeopardize the bill? Either you are not going to be able to pass any civil rights legislations or you can pass it here on this bill and get it on its way.

Mr. CELLER. I am one of those who do not believe that we should adopt any civil rights provisions piecemeal. We should not be taking 17 bites at the cherry. When we can do it at one fell swoop, let us do it at one fell swoop. But you are dangerously agitating here and you are going to influence some Members on either side of the House against the general provisions of the bill at hand, if you adopt this amendment. I fervently hope the amendment will not prevail.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words to urge the members of the Democratic Party in this House to support this amendment, as the great majority of the members of the Republican Party will.

Mr. Chairman, on the area redevelopment bill I withheld an amendment of this sort. I withheld it at that time because the President at that time had announced that he was going to introduce, or expected to have introduced a bill which would have a provision of this sort in it. Since then title VI of the civil rights bill has been introduced. It is inconclusive. It would, in effect, authorize a continuation of the use of Federal funds in a discriminatory way, if the administrator of the program wished to make those funds available under those circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, the ARA bill from the other body came before our committee

again last week. I again proposed the same amendment, or basically the same amendment. It was again turned down by the members of the Democratic Party, after letting five of their members off the hook not to vote, members who incidentally come from the large metropolitan congressional districts.

Mr. Chairman, I think, of course, this bill differs from the ARA. If that bill comes out of the Committee on Rules to the floor again I shall probably introduce the same amendment again.

It was said and will probably be said again that I am going to defeat the bill. This certainly cannot be said of this bill. As a matter of fact, I do not know whether I will be able to vote for the ARA bill. I think it is important, Mr. Chairman, that the ARA bill have a civil rights clause in it before the bill is passed out. To me it is more important that it have such an amendment than that the bill pass. It has been said that it is absolutely essential for the purpose of this legislation today that it have this amendment and I agree.

I would like to give a little advice and information to the Members of this body as to the feeling of some of the people involved and who will be most directly involved in this program. I would like to tell them that last week when I offered my amendment in the hearings on the ARA bill before the Committee on Banking and Currency, at that time Mr. Clarence Mitchell, the NAACP regional director, came before the committee in support of that amendment and, among other things, called to the attention of the members of the committee—and I have had printed in the minority views on the ARA bill which will be available in a report to all of us—to a copy of the resolution this year, the 53d meeting of the NAACP, which reads in part as follows:

> Federally supported racial discrimination or segregation in any form is unconscionable. We support and urge the adoption in Congress of antisegregation amendments in all legislation for schools, hospitals, recreation, disaster relief, or any other purpose under which the Federal Government will provide grants, loans, technical assistance, or any other type of aid.

Continuing, that resolution states:

> Our wealth and our resources should be pledged to spread educational advantages, relieve the suffering and succor the victims of storms, floods, or other disasters. This we support. However, we insist that all aid must be available to every citizen without regard to race. No State, city, political subdivision, or any private person should be permitted to use Federal money to build, rebuild, operate, or extend any program, facility, or activity which bars American citizens or visitors from foreign countries on the basis of race.

This is the statement made by some of the people who represent those who are most involved or essentially tied up in the great need for this program.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the members of the Committee to consider this and to vote their consciences on this amendment.

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

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, questioned what I have said a moment ago, indicating that maybe I just spoke for myself. I would like to remind all others that in our Republican policy committee we discussed this matter at some length and a public statement was issued to the effect that we are in support of this bill. So there is not any question in my mind but what the bill is going to pass with or without this amendment.

I have always understood that a bird in hand is worth two or three in the bush. Here is one place where we can provide—and I do not see how anyone can quarrel with it—that the benefits of this program shall be open to everybody who can qualify. That is what this amendment seeks to do.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the distinguished minority leader.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding and I thank him for his remarks. I would like to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] for offering this amendment. It is both reasonable and justified.

I believe this antidiscrimination amendment should receive support from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt if any man in this House can speak to me in terms of civil rights who has felt perhaps civil rights any more than I have. I doubt if anyone has had the experience of being refused admittance into places of public accommodation, even in the district of the sponsor of this amendment, because of his wife whose complexion is obviously more Negro than mine. I think anyone who has gone through that experience can speak in terms of civil rights as a prize possession, as something that is sacred and as something which should not be dragged through partisan political battles merely for publicity.

I certainly believe the first thing that is wrong about the presentation of this amendment—and certainly I have a deep regard for my colleague from California [Mr. BELL]—is that it is not a proper introduction of civil rights to this bill at this time. It can only prostitute that which to me is sacred, and something which to millions of people throughout America is sacred and should not be handled in this manner.

There are other things wrong with this amendment. It is technically defective. It has been said that the amendment will provide for a nondiscriminatory program in the field of vocational education. You should understand the amendment would deprive any State of any Federal funds if that State had as much as one school or one district which still discriminated, and despite the fact there may innocently be many others that are trying to comply in every way with the Supreme Court decision, and despite the fact there are many that are actually in compliance with it. The innocent would be spanked with the guilty. As a matter of fact, they would be spanked more militantly than the guilty.

There are other defects in this amendment. They have highjacked this amendment. The amendment is not going to be presented to this bill in its present form. We intend to correct some of the mistakes which are in this amendment. They have in highjacking the amendment worked out what they thought would place us in the position of opposition to such amendment. We intend certainly to correct some of the mistakes in this amendment and to bring it back for your approval.

There is another defect in this amendment in that it is ineffectual and very unjust. Of all the Federal programs to aid various educational programs, this is almost the last one on the totem pole. As a matter of fact there is only one educational program which authorizes less money and appropriates less Federal money than this, and that is for Federal Indian education services. They have selected perhaps the weakest of all the educational programs in terms of actual money in order to make a record in the field of civil rights.

Not only that, but only a small percentage of Federal money goes into vocational education on the local level. Most of the Southern States contribute 10 or 15 times more dollars than the $1 of money which they receive from the Federal Government. In other words, if you are going to use this as a weapon, you are only using a popgun. It is just like going out into darkest Africa to hunt wild game with a popgun and some bubble gum in your mouth. That is all it amounts to. It is one of the weakest programs to which to attach this. Why not attach it to manpower, which has 100 percent financing by the Government in it and not this, which only has one-fifteenth of the amount of money appropriated, with most of it to be put up by local government?

Do you think under those terms you are going to threaten any Southern State or any State in defiance of the Constitution, or any district? You will certainly not do it for this small amount of money being appropriated. But in my opinion the real danger of this amendment is it will defeat this bill and deprive more Negroes of needed training than even whites. The whites in the Deep South and elsewhere can go to private training schools and to private on-the-job training provided by industry, but this will not be possible for the Negroes who will not get this money if this bill is not passed.

This is a most important bill. Certainly the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL], coming from a silk stocking district surrounded by the green Palos Verdes hills stretching up the seacoast to the beautiful Malibu sands, could not be worried, because his district is not concerned if this bill is defeated. However, I come from and I represent a district which is between the noise of

downtown Los Angeles and the stockyards, and the poor Negro boys and girls in my district need this training.

For that reason I oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have been told here today that we should lay aside partisan differences. So I lay them aside. At no time in the consideration of this legislation, in the subcommittee or in the full committee, have partisan considerations entered into our deliberations. This has been fully attested to by the chairman of the subcommittee and by others. We have a bipartisan front. We believe traditionally, and I believe in both parties, in the vocational education system. No one here is trying to put the dagger into vocational education.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. We have been bipartisan except that we had this amendment up in the committee and it was defeated in committee.

Mr. GOODELL. This is the division we have. It has also been said that this is the weakest of our Federal education programs. I deny that. Perhaps it is the strongest of all the Federal education programs. I can tell you that there is no program that is more important to the Negroes of this country. This is the program that can really help them where it counts—in jobs. This is the program where they should be guaranteed equal opportunity to prepare themselves for jobs—good jobs, on an equal basis.

I would be amused, Mr. Chairman, if it were not so tragic, to observe the tortured reasoning of my friends on the other side and their painful, awkward, and embarrassed thrashings to try to get out of this. I say this to you advisedly. We know that there are two factions that disagree in the Democratic Party. There is a faction here that sincerely believes in civil rights, in the Democratic Party. I attribute to them high motives. They want to help the Negro. But, I ask you, do not be tired young liberals, do not be discouraged before we go into battle. Do not lay down your arms before we even enter the battle lists. You stand before us and say we cannot win; it is useless to do this. I wish you would stop listening to the summons of expediency and pragmatism. You have a chance here to vote what I believe sincerely are your convictions. And I tell you that this program on which you will have almost solid Republican support, regardless what you do. You cannot stand here in good faith and say that the program is going to be defeated if you put this amendment on here.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether it would be parliamentary or not, but I would like to have the Republicans who are here—and we are in goodly number—raise their hands to indicate whether they will vote for this bill with or without the amendment.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I tell you that this bill has solid Republican support. It is going to have it whatever you do with this amendment. If you cannot add a civil rights amendment to this bill you cannot add it to anything. You should stand up now and face this question on your convictions because you can do it without being expedient, because you can do it without killing the legislation.

I stand here and admit to you that you have some basis for making this argument when you have a close vote, where you do not think you are going to get Republican support. Perhaps you would kill legislation under those circumstances. But do not stay in this coalition between your two factions. You of that faction over here who believe in civil rights, join this side. We will be with you on vocational education and we will see that this program is administered so that there is equal opportunity for everyone, on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have been very impressed by the articulate and very well reasoned argument made by my friend from New York [Mr. GOODELL]. His argument that the bill will pass the House with or without a Powell amendment impresses us all. The comments of his leader to the same effect certainly impresses us. But I wonder if they have forgotten that the U.S. Congress is not unicameral. Can the gentleman from New York or the gentleman from Indiana or any Member on that side, name a single Federal educational proposal to which a Powell amendment was added in this House that has ever become the law of the United States?

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

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

Mr. GOODELL. For a man who says that he believes in the future, who is a progressive—and I respect his sincerity in this field—I say to him, are you going to look to the past forever? Cannot we look forward now and break some new lines and have bipartisan support for this legislation across the board? Let us fight the battle now and face it in the Senate. We are going to do everything we can to see that the legislation is not killed.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I will say to my friend that I try to learn from my mistakes. And in 1960, as the gentleman from New Jersey, the gentleman from Indiana, and the gentleman from New York have pointed out, we passed an education bill in the House of Representatives that included a Powell amendment. That bill died. It never became law. And when we conducted an autopsy to see what had happened to it, the most likely cause of the death was found to be its antidiscrimination amendment.

I say to you that if you want any educational program you are going to have to vote against Powell amendments to it. If you want improved and expanded vocational education you will have to oppose this amendment. The gentleman from New York, when he introduced his own bill to provide about a billion dollars for higher education in the next 5 years, was prudent enough not to include, in that bill, the antidiscrimination amendment that he now wants us to put into this bill.

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

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I would be very grateful, following the leadership of my dear friend from Indiana, if all the Republicans who plan to vote for the public accommodations section in the civil rights bill will please hold up their hands.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman speaks of the higher education bill. I introduced that bill on a bipartisan basis, and I have indicated consistently I would support a civil rights amendment to that legislation. I say to you, as it relates right here on the vocational program to the Negro, the civil rights spokesmen who came before our committee made it clear that at this juncture in our history even if it had to mean delay in this program they wanted the civil rights provision in, that the program as it operates now in too many States does not help the Negro effectively, and we should face this issue now. I am convinced if you would join our ranks over here with your ranks over there in bipartisan support we could do it, but I am afraid you are too timid at this stage and will not face up to it.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I liked the gentleman's brand of bipartisanship better on the higher education bill, because when he was bipartisan on that bill he did not offer in committee or include in his own proposal any amendment that would have had the effect of causing that bill to be defeated at some place in the legislative process. Nevertheless I like the Bell amendment and I like the gentleman from New York. I believe he is sincere. But I want an improved vocational education program and my better judgment tells me that I am not going to get it by supporting this kind of amendment in the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. Chairman, may I first take the opportunity to congratulate my colleague from California [Mr. HAWKINS]. I do not know whether or not you know it, but his district is 80 percent Negro. When a Negro Congressman representing a district of that kind can come up and make that kind of speech, he is a man of great courage, in my book.

I should also like to call the attention of my Republican colleagues to the statement of Clarence Mitchell on this bill, when he said the first and most important step to be taken is the passage of a National Fair Employment Practices Act. I wonder why not one single Member on that side of the aisle, who suddenly have become such civil rights advocates, have mentioned that they would support other civil rights legislation.

It seems to me, therefore, that what we are doing is exactly what the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] said, we are seeing a kind of dramatic exposition of how to get away with something as cheaply as possible to make a political gain. If they had really wanted to move forward, there were all kinds of opportunities, such as the medical bill, that did not pass in this House. It was not offered at that time by my friends on this side.

All I can say is that as far as I am concerned, the realities of this situation are that if we put the amendment on this bill now, you ought to know that in the other body there will not be two civil rights bills and this bill will not get enacted. I stand for the realities of the situation. Let us enact this bill. Let us make it law. Let us help those Negroes and whites who need this bill. The way to do it is to show demagoguery for what it is and not vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] to this bill at this time.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I would ask the gentleman to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL] who offered the amendment to the medical facilities bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. But it did not pass. It did not get a lot of support the way it is today.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIBAL. I would like to respond to your allegation. When the medical facilities bill was before this House, I offered an essentially identical amendment. Every Republican in this House voted for it. I do not recall where the gentleman from California was at that time. Perhaps, he was not in this country. But, it was definitely a partisan vote with all Democrats voting against it except, I might say, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I do not know just who offered it, whether it was the gentleman from Connecticut who offered it. But, there was not that unanimity that we are seeing here today on the Republican side.

Mr. SIBAL. There were no Democratic votes except one, as I mentioned, and all the Republicans voted for it.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. I respect the gentleman's statements but let me say, he knows full well that I and many other Republicans on that subcommittee and on the committee supported the measures to which he refers. The gentleman also asks the question as to why we are adding this civil rights amendment just to the vocational education bill. That is the only legislation that is before us today. That is the only one we can offer it to now.

Second, this is, perhaps, and I am sure the gentleman would agree with me, this is perhaps the most important area for Negroes—the area of jobs and of job opportunities and of the opportunity to equip oneself to get a job through training and education.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am sorry I cannot yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman that this is important, but he wants to play politics with an important bill. I will not play politics with it. I want to say further insofar as I am concerned, and I say this to the gentleman in fairness to him, that he has supported, and some Republicans have supported civil rights measures. But with reference to the four members on the Committee on Rules, have they voted out the FEPC bill or have they made any move to do that? Not one of them. I think the record speaks for itself and we may leave it at that point.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] rise?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close at 5 o'clock with the last 5 minutes reserved to the chairman of the committee.

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

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I make this statement to the chairman?

I have tried in all sincerity to get 5 minutes from the controller of the time on the majority side in your absence. He said he did not have the time. I have been repeatedly jumping up and trying to get recognition here. I recognize the fact that being a newcomer, the members of the committee must be recognized first. But I would like to ask unanimous consent of the committee to speak for 5 minutes on this regardless of whether it comes under the gentleman's motion or whether it comes under unanimous consent.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous consent request for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, no doubt mine will be a voice crying in the wilderness with reference to this particular bill because thus far I have yet to hear anyone stand here and say that they are opposed to the bill with or without the Powell amendment. That is the position I stand in now. Lest any of you get the idea I am against vocational education, let me set the record straight. No one is a greater champion of vocational education than I and the people of South Carolina are. In fact, we believe in it so much that last year when I was privileged to serve as a member of the Richmond County delegation in South Carolina our people in our county taxed our own people to spend $425,000 in order to build a technical education center in Richmond County, South Carolina. If that is not enough, I would remind you that my State although we are one of the poorest States so far as per capita income is concerned in the United States, realizing the importance of vocational education, is now in the process of setting up some nine of these technical education centers throughout the State of South Carolina. If that is not enough, as I have read the hearings of the committee here, the State of North Carolina, my sister State, has some 20 of these technical education centers which are now educating some 25,000 or more North Carolinians in vocational education. People speak of discrimination. Who has been discriminatory? Has it been in the areas of South Carolina, North Carolina, and the other southern States? Has it been our southern people who are trying to provide technical education training for our people?

Or, has it been these people who now suddenly come hat in hand to Washington saying, "We cannot do it at home?"

May I ask the Members of the House this question: If poor little South Carolina which is right at the bottom economically speaking in per capita income, can face up to this problem, if we can tax our own people to provide these educational centers for the education of our people, then why cannot big New York do it? Why cannot big California do it?

Why cannot the other States in the Nation meet this need on a local basis?

Mr. Chairman, the basic issue is not whether or not you believe in vocational education. We all believe in that. If this bill is defeated it will not affect one iota the $57 million which we presently have for vocational education. The question on this bill is simply whether or not you want the States and the counties and the individual governmental entities to contine their efforts to provide vocational education, or do you want them to come hat in hand to Washington in order to get $45 million this year, $90 million next year, $135 million the following year, and $180 million thereafter. The question is simply this: Do you believe in local responsibility? Do you believe that the States, even the poorer States as those in the Southland, should continue this effort, or do you want them to rush to Washington, as we are so prone to do now, because that is where the so-called easy money is? The question is whether or not you want the folks to do it at home. We in the Southland yield to no State, area, or section or anyone in the matter of trying to educate our people, both academically and vocationally speaking. I ask you Representatives of other States of the Nation why do you not, with all of your wealth, face up to this responsibility like the poorer Southern States have been trying to face it. Consider it well and I believe you will vote down this bill, because it is not necessary, it will penalize those States which have faced up to the problem without Federal handouts, it will further invade the rights of our States in the field of education and finally because our Federal Treasury cannot stand additional expenditures of this proportion for unwarranted programs.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may ex-

tend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I commend my colleague from South Carolina and his State for their efforts in the field of vocational education. I take this opportunity to respond as best I can to his inquiry concerning the efforts of California. I cannot give him figures for our State but can tell him that the Los Angeles City School District, during the past fiscal year, spent $50,400,000 for vocational education and training. This was part of a city school budget which exceeded one-third of a billion dollars. I would not want the gentleman from South Carolina nor this House to worry about the State of California or the city of Los Angeles neglecting its obligation in any phase of public education. I support H.R. 4955 in part because it makes some small contribution to this taxload borne by residents of the city of Los Angeles but more importantly because it may be some incentive to other areas of this Nation to raise their sights as to the needs for vocational training.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5 minutes after 5 o'clock, the last 5 minutes reserved to the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa will state his point of order.

Mr. GROSS. The time cannot be reserved under a motion to limit debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. POWELL. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at a quarter after 5 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, we have witnessed here this afternoon a very unusual spectacle. We have seen much controversy over everything except whether this is a bill that has merit or not. Finally, one man has risen to his feet, Mr. WATSON of South Carolina, and attempted to place in proper focus what we are considering this afternoon. That is whether or not you are in favor of Federal aid to vocational education or not.

As a former member of the State board of education in Louisiana, I know that vocational education is good and it will work. The question is are we going to allow vocational education to become completely submissive to the Federal Government and pass legislation now which cannot help but involve complete Federal control by Executive order, whether you want it by amendment or not. That is the decision you must make. Are you for Federal aid to education with Federal control, whether you have civil rights riders now or not? These controls will come later. Wait and see.

Let me point out to you it is rather odd to find some people here discussing civil rights, who have been discussing that subject all afternoon. You have not found many people who really know something about civil rights speaking this afternoon. The battle has been between other elements. The reasons should be obvious to all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 4955, just as I have supported all vocational training legislation in the past. Vocational training in all fields has proven of great benefit to millions of our people of all ages, fitting them for a vocation of their own choice.

The acceleration of this program will, I am sure, prove its worth as time goes on, by reducing unemployment to a far greater degree, and costing but a small percentage as compared to the area development program or any other program of that nature that has or can be devised by the mind of man. Also, Mr. Chairman, the benefits provided in such legislation as this, must in all fairness accrue to all our people irrespective of race, color, or creed, hence I shall support such an amendment which I understand will be offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to propose a test of the newfound devotion on the right side of the aisle to civil rights. A simple bill has been introduced which would forbid any Government funds for any endeavor in which racial discrimination is practiced.

There is a discharge petition relating to that bill on the desk here. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODALL] exhorted us not to be tired liberals, not to be afraid because something might be difficult. Let him give testimony to his attitude by signing the discharge petition, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to come forward and sign that discharge petition. I do not expect to be killed in the stampede, but if you really believe that no Federal money should go to segregated projects you will come up here prior to 5:15 p.m. today and sign this petition.

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

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

Mr. GOODELL. A discharge petition involves other procedures.

Mr. JOELSON. I do not yield further. The discharge petition refers simply to a bill to outlaw Federal funds for any project in which discrimination is practiced. If you believe in that principle you should come up and sign that petition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] for a minute and a half.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, 8 months have gone by and this Congress has done practically nothing. Meanwhile the windstorms swell across the country, 100 years of failure to fulfill the American promise of freedom, dignity, and equality for every American confronts the Congress, and still the Congress sleeps.

Business as usual is the byword. I have unending respect for the distinguished chairman of my own committee, the Judiciary Committee. He is a good soldier, but my heart bled for him this afternoon when he advocated that Congress do nothing. It is too late for inaction. It is too late because the country will not wait. The Congress can delay no longer. This amendment strikes at the heart of the problem of unemployment in the United States. It will help open up the labor market to all minority groups, and it should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] for a minute and a half.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the House today is faced with a crucial vote. Whether or not we will face our responsibilities as a Congress and as a nation is before us. There has been much talk of politics. There has been some laughter on the other side of the aisle. I submit that this is a serious question. I submit that we have a real opportunity to exercise leadership in the national interest today. Anybody who has worked seriously in the field of employment and unemployment knows that in the field of vocational training there is a clear need for training for all Americans. In particular we should attach an antidiscrimination amendment to this program. It is my hope that the other side of the aisle will join in a bipartisan opportunity to do something that is basic to the future of our country and take a forward step which is essential to the training opportunities for all Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] for a minute and a half.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the pending amendment which is consistent with my bill, H.R. 5741, which would deny Federal assistance to any program in which discrimination is practiced. I have consistently supported antidiscrimination amendments, even when I was the only member of my political party to do so. As recently as April 30, when the 1964 Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies appropriation bill was before the House, I proposed amendments to eliminate segregation in the impacted areas program and the Hill-Burton hospital construction program. These amendments were defeated.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL] has a short memory, for on April 24, 1963, I spoke and voted for a similar amendment to H.R. 12, the Health Professions Education Act of 1963.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] has suggested that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle can make clear their good faith by signing the discharge petition which I filed for H.R. 5741. I urge all of my colleagues to sign this discharge petition. By passing H.R. 5741, we will remove this kind of an amendment as a political issue.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question about the fact that there is segregation and discrimination in the vocational education program. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has informed me that in certain States vocational education programs are operated on a discriminatory basis.

In four States—Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina—the vocational programs which are supported with Federal funds are conducted on a completely segregated basis. In fiscal year 1963 $2,987,355 in Federal funds was allocated to these four States for vocational education.

The Civil Rights Commission concluded:

> Federal funds in some places support vocational education that is not strictly separate but palpably unequal even in relation to current employment opportunities for Negroes. Moreover, the pattern of vocational education supported by Federal funds adopts the discriminatory employment patterns of the past and perpetuates them for the future by denying to Negroes the opportunity to obtain training in new fields. To the extent that openings for Negroes do occur in these fields, there are few who are trained to fill them. The circle of discrimination is complete—few are qualified because few will be hired; few will be hired because few are qualified (1961 U.S. Civil Rights Commission Rept. No. 3, p. 104).

The Civil Rights Commission, speaking of Georgia, also reported:

> Many counties offer Federal grant training to whites but not to Negroes (Ibid., p. 99).

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government should no longer underwrite segregation.

According to the report on H.R. 4955 on page 6, the President's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education recommended in its report, which reviewed and analyzed Federal vocational education legislation and the program of the States, that vocational education must "make educational opportunities equally available to all regardless of race, sex, scholastic aptitude, or place of residence."

Mr. Chairman, this afternoon the House faces a unique opportunity, an opportunity for the first time this session to pass a civil rights proposal and with Republican support. Let us take the opportunity, and let us do it. Let us show the country right now that we are able in this House of Representatives to write into law what makes only good commonsense and moral sense and what is right, that is, that there shall be no discrimination in the administration or operation of this program which is so important to all of the people of the country. It seems to me that if ever—if ever—it was encumbent upon all of us to march down the aisle in support of civil rights, the time is now. In my opinion from the statements which have been made here today we can obviously pass this bill with a civil rights amendment. So let us do so now, and let us remember that in March 1933, a New Deal Congress amended the Civilian Conservation Corps bill to provide that there should be no discrimination. What has happened in the last 30 years? What progress have we made? In 1963 should we do less? In 1963 are we to say "No. No, we are afraid of what might happen over in the Senate"? Let us call upon the U.S. Senate to act, too. Let us challenge by our vote today the Senate to pass this bill also.

Mr. Chairman, we should meet our obligation now. Segregation can no longer be tolerated in or out of Government programs. If Congress is to play a constructive role in the struggle for liberty, we must take every opportunity to eradicate such affronts to the Constitution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I was most pleased last year that we passed a Manpower Training Act which hits at one of our great economic problems, which is unemployment. There is no question that unemployment for this entire Nation is serious, running around 6 percent. But if there is any group where unemployment particularly hits it is the young Negro, where the rate is not 6 percent but around 20 percent.

This bill is designed—and I am happy to see that it has got bipartisan support, as it should have—is designed to hit at this problem. It becomes very important that we direct our attention to this.

I was really hesitant to take the well of the House after some of the remarks of the gentlemen on the Democratic side. If we have reached the point here—and this is serious for all of us—where we cannot discuss these issues without calling each other phonies then this country is in sad shape; if we cannot conduct a debate on the floor of the House on the merits of an issue without that charge being leveled, we are in sad shape.

I think this is most important—and I am glad that I follow the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN]—this is important; this is the core of this bill. I think it is very important that the people on the Democratic side of the aisle realize that indeed this is a breakthrough. Let us get on with it and move on to the big problem of unemployment which is so heavily concentrated among our unskilled and semiskilled people who, unfortunately, largely are our Negro citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bell amendment for a reason that I have not heard mentioned here this afternoon. Those of us who have followed these hearings very closely over the years and who are members of the Committee on Education and Labor are very familiar with how difficult it is for a graduate of a vocational school in the skilled trades to get a job today, white or black. Mr. Meany, who is the president of the AFL-CIO has testified that within the workings of his organization he cannot break down all of the race barriers. He has said he needs the help and the arm of government, that he needs the help and arm of the Congress.

What is going to happen if the House of Representatives refuses to take one little step in the direction of removing discrimination in the vocational field? Today a Negro boy, graduating from a vocational high school in the North, cannot get a job as a plumber, a carpenter, a sheet metal worker or an electrician. He cannot be taken into the apprenticeship program. Right at this very moment, the biggest construction job in the city of Cleveland is tied up because the union refuses to hire two mechanics who are skilled Negro mechanics.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that if this House of Representatives does not have the courage to pass this weak amendment then we are saying to organized labor, "We don't care whether you break down the barriers in your apprenticeship program or your race problem; you go ahead and run it as you are." But if we pass this amendment I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that 4 years from now when these boys who entered the skilled trade schools are graduating and looking for jobs, the union will have to give them jobs, white or black.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I lay no claim to holding a liberal philosophy, but I do say that no man or woman in this House, with 10½ years of tenure, can boast a more liberal voting record on the subject of civil rights than the present occupant of the well of the House. I challenge anyone to dispute that statement.

And so I must say frankly that I resent the blanket indictment of "phony" because I support an amendment in which I deeply believe. I have always gone down this aisle on teller votes in support of antidiscrimination amendments to such things as medical facilities bills, housing bills and all the others, and I have voted for every civil rights bill that has been brought to this floor. I do not believe that consistency of principle should ever be interpreted as "phony."

Why will not this bill pass if this amendment is adopted? This House is controlled by the majority party 277 to 158. The other body is controlled by the Democrats by 67 to 33. Do we mean when we say this will not pass with the Bell amendment included that the principle of civil rights cannot pass these two bodies? In effect are we not saying that the President of the United States is engaging in a meaningless and useless gesture by conveying his recommendations on a civil rights bill to the Congress? We Republicans are not saying this but apparently members of the other party are in the position of saying in effect that their President, President Kennedy, has engaged in such a meaningless gesture.

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

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Chairman, I took this time to apprise the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] that we Republicans are not "phony" on civil rights. I do not mind that he said it. He is a new Member and he does not know the rules. But if we are going to discuss civil rights let us go back to 1957 and find out who voted for what. I noticed the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] when we were called "phonies" by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] smiling like a squirrel that had just swallowed a walnut and applauding vigorously.

How did the majority leader vote on that civil rights bill in 1957—the first since the Civil War? He voted "no." How did the majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] vote? He voted "no." He also signed the southern manifesto in 1954 which stated that desegregation was immoral.

I would suggest to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS] that he spend less time calling Republicans "phonies" and more time importuning his majority leader and majority whip to support civil rights. I do not say they were "phonies" when they voted against civil rights, I say they voted their convictions on civil rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, there are some in this Chamber who for various selfish reasons, are looking to the next election. I will take my chances on the next election and look to the next generation.

I rise in opposition to this amendment because I want to help the thousands upon thousands of children in Chicago, Negro and white, who for the first time under this legislation would have an opportunity to participate in vocational training.

The gentleman from New York made all sorts of speeches here as did the previous speaker, but nobody in this Chamber can deny that under a parliamentary situation over which this House has no control, the other body can tie this legislation up and talk it to death through a filibuster if the Bell amendment is included in this bill. No one can deny this, despite all the speeches we have heard around here today. If I lived in Aiken, S.C., with the Federal installations there, maybe I too might be against this bill. I too wouldn't need this bill because of all the Federal money Aiken gets from the aid to impacted areas bill.

But under the legislation before us, this is the first time that we have an opportunity to help the urban areas of America which have been the recipients of this tremendous inmigration of families from rural areas into the urban areas. This bill, for the first time, makes Chicago and other large urban areas eligible for Federal aid to vocational training. For that reason, I hope this amendment will be defeated. Let us get on with this bill. Let us enact meaningful legislation which will help a city like Chicago shift part of the present burden for maintaining our public schools' vocational education program from the real estate tax payer in my district to the Federal Government. After all, Mr. Speaker, when thousands of families exercise their constitutional right and move from another State to Illinois, I don't know why the taxpayer in my district should be forced to carry the full burden of providing education for these migrant families. Once these migrant families exercise their Federal right to move from one State to another, I believe the Federal Government should assume part of the cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am a little flabbergasted by some of the rationale or logic that is used to oppose the Bell amendment. I thought that in this day and age we were supposed to think positively yet I have never heard such negative thinking as has been expressed in opposing the Bell amendment. You do not dare adopt something that you believe in, we are told. Those on the other side who are against the amendment stand up and tell us, "Oh, we are for it, but we do not dare vote for it because it might defeat the bill."

And yet, at the same time I think we must recognize one of the major programs of the administration is a broad civil rights legislation. Committees are now considering legislation of a broad nature. Are you saying that this is all a useless gesture and that that cannot be passed and, therefore, the committee should stop considering it? Anybody who votes against this amendment on the rationale that we cannot have this amendment because it would kill the bill might just as well say to us and to the President and to members of the Committee on the Judiciary—stop wasting your time in trying to report out a civil rights bill. If a civil rights amendment will kill this bill, how pray tell, can you ever pass a civil rights bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, it must be difficult for many people in this Chamber and in this country to realize that the Republicans are giving wholehearted and strong support to the vocational education bill. They have been trying to claim all the time that the Republicans are obstructionists. But when we have a measure that we believe in, we work as hard as we can for that program. All of us on the committee have taken that positive position, and that is what we are doing now.

Last night my phone was ringing from people saying that they heard that Republicans on the policy committee took a position in opposition to this legislation. Evidently, some people started spreading that story around to discredit Republicans. Then it is claimed that because we believe in equal rights for people who will utilize vocational education, which is a most important thing, that we really are against the whole bill. We have decided to make this fight at a time when we are strongly in support of a bill. I have indicated my support for this bill. In fact, you know of my strong support for the college education bill and nobody needs to wonder about that. I have told my fellow members on the Committee on Education and Labor that I am ready to vote for a civil rights amendment on that bill any time because I believe civil rights is that important this year. We are going to push it.

In the event you people do not see fit to support the Bell amendment, we are going to offer a motion to recommit which will be offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] so that all can be on record today show whether they favor civil rights or not. The decision is 1963. It cannot be put off until some other time. We cannot wait until some grand program is offered to us. Now, today, at this time we make our decision.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] to close debate.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, as I said earlier during general debate, when the Powell amendment came up, it would be a matter of conscience. So all I want to do is to stand here not as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor or as a Democrat, not even as a Member of the Congress, but just as an American citizen and to state simply one or two facts.

The Powell amendment was initiated back in 1954. The Powell amendment has passed. When I was a fledgling Congressman, I offered it, not knowing about the philosophy of the Powell amendment concept in full, to the school lunch program. It passed this House and the other body and became the law of the land. In 1960 the Powell amendment passed this body. True, it died in the Committee on Rules, but with this manifestation by people who belong to the Rules Committee on the other side, I do not see why it or any other legislation cannot come out.

I do not like the word "phony" in the world of civil rights. Civil rights to me is what Israel is to the Jew or as sacred as Ireland is to an Irishman or Catholicism is to a Catholic. Civil rights goes way beyond the matter of being Republican or Democrat. There are phonies on both sides of this aisle. We all know that. I have been here 20 years. So let us not talk about phonies because, if you do, you will be talking about both sides of the aisle and not just one.

My committee is a bipartisan committee. We have worked hard to whip this legislation together. Out of our committee we bring legislation after legislation on a bipartisan basis; and those Democrats on my committee know that. There are some we cannot convert—it is true—such as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] who is going to offer a motion to recommit. But, we like each other. There is no finer person than the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL]. I know him personally and socially, he and his wife and my wife and I. So let no one say that he is insincere.

My concern is this, that this House is rapidly becoming a second-class body with a growing, massive, inferiority complex. Every time anything comes up we say, "The other body, the other body." What are we doing here? When we go home let it be a unicameral body representing a legislative body, not bicameral. Let us live up to our own conscience, and my conscience when I walk down that aisle is going to meet 180 million people, 20 million people black; and after that, God. And, I am going to vote my conscience.

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

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

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BELL and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 146, noes 194.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAHILL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAHILL: Page 50, line 25, strike out "under public supervision and control" and insert "in public or other nonprofit educational institutions".

Page 53, lines 5 and 6, strike out "other public" and insert "public or other nonprofit".

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, those of you who were here when we were talking on the bill will know the purpose of this amendment. For those who were not here let me briefly explain it. It is a very uncomplicated amendment. On page 50 of the bill the definition given of vocational education is this: It means "vocational or technical training or retraining which is given in schools or classes—including field or laboratory work incidental thereto—and these are the key words—"under public supervision and control or under contract with a State board or local educational agency."

This amendment would strike those words and it would make the provisions of this bill, if passed, applicable not only to pupils and students of public institutions but would also make this bill applicable to nonprofit educational institutions.

As I indicated in my earlier statement to the House, this would apply to Boys Town and Moose Heart and institutions like that, as well as religious institutions of all denominations.

I think you all understand the purpose of the amendment. Let me just say this one word. I am sure that the chairman of this committee, being interested as he is in the elimination of discrimination in any guise, should accept the amendment.

Let me point out that most of these private institutions are supported and are in existence today largely because of vocations, and vocations do not supply machinery. Usually people with vocations do not have technical skills. Therefore, I would say to you that if the public institutions need this type of legislation a fortiori, so do the private institutions, and I would hope, therefore, that the House and especially the committee headed by the eminent chairman from New York, will accept this amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is with some reluctance that I take the floor to oppose the amendment of my distinguished colleague from New Jersey. In this instance I feel, however, that it should be done and that the issue should be clarified.

Unlike many other educational programs the moneys under these longstanding acts are allocated not to the institutions of learning, to the schools themselves, but specifically to the States themselves. If, indeed, there is merit to the gentleman's suggestion, and I think that there is, the remedy is to pass this legislation as it is, allocate the moneys to the States and then to make the appeal for the specific institutions within the States to the chief State school officer.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Will the gentleman and will the committee explain whether or not the State of New Jersey, for example, if granted funds under this bill would have a legal right to in turn make contributions to the parochial school system of New Jersey?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I would say to the gentleman that we would have to review the constitutions of the 50 States. In the State of New Jersey the answer would be in the affirmative. In many other States, indeed I think the majority, the answer would be that their constitutions prohibit it. But the gentleman's amendment will not remedy the situation. I respectfully suggest to him that the moneys under this formula will go to the States and the disposition is made there.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CAHILL. Will the gentleman, as a member of the committee, tell me whether it was the opinion of the committee and whether the committee intended, that these funds should be used for public and private institutions alike?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am sorry I cannot answer that specifically because I do not think that the issue was raised in that context for the reason which I am explaining; the reason being it did not become an issue in this legislation, I will say to my colleague, because the money goes to the State. There is no opportunity, as there is in the National Defense Education Act, to make specific and categorical allocations.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. POWELL. In answer to the question of our colleague from New Jersey the State and the State alone is the body that distributes these funds. In section 8, for example, on page 50, we find:

The term "vocational education" means vocational or technical training or retraining which is given in schools or classes * * * under public supervision and control or under contract with a State board or local educational agency.

It is up to the State.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me so I may ask the chairman a question?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. CAHILL. I would like to ask why on page 43 of the bill where you deal with the 5 percent and you deal with those appropriations that go for experimental, developmental or pilot programs you specifically point out nonprofit agencies, but in the rest of the bill you do not spell it out, and therefore it would seem to me exclude it.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I believe that the language which the Chairman has just read explains that very specifically. In other words, the State is at liberty under contract to make disposition of funds that the gentleman would desire. It is my considered opinion in this context that this amendment will not achieve the gentleman's purpose and should be defeated.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. CAHILL. Would it not be the gentleman's opinion that if this is the thought and this is the desire of the committee that the best way to clarify it would be to accept this amendment and therefore make it crystal clear to the States that this was the intention of the Congress?

Mr. THOMPSON. of New Jersey. I cannot agree with my distinguished colleague who is a distinguished lawyer as well because I do not think his amendment is designed in sufficient depth to achieve his purpose.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CAHILL) there were—ayes 44, noes 123.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to discuss some of the fiscal aspects of this bill. On page 12 of the committee report we have the figures to show how it increases from $45 million, on top of the basic $57 million, for the first fiscal year, to $90 million, then to $135 million, and then to $180 million, and so on.

Very frankly, I am very much concerned about any program that increases this rapidly, knowing that we have the problem of getting adequate teachers. However, I know the committee has gone into this and I am willing to accept their judgment that this can be done and leave the details to the Appropriations Committee to be certain the programs will have realistic planning.

The main fiscal aspects I want to address myself to are for the record, and also to some of my colleagues on my side of the aisle who are concerned about the budget.

I do recognize that this is beyond the President's request and the President's budget to some degree. I feel, though, that this program is going to do more in the way of removing some of these Federal expenditures that we have in the many areas where we seek to cope with unemployment than any single thing I can think of. This bill is directing our attention to the real economic problem, unemployment. We transfer a person from the unemployed side of the ledger to the employed side and we gain a taxpayer and lose a public charge. Our society gains in gross national product and the individual gains in dignity.

The primary thing I want to call attention to is that this program of vocational education conforms to the Republican position. This is the way to go at the unemployment problem. The costly proposals of the administration of area redevelopment, accelerated public works, youth opportunity, domestic peace corps, and trade adjustment do not hit at the basic problem. And I might add the biggest and most costly programs in the field of vocational education are hardly ever mentioned, the ones conducted by the Military Establishment, which are redundant to a large degree with the civilian educational programs. These administration proposals total up, exclusive of the military, to over $2 billion.

So let me assure my friends who are concerned about the budget, that if we can hold the line on these other kinds of programs which run up to around $2 billion and which do not reach in and hit at the problem of unemployment, we can well spend one-tenth the money right here and get good results, and we will be almost $2 billion closer to a balanced budget.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how many amendments are at the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. There are no amendments at the desk.

Mr. POWELL. Then, Mr. Chairman, if no Members desire to offer further amendments, I move that all debate close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, for obvious reasons the Nation's press is not able to report the partisan lineups which occur on teller votes. I observed the number of Democrats going through the "yea" line for the Bell amendment and the number of Republicans going through the "nay" line and would like to report the results of that observation for the record.

My count shows that 142 Republicans——

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that that can be done under the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may not mention the names of the Members who voted.

The point of order is overruled.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, my count shows that 142 Republicans voted against discrimination and 185 Democrats voted for discrimination.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER].

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, it is a distinct privilege to speak in support of H.R. 4955 the Vocational Education Act of 1963. My own State of Georgia has made great contributions to the Nation in this field. It was Senator Hoke Smith and Congressman Dudley Hughes, both of Georgia, who authored the Smith-Hughes Vocational Act of 1917.

The late Senator Walter George, of Georgia, was the moving figure in the George-Barden Act, some 30 years later. This firm support for vocational education is continued by my colleague, the Honorable PHIL LANDRUM, of the Ninth District of Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote briefly from a report of a commission that was concerned with the problems of equipping young people for making a living:

> There is a great and crying need of providing vocational education of this character for every part of the United States—to conserve and develop our resources; to promote a more productive and prosperous agriculture; to prevent the waste of human labor; to supplement apprenticeship; to increase the wage-earning power of our productive workers; to meet the increasing demand for trained workmen; to offset the increased cost of living.

One would think this written only yesterday. Yet, it is contained in the report of the first Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education. Its date is the year 1914. Thus it is seen that vocational education is a continuing need. The goals described in that report are more pressing today than ever—for in 1914 there was no such word as "automation", no such term as "dropout."

I need not reiterate what has been so ably stated today concerning the effects of automation and its great human impact. During the last 10 years, total employment in the United States rose by 11 percent. There was in this period a 67-percent increase in the number of professional and technical workers, a 12-percent increase in the number of craftsmen and foremen, and only a 4-percent increase in the number of laborers.

During the past 15 years the percentage of white-collar workers rose from 35 percent to 44 percent; the percentage of blue-collar workers dropped from 41 percent to 36 percent. It is unmistakenly true that the economy of America today demands—not so much strength as skill—not so much brawn as training.

My own State of Georgia presents a compelling example of this change. Whereas we were once overwhelmingly rural, Georgia's population is now almost 60 percent urban. Whereas agriculture was once the major source of personal income, today it accounts for less than 7 percent. And what has happened to Georgia has occurred throughout the United States, in varying degrees.

The categorical restrictions in the Smith-Hughes Act, valid in the days of its passage, have long since become outmoded. For instance, in my State, we are spending 70 percent of vocational funds for agriculture, a field that produces less than 7 percent of personal income.

It is obvious that a sound vocational program must provide the skills that are needed today, and will be needed tomorrow. It does little good to train cabinet makers when cabinets are made by machines. It does little good to teach agricultural skills, when those skills will not be utilized.

H.R. 4955 has been termed the most significant legislation in this field since the Landmark Act of 1917. It is significant in that it recognizes that times have changed and with them, the skills modern industry demands.

It is significant in that it removes some of the strictures of the Smith-Hughes Act and the George-Barden Act—because it broadens the definition of vocational agriculture and of home economics. This bill seeks to train for tomorrow, not for yesterday. I would commend the members of the committee for their work in fashioning this program, and in drawing legislation that is practical, realistic, and effective.

Mr. Chairman, if we are ever to solve our problems of unemployment, it will not be by increased or extended unemployment benefits, but by legislation such as the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Manpower Development and Training Act, and retraining provisions such as those of the Area Redevelopment Act and the Trade Expansion Act. If we are ever to assure equality of opportunity, then we must first provide opportunity. That will be done, not through shortsighted and unworkable expedients, but through long-term efforts such as H.R. 4955.

Our world today is far too complex for quick and easy solutions. The problem of upgrading skills will not be accomplished overnight. But with the passage of this bill, Mr. Chairman, and with diligent and careful administration by local school systems, it will be accomplished.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the committee substitute amendment.

The committee substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. BOLLING, 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. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, pursuant to House Resolution 469, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in 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 the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky rise?

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

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SNYDER. I am opposed to the bill in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, is a motion to recommit from a Member for a specific purpose in order when the gentleman offering the motion is against the bill in its entirety?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Kentucky has stated he is opposed to the bill in its present form; and, of course, the bill that is now before the House is the bill, as it is, in its present form.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SNYDER moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 4955, to the Committee on Education and Labor with directions to report it back forthwith, with the following amendment: On page 46, line 17 (SEC. 5(a)), strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof, "; and", and add the following new paragraph:

"(8) Provides that after June 30, 1965, any program assisted with funds appropriated under this Act shall be operated, and students admitted thereto, on a racially nondiscriminatory basis."

On page 60, after line 16, insert the heading "NONDISCRIMINATION" and the following new section:

"SEC. 13. (a) Section 8 of the Act of February 23, 1917 (relating to vocational education) is amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 8" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) After June 30, 1965, each State plan shall require that any vocational education program assisted with funds appropriated under this Act shall be operated, and students admitted thereto, on a racially nondiscriminatory basis.'

"(b) Section 203(a) of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 is amended by striking out 'and' at the end of clause (4), by striking out the period at the end of clause (5) and inserting in lieu thereof '; and', and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(6) after June 30, 1965, provide that any practical nurse training program assisted with funds appropriated under this title will be operated, and students admitted thereto, on a racially nondiscriminatory basis.'"

On page 60, line 18, strike out "SEC. 13" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 14".

On page 61, line 2, strike out "SEC. 14" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 15".

Mr. SNYDER (interrupting the reading of the motion to recommit). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of this motion be dispensed with, with the statement that this is the Bell amendment.

The SPEAKER. And that it be considered as read at this point in the RECORD?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 181, nays 217, answered "present" 1, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—181

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abele | Fulton, Pa. | Osmers |
| Adair | Gallagher | Ostertag |
| Alger | Gavin | Pelly |
| Anderson | Gilbert | Pillion |
| Arends | Glenn | Pirnie |
| Ashbrook | Goodell | Powell |
| Auchincloss | Goodling | Price |
| Avery | Green, Oreg. | Quie |
| Ayres | Gross | Reid, Ill. |
| Baldwin | Grover | Reid, N.Y. |
| Barry | Gubser | Reifel |
| Bates | Gurney | Reuss |
| Becker | Hall | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Beermann | Halleck | Rich |
| Bell | Halpern | Riehlman |
| Bennett, Mich. | Harrison | Robison |
| Berry | Harsha | Rodino |
| Betts | Harvey, Ind. | Rogers, Colo. |
| Bolton, Frances P. | Harvey, Mich. | Rooney, N.Y. |
| | Hoeven | Roudebush |
| Bolton, Oliver P. | Hoffman | Rumsfeld |
| | Horan | Ryan, N.Y. |
| Bow | Horton | St. George |
| Bray | Hosmer | Saylor |
| Brock | Hutchinson | Schadeberg |
| Bromwell | Jensen | Schenck |
| Broomfield | Joelson | Schneebeli |
| Brotzman | Karsten | Schweiker |
| Brown, Ohio | Kastenmeier | Schwengel |
| Bruce | Keith | Secrest |
| Burton | King, N.Y. | Senner |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Kunkel | Short |
| Cahill | Kyl | Shriver |
| Cederberg | Laird | Sibal |
| Chamberlain | Langen | Siler |
| Chenoweth | Latta | Skubitz |
| Clancy | Lindsay | Smith, Calif. |
| Clausen, Don H. | Lipscomb | Snyder |
| | Lloyd | Springer |
| Clawson, Del | McClory | Stafford |
| Cleveland | McCulloch | Stinson |
| Cohelan | McDade | Sullivan |
| Collier | McIntire | Taft |
| Conte | McLoskey | Talcott |
| Corbett | MacGregor | Teague, Calif. |
| Cunningham | Mailliard | Thomson, Wis. |
| Curtin | Martin, Calif. | Tollefson |
| Curtis | Martin, Nebr. | Tupper |
| Dague | Mathias | Utt |
| Daniels | May | Vanik |
| Derounian | Michel | Weaver |
| Devine | Milliken | Westland |
| Dole | Minish | Whalley |
| Dwyer | Moore | Wharton |
| Ellsworth | Morse | Widnall |
| Farbstein | Morton | Wilson, Bob |
| Feighan | Mosher | Wilson, Ind. |
| Findley | Nelsen | Wydler |
| Fino | Nix | Wyman |
| Ford | Norblad | Younger |
| Foreman | O'Hara, Ill. | |
| Frelinghuysen | O'Konski | |

NAYS—217

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Albert | Ashley |
| Addabbo | Andrews | Ashmore |
| Aspinall | Hagen, Calif. | Patten |
| Baker | Haley | Pepper |
| Barrett | Hanna | Perkins |
| Bass | Hansen | Philbin |
| Beckworth | Harding | Pike |
| Bennett, Fla. | Hardy | Pilcher |
| Boggs | Harris | Poage |
| Boland | Hawkins | Poff |
| Bolling | Hays | Pool |
| Bonner | Healey | Pucinski |
| Brademas | Hébert | Purcell |
| Brooks | Hechler | Quillen |
| Brown, Calif. | Hemphill | Rains |
| Broyhill, N.C. | Henderson | Randall |
| Broyhill, Va. | Herlong | Rhodes, Pa. |
| Burke | Holifield | Rivers, Alaska |
| Burkhalter | Holland | Rivers, S.C. |
| Burleson | Huddleston | Roberts, Ala. |
| Byrne, Pa. | Hull | Roberts, Tex. |
| Cameron | Ichord | Rogers, Fla. |
| Cannon | Jarman | Rogers, Tex. |
| Carey | Jennings | Rooney, Pa. |
| Casey | Johnson, Calif. | Roosevelt |
| Celler | Johnson, Wis. | Rosenthal |
| Chelf | Jonas | Rostenkowski |
| Clark | Jones, Ala. | Roush |
| Cooley | Karth | Roybal |
| Corman | Kee | Ryan, Mich. |
| Daddario | Keogh | St Germain |
| Davis, Ga. | Kilgore | St. Onge |
| Davis, Tenn. | King, Calif. | Scott |
| Dawson | Kirwan | Selden |
| Delaney | Kluczynski | Sheppard |
| Dent | Kornegay | Shipley |
| Denton | Landrum | Sickles |
| Dingell | Lankford | Sisk |
| Donohue | Leggett | Slack |
| Dorn | Lennon | Smith, Iowa |
| Dowdy | Lesinski | Smith, Va. |
| Downing | Libonati | Staebler |
| Dulski | Long, La. | Staggers |
| Duncan | Long, Md. | Steed |
| Edmondson | McDowell | Stephens |
| Edwards | McFall | Stratton |
| Elliott | McMillan | Stubblefield |
| Everett | Madden | Taylor |
| Fallon | Mahon | Teague, Tex. |
| Fascell | Marsh | Thomas |
| Finnegan | Matsunaga | Thompson, La. |
| Fisher | Matthews | Thompson, N.J. |
| Flood | Mills | Thompson, Tex. |
| Flynt | Monagan | Thornberry |
| Fogarty | Montoya | Toll |
| Forrester | Moorhead | Tuck |
| Fountain | Morgan | Tuten |
| Fraser | Morris | Udall |
| Friedel | Morrison | Ullman |
| Fulton, Tenn. | Moss | Van Deerlin |
| Garmatz | Multer | Waggonner |
| Gary | Murphy, Ill. | Watson |
| Gathings | Murphy, N.Y. | Watts |
| Giaimo | Murray | Weltner |
| Gibbons | Natcher | White |
| Gill | Nedzi | Whitener |
| Gonzalez | O'Brien, N.Y. | Wickersham |
| Grabowski | O'Hara, Mich. | Willis |
| Grant | Olsen, Mont. | Wright |
| Gray | Olson, Minn. | Young |
| Green, Pa. | O'Neill | Zablocki |
| Griffiths | Passman | |
| Hagan, Ga. | Patman | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Diggs

NOT VOTING—34

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Johansen | Shelley |
| Baring | Jones, Mo. | Sikes |
| Battin | Kelly | Trimble |
| Belcher | Kilburn | Van Pelt |
| Blatnik | Knox | Vinson |
| Buckley | Macdonald | Wallhauser |
| Colmer | Martin, Mass. | Whitten |
| Cramer | Meader | Williams |
| Derwinski | Miller, Calif. | Wilson, Charles H. |
| Evins | Miller, N.Y. | |
| Fuqua | Minshall | Winstead |
| Griffin | O'Brien, Ill. | |

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wallhauser for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Johansen for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Derwinski for, with Mr. Cramer against.

Mr. Griffin for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Trimble against.

Mr. Minshall for, with Mr. Evins against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Winstead with Mr. Knox.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Meader.

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Baring.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Vinson.

Mr. BARRETT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. POWELL. 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 378, nays 21, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—378

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Curtin | Halpern |
| Abele | Curtis | Hanna |
| Adair | Daddario | Hansen |
| Addabbo | Dague | Harding |
| Albert | Daniels | Hardy |
| Anderson | Davis, Ga. | Harris |
| Arends | Davis, Tenn. | Harrison |
| Ashley | Dawson | Harsha |
| Aspinall | Delaney | Harvey, Ind. |
| Auchincloss | Dent | Harvey, Mich. |
| Avery | Denton | Hawkins |
| Ayres | Derounian | Hays |
| Baker | Devine | Healey |
| Baldwin | Diggs | Hébert |
| Barrett | Dingell | Hechler |
| Barry | Dole | Henderson |
| Bass | Donohue | Herlong |
| Bates | Dowdy | Hoeven |
| Becker | Downing | Hoffman |
| Beckworth | Dulski | Holifield |
| Bell | Duncan | Holland |
| Bennett, Fla. | Dwyer | Horan |
| Bennett, Mich. | Edmondson | Horton |
| Berry | Edwards | Hosmer |
| Betts | Elliott | Huddleston |
| Boggs | Ellsworth | Hull |
| Boland | Everett | Hutchinson |
| Bolling | Fallon | Ichord |
| Bolton, Frances P. | Farbstein | Jarman |
| | Fascell | Jennings |
| Bolton, Oliver P. | Feighan | Jensen |
| | Findley | Joelson |
| Bonner | Finnegan | Johnson, Calif. |
| Bow | Fino | Johnson, Wis. |
| Brademas | Fisher | Jonas |
| Bray | Flood | Jones, Ala. |
| Brock | Flynt | Karsten |
| Bromwell | Fogarty | Karth |
| Brooks | Ford | Kastenmeier |
| Broomfield | Forrester | Kee |
| Brotzman | Fountain | Keith |
| Brown, Calif. | Fraser | Keogh |
| Brown, Ohio | Frelinghuysen | Kilgore |
| Broyhill, N.C. | Friedel | King, Calif. |
| Broyhill, Va. | Fulton, Pa. | King, N.Y. |
| Burke | Fulton, Tenn. | Kirwan |
| Burkhalter | Gallagher | Kluczynski |
| Burton | Garmatz | Kornegay |
| Byrne, Pa. | Gary | Kunkel |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Gathings | Kyl |
| Cahill | Gavin | Laird |
| Cameron | Giaimo | Landrum |
| Cannon | Gibbons | Langen |
| Carey | Gilbert | Lankford |
| Casey | Gill | Latta |
| Cederberg | Glenn | Leggett |
| Celler | Gonzalez | Lennon |
| Chamberlain | Goodell | Lesinski |
| Chelf | Goodling | Libonati |
| Chenoweth | Grabowski | Lindsay |
| Clancy | Grant | Lipscomb |
| Clark | Gray | Lloyd |
| Clausen, Don H. | Green, Oreg. | Long, Md. |
| | Green, Pa. | McClory |
| Clawson, Del | Griffiths | McCulloch |
| Cleveland | Gross | McDade |
| Cohelan | Grover | McDowell |
| Collier | Gubser | McFall |
| Conte | Hagan, Ga. | McIntire |
| Cooley | Hagen, Calif. | McLoskey |
| Corbett | Haley | MacGregor |
| Corman | Hall | Madden |
| Cunningham | Halleck | Mahon |
| Mailliard | Powell | Skubitz |
| Marsh | Price | Slack |
| Martin, Calif. | Pucinski | Smith, Calif. |
| Martin, Nebr. | Purcell | Smith, Iowa |
| Mathias | Quie | Smith, Va. |
| Matsunaga | Quillen | Springer |
| Matthews | Rains | Staebler |
| May | Randall | Stafford |
| Michel | Reid, Ill. | Staggers |
| Milliken | Reid, N.Y. | Steed |
| Mills | Reifel | Stephens |
| Minish | Reuss | Stinson |
| Monagan | Rhodes, Ariz. | Stratton |
| Montoya | Rhodes, Pa. | Stubblefield |
| Moore | Rich | Sullivan |
| Moorhead | Riehlman | Taft |
| Morgan | Rivers, Alaska | Talcott |
| Morris | Roberts, Ala. | Taylor |
| Morrison | Roberts, Tex. | Teague, Calif. |
| Morse | Rodino | Teague, Tex. |
| Morton | Rogers, Colo. | Thomas |
| Mosher | Rogers, Fla. | Thompson, La. |
| Moss | Rooney, N.Y. | Thompson, N.J. |
| Multer | Rooney, Pa. | Thompson, Tex. |
| Murphy, Ill. | Roosevelt | Thomson, Wis. |
| Murphy, N.Y. | Rosenthal | Thornberry |
| Murray | Rostenkowski | Toll |
| Natcher | Roudebush | Tollefson |
| Nedzi | Roush | Tuck |
| Nelsen | Roybal | Tupper |
| Nix | Rumsfeld | Tuten |
| Norblad | Ryan, Mich. | Udall |
| O'Brien, N.Y. | Ryan, N.Y. | Ullman |
| O'Hara, Ill. | St. George | Van Deerlin |
| O'Hara, Mich. | St Germain | Vanik |
| O'Konski | St. Onge | Watts |
| Olsen, Mont. | Saylor | Weaver |
| Olson, Minn. | Schadeberg | Weltner |
| O'Neill | Schenck | Westland |
| Osmers | Schneebeli | Whalley |
| Ostertag | Schweiker | Wharton |
| Passman | Schwengel | White |
| Patman | Scott | Whitener |
| Patten | Secrest | Wickersham |
| Pelly | Selden | Widnall |
| Pepper | Senner | Willis |
| Perkins | Sheppard | Wilson, Bob |
| Philbin | Shipley | Wilson, Ind. |
| Pike | Short | Wright |
| Pilcher | Shriver | Wydler |
| Pillion | Sibal | Wyman |
| Pirnie | Sickles | Young |
| Poage | Siler | Younger |
| Poff | Sisk | Zablocki |

NAYS—21

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Alger | Dorn | Rivers, S.C. |
| Andrews | Foreman | Robison |
| Ashbrook | Gurney | Rogers, Tex. |
| Ashmore | Hemphill | Snyder |
| Beermann | Long, La. | Utt |
| Bruce | McMillan | Waggonner |
| Burleson | Pool | Watson |

NOT VOTING—34

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Johansen | Shelley |
| Baring | Jones, Mo. | Sikes |
| Battin | Kelly | Trimble |
| Belcher | Kilburn | Van Pelt |
| Blatnik | Knox | Vinson |
| Buckley | Macdonald | Wallhauser |
| Colmer | Martin, Mass. | Whitten |
| Cramer | Meader | Williams |
| Derwinski | Miller, Calif. | Wilson, Charles H. |
| Evins | Miller, N.Y. | |
| Fuqua | Minshall | Winstead |
| Griffin | O'Brien, Ill. | |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Winstead with Mr. Johansen.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Meader.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Kilburn.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Knox.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Wallhauser.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Baring.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 4955.

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

There was no objection.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the program for tomorrow and the balance of the week?

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. It is planned to take up the rule on H.R. 7824, which makes in order the consideration of the debt limit bill, which we will consider on Thursday.

Mr. MORSE. Will we proceed on this tomorrow?

Mr. ALBERT. We are going to take up the rule tomorrow but we are not going to take up the bill.

## COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for that purpose, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

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

There was no objection.

## HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to direct the attention of the House to the fact that today is the 70th birthday of the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN. Mr. PATMAN has served this Congress for over 35 years. After this long period of diligent and vigorous public service he looks younger and acts with greater courage and energy than many of us who have

been here a much shorter period of time. I think it is remarkable that he has been able to give us this fine period of service. I certainly want to congratulate Mr. PATMAN on this occasion.

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

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege to rise in recognition of the dean of the Texas delegation, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN. Especially is it gratifying to me for the main and simple reason that ever since I was a student in high school, and even before then, I was very much aware of the tremendous contribution that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] had made and was in the process of making in behalf of the Government, in behalf of the recognition of the small businessman, and in behalf of the recognition of a tradition that has been rooted in American history.

Mr. PATMAN symbolizes not only to those of us who come from Texas but to the entire country the wholesome aspects of representative democracy. He has taken on some formidable opposition at times. Some of the most powerful financial and vested interests have on various and sundry occasions hurled tremendous sums of money against him in his district seeking his defeat, merely because he symbolized this constant fight on behalf of the small businessman, the plain, average citizen.

In addition, Mr. PATMAN has contributed greatly to the knowledge and understanding of the processes of American government which you and I must apply in this day and time. He is the author of a booklet that has been used extensively, particularly in Texas, by high school children, in which questions and answers relative to the fundamentals of American government have been very intelligently set forth.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by invoking the grace of the Almighty to give a long continued and fruitful life to our distinguished dean of the Texas delegation, WRIGHT PATMAN, of Patman's Switch, Tex., chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I join the distinguished gentleman from Ohio in wishing a happy birthday to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. He is one of the most courageous, one of the most industrious, one of the most effective Members of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. VANIK. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, WRIGHT PATMAN is one of the dedicated Members of the National House of Representatives. He is an inspiration to me and has been, for many years, for his dedicated service, his fine, noble and beautiful outlook on life, his courage and his outstanding ability. Even those who disagree with him, and I do not, for he and I have a common outlook on legislation and on the conduct of government, have profound respect for WRIGHT PATMAN. I am indeed fortunate, as are all others who enjoy his friendship. I congratulate WRIGHT PATMAN on his birthday anniversary and extend to him my very best wishes for countless future anniversaries.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

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

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

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for taking this time to express his appreciation for the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the dean of our delegation. I would like to add my voice to his and that of others in sending our fondest and best wishes to this distinguished American both on the occasion of his 70th birthday and also for his great contribution to the Nation.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, we are proud to congratulate our good friend, WRIGHT PATMAN, distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, on his 70th birthday. The Members of the Illinois delegation hold our genial leader from Texas in high regard and manifest great admiration for his exceptional talents in the field of finance. His study of Government monetary structures within its agencies including the finite operations of the Federal Reserve have been enlightening to the membership.

He has contributed much to our understanding in determining the fiscal problems confronting the Congress, and, as well, their solution. We are happy to join our good wishes for health, happiness, and continued success in his endeavors on this day and together with his many friends and loving family we embrace him in a firm friendship, wishing him God's blessings and a long life.

Mr. HECHLER. I would like to add my compliments to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] as he celebrates his birthday today. Everyone in the State of West Virginia is certainly grateful for the outstanding work the gentleman has done to aid the economy of our State and Nation. He is an indefatigable worker and one of the most thorough students in this body. I congratulate him and may his life be a long and happy one.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to add my wishes for a happy birthday and aloha to a most distinguished Member of Congress, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, dean of the Texas delegation and chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

Congressman PATMAN has been an acknowledged leader in Congress for many years. In fact, he was already a famous man when I was still a student in high school. His name was an oft-repeated one in connection with American politics and Federal legislation even in the remote Pacific Paradise. To meet him and to serve with him in this great body, therefore, have meant to me an honor and privilege. Even in the short time that I have been in Congress, I have benefited from his wise counseling and personal interest. As Hawaii's Representative and as a friend, I join the others in wishing Congressman PATMAN good health and happiness in the years ahead and look forward to his continued leadership in the affairs of our great Nation.

---

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks with reference to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

---

## PHILIP L. GRAHAM

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in both Houses of this Congress to express my feelings on the death of Philip L. Graham, the brilliant and forceful president of the Washington Post Co., and one of the enlightened and progressive luminaries in American journalism.

We are all saddened by the untimely passing of this great lawyer-journalist-business executive, whose dynamism not only led him to make significant contributions to intelligent and masterful newspaper publishing, bringing the Washington Post to the pinnacle among American newspapers with an international reputation, but to range beyond the daily editions into the relatively newer communications media of radio, television, and weekly news magazines.

Mr. Graham was the champion of freedom in intellectual thought, and he encouraged diversity of ideas in the editorial opinions of the communications media under his direction on international, national, and local matters. He believed intensely and passionately in causes and programs, not in political parties and party lines, and the media under his command very often were at odds with prevailing popular opinion as it editorialized and supported such causes and programs. Always fair, Mr. Graham saw to it that the opponents' objections, ideas, and reasoning were given liberal space both in the news columns and "Letters to the Editor" column on the editorial page of the Washington Post, for he genuinely and deeply believed with Voltaire that "I wholly disagree with what you have to say but will defend to the death your right to say it."

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of knowing Mr. Graham and corresponding with him on National Capital affairs, and always found his counsel to be most helpful and illuminating. His address last October 10 to the 25th anniversary dinner of the Washington Building Congress which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 11, contained the best, clearest, and most commonsense statements that I have read on the Nation's Capital since I came to Congress in 1953. This capital city of the Nation has certainly benefited from Mr. Graham's brilliance, perspective, wisdom, sage advice, and wholehearted support of just, humane, and material causes and programs.

I know I express the sentiments of my colleagues when I say that Philip Graham has left the Washington Post with a great legacy in the truest and finest sense of American free journalism, and we trust that his successors will see to it that the Washington Post will continue to remain as a guiding beacon of responsible journalism for other great dailies throughout this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the editorial on Mr. Graham from yesterday's Washington Sunday Post:

PHILIP L. GRAHAM

Philip L. Graham, president of the Washington Post Co., would have excelled in whatever field commanded his energy and ability. He chose journalism, and leaves as his legacy an independent newspaper with an international reputation, an impressive range of achievements in public service and a host of memories of a gallant figure. It is a legacy that will endure.

To his associates on this newspaper, Mr. Graham was as much a friend as an employer. There was no detail of journalism he regarded as too trifling to engage his sympathetic attention and no person beyond reach of his concern. His rangy figure and quicksilver wit were as familiar a part of our enterprise as the fonts of type in our composing room. In all that he dealt with at the Washington Post and its related ventures, he was broadly liberal, eminently practical and endowed with an intuitive grasp of coming needs.

Trained as a lawyer, Mr. Graham served as law secretary to both Mr. Justice Frankfurter and Mr. Justice Reed; he never lost his concern with law and justice—or a capacity for generous anger when either was ignored. After rising from private to major in the Army Air Force, he returned to the Capital after the war and gave his full energies to the Washington Post. The record speaks for itself.

In 1946, Mr. Graham became publisher of a newspaper then ranked third in circulation in Washington and that incurred draining deficits. In collaboration with Eugene Meyer, Mr. Graham gave a secure foundation to the Post. A new plant was built, the Times-Herald purchased, and a television and radio division, including WTOP in Washington and WJXT in Jacksonville, was formed. The partnership of Mr. Meyer and Mr. Graham transcended normal business relations and family ties; there was a fraternal affinity between two persons of complementary character whose closeness assured executive continuity when, in 1959, Mr. Meyer died.

Growth continued in recent years as the Post expanded its facilities, acquired Newsweek and Art News, and established a news service in partnership with the Los Angeles Times. The range of Mr. Graham's interest and acquaintanceship was extraordinary, and though his contribution of signed articles was infrequent, his suggestions were not. They gave depth and authority to much that appeared under the name of others. If the Post today is both prosperous and influential, a full measure of credit is owed to Philip L. Graham.

His country and city commanded much of his time. Through his father, who was an influential State senator in Florida, Mr. Graham early in life acquired an insight into the skills of politics. He could combine moral courage, wit, and tact in dealing with others, and his ability profited a bewildering diversity of causes—everything from the Advertising Council, the United Givers Fund, the Federal City Council, the Committee for Economic Development, and George Washington University to the Communications Satellite Corp.

Mr. Graham invested the full capacity of his mind and heart in anything that deeply moved and interested him. He was not a person given to qualified commitments to his country, his enterprise, or his friends. It was this quality that precipitated the illness that led to his death.

Our sense of loss is total; he was a man neither easily forgotten nor found again.

## OPERATION SWIFT STRIKE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a 2-day inspection trip of Operation Swift Strike III down in the Carolinas. When I returned home last night I was surprised and shocked to see a story in the Washington Post attributed to the Associated Press that gives what I consider to be a mistaken impression of this combined military training operation involving 100,000 men.

Mr. Speaker, I want to report to the Members of this House, as a trained observer of military operations, I think Operation Swift Strike III is not only excellently planned but has been superbly executed. Our soldiers, officers, and men participating in this realistic operation show that they are well trained, well directed, and are doing their jobs enthusiastically.

I want to remind those who would dwell upon a few accidents such as a fallen bulldozer and a couple of jeeps that came to the ground without the benefit of parachutes, that a great majority of the equipment air-dropped into this operation landed intact within the drop zones and that the fighting capabilities of our soldiers were not impaired by the small amount of accidents that occurred. It is my belief that the injury rates of the parachutists were extremely low in this very realistic military operation. I believe we have every reason to be proud of our Armed Forces as they have been displayed in this training operation in the Carolinas.

Americans should be assured that their top military and civilian leaders have been diligently examining the state of training and readiness of our Armed Forces during this arduous test. I observed Gen. Paul Adams, Commander in Chief, U.S. Strike Command, Gen. Earle Wheeler, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, and key members of their staffs, actively inspecting, examining and evaluating our personnel and equipment under realistic battlefield conditions. Our able Secretary of the Army Cyrus Vance, and key civilian personnel of the Department of the Army, were in the area vigorously carrying out their duties and responsibilities.

I feel that I should report to Congress that our Forces are ably led, adequately equipped, and sufficiently trained to give a fine accounting for themselves should the need arise. I hope that Americans, as well as our enemy, will not be misled by inadequate newspaper reporting.

## PHILIP GRAHAM, 1915–63, SHAPER OF OUR NATIONAL CHARACTER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I was stunned by the unexpected death of a close personal friend, Philip L. Graham, last weekend. His passing is not only a deep loss to all of us who loved him but also a temporary setback for the defense of a free society.

Phil was one of those few people who cared deeply about ideas and handled them with both skill and pleasure. He once said, "I am insatiably curious about the state of our world," and this attitude seemed to motivate him toward the field of communications. Phil felt deeply, I think, that democracy can fail when a government fails to explain itself thoroughly and candidly to its citizens and that success rests upon the newspapers to interpret what the government is saying.

As an influential shaper of our national character, Phil attempted continually to determine the quality of life in the society he served. He regarded his readers as free persons who need to be informed, not as objects of propaganda. We shall all miss this man, "a man neither easily forgotten nor found again."

Those who knew Phil Graham will find that the August 12 issue of Newsweek captured some of his greatness in an article which I ask leave to extend below:

PHILIP L. GRAHAM, 1915–63

A few short months ago, Philip Leslie Graham, the controlling voice and informing spirit of this magazine, spoke about himself to a group of Newsweek editors and correspondents. "I came to journalism quite by chance," he said, "from another ancient and honorable calling—that of the law. It is said—in explanation of the inner torment of that minority of very good lawyers—that the law is a jealous mistress.

"No doubt that is a true statement of what stretches good men who engage in any precariously intellectual vocation. When I think of a few serious journalists I have known, I know that the jealous demands of excellence in our calling have borne down on them heavily and deeply while also elevating and enlarging them.

"I am insatiably curious about the state of our world. I revel in the recitation of the daily and weekly grist of journalism.

"Much of it, of course, is pure chaff. But no one yet has been able to produce wheat without chaff. And not even such garrulous romantics as Fidel Castro or such transcendent spirits as Abraham Lincoln can produce a history which does not rest on a foundation of tedium and detail—and even sheer drudgery.

"So let us drudge on about our inescapably impossible task of providing every week a first rough draft of a history that will never be completed about a world we can never understand."

To the many who will hold his memory dear, this is pure "Phil." When he spoke, he had a wit which could dissolve pomposity and lighten tedium; a high seriousness which could endow the most trivial problem with dignity; a certitude that stemmed from an instinct for the highest standards; a sympathy which extended to the great and to the weak alike. He was always electric, with a kind of complex, stormy humanity that somehow led him, last Saturday afternoon, to take his life at his farm in Virginia, just a short drive from Washington, D.C., where his career in law and letters began.

Washington was Mr. Graham's city. It was there, in 1940, that he married Katharine Meyer, daughter of the late Eugene Meyer, who then owned the Washington Post. It was there they raised their four children. In the 23 years he lived in Washington, he saw it change from a national capital which was just one among many to the prime center of political, economic, and military might in the world. When he visited Newsweek's weekly editorial meetings in New York, he always conveyed a sense of high excitement about the power and responsibility that he lived with.

Mr. Graham came to Washington by way of Terry, S. Dak., where he was born; Florida where he grew up and went to high school and college, and Cambridge, Mass., where he attended Harvard Law School and became president of the Law Review. This distinction led him to serve as law secretary to both Justice Stanley Reed and Justice Felix Frankfurter. In 1946, Mr. Graham became publisher of the Washington Post. Behind him were 4 years in the Army and a Legion of Merit for his service in the Pacific.

Working with Mr. Meyer, Mr. Graham built the Post into one of the most prosperous and influential newspapers in the country. Though he had no journalistic experience before, he had a natural and extraordinary feel for news, as well as a business sense which led him to a widening series of ambitious and successful ventures. A new plant for the Post was built in 1951, the Times-Herald was purchased, a radio and television division was established, and in 1961 Newsweek was added to the organization. More recently, Mr. Graham acquired Art News and Portfolio and launched a news service with the Los Angeles Times.

But these activities consumed only a part of Mr. Graham's restless energies. Over the years he gave himself to a great variety of private and public causes. In an unofficial way he plunged deeply into the political and diplomatic life of the Nation. To list his friends in Government—not to speak of business, the professions, and the arts—would be to sound a rollcall of almost all who are distinguished in American life. Informed of his death as he cruised on the *Honey Fitz*, President Kennedy made the statement: "The death of Philip Graham is a serious loss to all who knew and admired his integrity and ability. It is a personal loss to me and all of his friends. He was a distinguished publisher, a man whose quiet and effective leadership contributed so much to this community and his Nation. He will be greatly missed by all of us."

Philip Graham will be missed by all, but there is a special poignance to the grief of those who knew him long and intimately. As the Washington Post, which was so much a part of his life, said: "Mr. Graham invested the full capacity of his mind and heart in anything that deeply moved and interested him. He was not a person given to qualified commitments to his country, his enterprise, or his friends.

"Our sense of loss is total; he was a man neither easily forgotten nor found again."

## RETIREMENT FOR CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES AFTER 30 YEARS WITHOUT REDUCTION IN ANNUITY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement that I submitted to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in support of the proposal to allow civil service employees to retire after 30 years without a reduction in annuity and without regard to age:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE ON CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AFTER 30 YEARS' SERVICE, JULY 31, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my appreciation for this opportunity to speak in support of the legislation before you to allow civil service retirement on a full annuity after 30 years of service.

For a number of years I have introduced legislation to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to allow employees to retire at any age after 30 years' service without reduction of benefits. This year I introduced H.R. 718 and H.R. 719 to this effect which are presently before this committee.

Although the bills I introduced carry no minimum age and would allow Federal employees with 30 years of service to retire at any age, I would also like to express my support for other bills before this committee to allow full annuities to 30-year employees at age 55. I would prefer to see one of my own bills enacted but I realize that they face stronger opposition from the Civil Service Commission than the age 55 bills. Since the latter bills obviously have much better prospects for approval, I am most happy to lend them my full and complete support.

These bills carry on a gradually evolved process of liberalizing the Civil Service Retirement Act to make it a more effective instrument in attracting and holding capable workers in the Federal service. When the Retirement Act was first enacted in 1920 it carried no provision for early retirement. The law was amended in 1930 to allow for optional retirement 2 years before the required age. It was later amended in 1942 to provide a reduced annuity at age 55 with an actuarial reduction of approximately 6.5 percent of the annuity for each year the employee was under 60 years of age. This actuarial reduction was itself reduced to 3 percent a year in 1948 and again to the present 1 percent a year in 1956.

The present bills, then, would carry out this process of liberalizing the law by eliminating the reduction in the annuity altogether, and bills of the type which I have introduced would in addition do away with the age 55 requirement to allow a full annuity after 30 years of service.

I do not think that this is such a tremendous change in the law. Its actuarial cost is only sixteen one-hundredths of 1 percent of payroll. Most employees who remain in service for 30 years would not exercise the option it offers to retire early, just as most do not exercise the present option. Only about 8 percent of those eligible to retire before age 60 with 30 years' service are doing so. The change made by these proposals—eliminating the 1 percent a year reduction—would not be enough of an inducement to increase this rate substantially.

At the same time, the proposals would improve the retirement system considerably for those who have good reasons to retire before age 65. The majority of those who retire after 30 years' service before age 60 do so for reasons of ill health or inability to keep pace with their duties. It is an unfair penalty to reduce the retirement benefits of these workers as the present law requires.

Moreover, I feel that the cost argument against these bills has been overemphasized. It is true that the cost to the retirement system will be increased slightly. But it is also true that the Government will benefit from many of these early retirements in a number of ways. They will allow the Government to replace older, in some cases partially disabled, workers with younger, more vigorous workers. These younger workers will in almost all cases be paid less than their predecessors for performing the same duties. And even in the case of those older workers who retire to take another job, the Government is going to realize some return of its funds in the form of income tax that they will pay on their combined salaries and retirement benefits.

I believe that these amendments for full annuities after 30 years of service—with or without the age 55 requirement—would improve the Civil Service Retirement Act considerably at very little cost. They would improve the situation of those choosing to retire before age 60 and they would benefit the Government, first, by making it possible to replace workers who are partially disabled or who have slowed down in their work, and secondly, by liberalizing the retirement system so that it would become a more effective instrument for recruiting capable people into the Federal service.

## CRISIS FOR COTTON

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I explained briefly the crisis facing our entire cotton industry and why if we fail to enact the Cooley bill, H.R. 6196, the virtual destruction of the industry will jeopardize many other parts of our agriculture and industry. I presented telegrams in strong support of the Cooley bill from the director of the California Department of Agriculture and from the general manager of the firm marketing one-third of the cotton grown in California. Labor and consumers have an equal stake in stabilizing the cotton industry.

That organized labor recognizes this is shown by the following telegram I have just received from Mr. William R.

O'Rear, secretary of the Central Labor Council of Fresno and Madera Counties, Calif.:

FRESNO, CALIF.

Hon. B. F. SISK:

Central Labor Council of Fresno and Madera Counties AFL-CIO went on record August 2 urging you to support H.R. 6196, the Cooley cotton bill. The cotton industry under present legislation would reduce acreage which will cause additional unemployment. The Cooley bill provides price protection for small growers but simultaneously larger growers would take a price cut under increased acreage. The cut plus the equalization fee provided in the bill would cause fair competition and increase consumption. The council believes that all of California would benefit by passage of H.R. 6196.

W. R. O'REAR,
*Secretary, Central Labor Council of Fresno and Madera Counties.*

## OLDER AMERICANS ACT OF 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced my bill to be known as the Older Americans Act of 1963. Its stated purpose is:

To provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the Administration of Aging.

With the introduction of this bill, I must express my deep concern that action has been so long delayed in an area so vital to the social and economic status of the Nation's 18 million persons over age 65. It is my honest conviction that few issues have come before the Congress that have such a great potential, not only for the individuals affected by the legislation but also for the Nation that can only benefit from the untapped manpower reserve that is represented among the ranks of our older citizens.

The Older Americans Act has six major titles, each of which is designed to implement the findings of almost 3,000 delegates who participated in the White House Conference on Aging in January 1961. In addition, this bill represents the considered judgment of informed leaders in the field of aging throughout the country.

I cannot recall introducing a bill that so nearly represents a mandate of the people. Associations of retired persons, community leaders, labor organizations, national voluntary agencies, State representatives, and private citizens have all documented the need for such a program and indicated their support and wholehearted cooperation in assisting in its implementation.

I shall not attempt to inventory the action that has been so desperately needed to meet our responsibility as a nation to its older citizens. I say again as I did when I introduced a bill 2 years ago recommending a Commission on Aging, "I marvel at the patience and loyalty of a group of persons so long neglected or ignored."

I do not have to remind the Members of this House that unless deserving citizens receive fair and equitable treatment through established channels of legislation and communication they are forced to submit to the pressures of leaders who frequently exploit them as a group for personal or political purposes.

My bill will make financial assistance and support available for, first, community planning; second, research and development projects; and, third, training projects.

In each of these areas the funds will assist in strengthening and expanding programs at the State and local levels, primarily where these older persons are living and where the greatest good can be accomplished with the least cost to the taxpayer.

I am mindful that there are those who would prefer to see a bill defeated rather than lose control of a program they presently administer. This must not happen to the Older Americans Act. Its importance transcends petty personal interests or motives and deals directly with an issue that each one of us must face squarely and honestly.

Time is very much of the essence, and to enact such legislation during this session of Congress will require a concerted effort of all who believe in the dignity and independence of their fellow man.

I ask your support of this legislation that will overcome the status of the older American as a second-class citizen and will elevate him to his rightful place as citizen first class.

## WETBACK LABOR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last week, I was astounded to hear that some kinds of work are "cruel, undesirable, un-American." I was even more amazed to hear that any kind of migrant—even a Congressman or baseball player—should be relieved of the necessity of constant travel and hard work.

These words are hard to take for me. I always understood that Americans take pride in work, even glorify it. But be that as it may, I think that we ought to take a serious look at words which proclaim that certain kinds of work are too low for Americans to perform. This is a warning sounded by John Steinbeck, the Nobel Prize winner, when he wrote in "Travels With Charlie":

I've seen many migrant crop-picking people about the country: Hindus, Filipinos, Mexicans, Okies away from their States. * * * It occurs to me that, just as the Carthagenians hired mercenaries to do their fighting for them, we Americans bring in mercenaries to do our hard and humble work. I hope we may not be overwhelmed one day by people not too proud or too lazy or too soft to bend to the earth and pick up the things we eat.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is a country which has a strong feeling against mercenaries. Let us not extend Public Law 78; we do not need mercenaries in this country.

## AUTOMATION WILL ELIMINATE DOMESTIC JOBS—THE BRACERO HELPS OUR DOMESTICS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, if the bracero program, providing for importation of supplemental labor to harvest crops when no domestic labor is available, is not extended, there will be many dire consequences in unexpected areas.

Farmers will be forced to accelerate mechanization and automation. Already great advances in mechanization of the agricultural harvesting and processing procedures have reduced the need for many braceros. The husbandry, harvesting, and processing of sugarbeets—a short time ago mostly manual—is now mostly mechanized—displacing many low- and high-skilled farmworkers—foreign and domestic. Some success has been achieved in the mechanization of picking tomatoes—which once seemed impossible.

Strawberries, one of the most difficult of the row crops to harvest mechanically, may move to Mexico where the land, labor, and water is less expensive. Of course, the jobs in the strawberry and allied businesses, as well as the profits, will go to Mexico also. We need these jobs and profits in America.

Mechanization will eliminate jobs of our domestic, as well as the bracero labor force. This will be enormously unfortunate for these people. They will have no alternative but public relief. They, of course, would not prefer this; but the alternative would be inevitable.

A skilled technician—such as in a factory or railroad—whose job is eliminated by mechanization or automation can always find employment in an industry requiring lower skills. But agricultural field jobs are near the lowest in skill requirements. When these jobs are automated, the unskilled worker has no place to go.

What happened in the coal fields will certainly follow in the vegetable fields. It would seem less expensive, more wholesome, and more satisfying for the individual to work than to accept relief.

I implore those Members of Congress who feel they must vote against an extension of the bracero program—regardless of the devastation to the agricultural industry—to devote some energy and thought to ways and means for assisting

our displaced domestic fieldworkers to obtain employment after their present jobs have been automated.

---

## THE 17TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CROSSROADS IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on May 5 this year I had the interesting experience of attending the 17th anniversary meeting of the international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast held at the Washington, D.C., YMCA. This will be of special interest to a large number of our colleagues in the Congress who have, from time to time, addressed the breakfast sessions; and I know their colleagues will be pleased to know about this as well.

There was present on this occasion a number of important persons including Warren I. Cikins of the White House staff who brought greetings from the President and the Honorable Brooks Hays who in the past has given this group one of his excellent messages that dealt the moral values.

A significant point of this event is that it was the 887th consecutive Sunday morning breakfast, held over the past 17 years, for the primary purpose of extending hospitality and fostering better understanding of the United States among the many visitors who come from all parts of the world to our Capital City while we learn about them.

During this period 14,800 visitors from 121 countries—or geographical areas—of every religious belief have met with us and others at the crossroads breakfast, there to be welcomed and given the opportunity to extend their hand of fellowship. The proportion of travelers from abroad has increased from year to year until they currently number about one-half of all those who weekly break bread together at the crossroads. The average attendance is about 50 to 60, with an opportunity to meet the potential leaders of the oncoming generation, followed by a talk by one of the most intelligent and capable speakers obtainable, people from all walks of life and all nationalities, from Congress, education, Government, industry, and from religious leaders. This makes a most interesting array of speakers from which those in attendance learn and benefit.

The leader of this wonderful project to promote better international understanding is Mr. Paul Brindle who has a fine record of giving of his talent to his fellow man. In the past 17 years he has been the leader and moving force behind this wonderful idea which has done so much to bring to the people who attend the crossroads breakfast from all over the world a better understanding of the American heart and mind. This program demonstrates beyond question that the real strength of America stems from the spiritual values that are spoken of, brilliantly displayed, and wonderfully explained by the large and varied cross-section of talented and experienced speakers that Mr. Brindle brings to the rostrum each Sunday morning.

Paul Brindle would be the first, I am sure, to admit that this important project could not be carried on without the active support and help received from others who are associated with him in this endeavor. They include Mr. H. B. Niece who is retired and formerly in the advertising business. He is a devoted and dedicated Christian gentleman. Then there is Mr. I. B. Potter who assumes the responsibility of recording the names of all of the new visitors and then he issues the life membership cards which have been extended now to over 15,000 people who have come there from all over the world. Mr. Charles Funkhouser who is a patent attorney serves as a receptionist. He does much to make the visitors welcome and to add substantially to the program in other ways. On occasions he is asked to offer prayer which he does in a most appropriate manner. Mrs. Florence Wise helps so much with the detail work such as typing and preparing the announcements, flyers, et cetera. Other people who help materially whenever called upon are Messrs. Lawrence Freude, Robert Gleason, Thomas DeClaire, Harry Puffer, Leroy Maas, Samuel Young, and Elmer Peterson. There are many others who have made significent contributions through the years.

A little-known but very important feature of this unusual program is its development of wholesome international friendships. This friendship is so evident in the correspondence received from the visitors after they have returned to their homes. This interesting mail is received by Paul Brindle. We in the Congress should be very interested in these messages about their reaction to their U.S. visit because this, I believe, is a kind of foreign aid which is very effective and does not cost the taxpayers anything.

On this special occasion, many of the letters and their heartwarming messages were read or reviewed by W. L. Robinson, an official of the American Automobile Association, who has a great interest in this project.

Because the letters indicate an ever-strengthening bond of friendship on a high level that is a formidable force for peace, understanding, and cooperation, I am making excerpts of them available to my colleagues and others in the hope that they will inspire others to cooperate and otherwise to encourage this type of voluntary foreign aid.

When we realize that every facet of this crossroads activity springs from the voluntary, spontaneous effort of outgoing good will, not only by all of those who support and participate in the breakfast but from those who in 71 countries were so appreciative as to write for the anniversary, then we begin to see the widening circle of benefits. This should be and I believe is a source of satisfaction for all of those who have assisted in any way with this unique service.

A very brief summary of the messages that have been sent follows:

V. R. Katre, of the Associated Cement Cos. in India, writes:

"It is a wonderful experience to meet people from various countries, not individually, but in a close-knit gathering. I had this experience when I was visiting Washington, D.C., in November 1961. International crossroads Sunday breakfast meetings are unique and the informal and friendly way people meet, is praiseworthy. Every Sunday morning I am reminded of the occasion I had to participate in one of these meetings, and think of the people from many countries whom I met. I wish the organizers all success and greet the brothers who would be present on the occasion of the 17th anniversary."

Rev. J. K. W. Mathieson, superintendent of Methodist Child Care in Victoria, Australia, reports:

"It is most encouraging to know that over against the many international tensions, the crossroads Sunday morning breakfast provides one longstanding and valuable witness and influence in the cause of international good will, mutual understanding, and peace."

Hans-Joachim Kohler, a student from Germany, and native of East Germany, writes:

"I am sorry that I could take part in your international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast only once, but nevertheless I will remember the happy hours with you whenever I think of my trip to Washington.

"For the school year 1962–63 I was the guest of a Jewish fraternity at Union College, Schenectady, N.Y. I have been very much impressed by the cordiality with which I, as a young German, have been received by my hosts and with their fairness in the many discussions about the last 30 years of German history. At the end of such discussions we always agreed that personal contacts are one of the best means to promote peace. Hostility and war are possible only if people think of each other not as human beings with the same hopes, feelings and problems, but in terms of abstract and distorted images (the American, the Jew, the German, etc.).

"For 17 years the international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast has been trying—and I think with great success—to promote just this personal friendship among people from many different countries, which we need so badly in our time. Therefore I wish wholeheartedly good luck to all of you. I am convinced that the international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast will continue its work as successfully as before, and I hope that still many more people from all over the world will make use of this unique opportunity for mutual understanding."

B. K. Shivalingappa, research engineer in India, writes:

"Time moves fast and years are passing rather quickly. However, on an occasion like this, it is just the time to recapitulate our deeds and actions and sort out those that were done for the betterment of the people in various fields, namely, physical, economical, mental, moral, social, and spiritual. If the selection so made is not appreciable it is high time that we should make up our mind to devote some portion of our precious time to the cause of humanity. Because time once spent cannot be relived or purchased. The span of our life is very limited. Before it is too late, let us make a strong decision to devote a part of our activities so as to benefit the people of the world irrespective of geographical boundaries, politicial divisions, caste, creed, color, or race.

"It is gratifying to note that the above purpose is served to a great extent in the coming anniversary on May 5, 1963. It is a proud privilege to take part in such a happy and memorable occasion with an august gathering. How I wish to be amongst them.

Though I am unable to attend the function physically, I am sure that I will grace the occasion with my mind and spirit.

"I conclude with a quotation from Mr. C. Jinarajadasa: 'The child is born with a purpose, which is to do a work in life. But it is first necessary to arouse in the child an enthusiasm for the work he is to do. And the best way for arousing that enthusiasm is to make the child's homelife and his school life as full of happiness as possible, so as to remind him of the heaven whence he has come to us. Surround the child with conditions of love, beauty and happiness and then the soul of the child will begin to cooperate with parent and teacher.' "

Atelio Romero, a pharmaceutical chemist of Venezuela, writes:

"One of the nicest experiences during my travels in the United States was my attendance to the international crossroads, sharing Sunday morning breakfast in a fraternal atmosphere among people of different nationalities.

"I congratulate you on being so active and enthusiastic in the various altruistic purposes of human solidarity and I am happy to participate in the 17th anniversary spiritually by means of this letter."

Dr. M. Camitan Magboo, physician and surgeon of Manila, writes:

"It seems to be only yesterday when I was honored to be among those seated around the breakfast table in 1955, and in that short period was a veritable source of perennial inspiration to me in all the actuations that I have been doing to date. As a member of the national board, YMCA of the Philippines, as past intercontinental vice president, International Association of Y's Men's Clubs, as medical director of a local hospital, and as a plain citizen, it has been my guidance in all the activities with which I have been associated, either in conferences or forums. Your diversified program and the international aspect of your subjects by different nationalities tend to a unity obviously manifested by all those that have the experience to have been in fellowship at your breakfast table. One cannot help but be broadminded, understanding of other people's problems and be a citizen of the world, after such an experience."

John R. Mackay, newspaperman of Perth (city of lights), who made a world tour at the time of the Y's Men's Club convention in 1962, writes:

"The most important international breakfast that I ever had was at the Washington YMCA on August 19. May I say that I was proud to be a representative of Australia on that day and hear the Honorable JOHN BRADEMAS speak. To have attended and experienced the fellowship and spirit was a warming thrill. I often think of you, Paul, and the work that you and others are doing for world understanding. While we are separated halfway around the world, I shall devote the hour corresponding to your 17th anniversary session to thinking of all of you around the table."

Claude Archieri and son, Michel, of French Guiana, writes:

"At the occasion of the 17th anniversary we want to assure you that the association reached fully its purpose as far as we are concerned, for beside the numerous interesting people we met there, it gave us the opportunity to be introduced to a part of the American society we couldn't have reached as unacquainted visitors."

J. Rooney, general secretary, YMCA, Durban, South Africa, writes:

"I should like to send my heartiest congratulations to yourself and all who assist you in this tremendous and important job of international good fellowship. To these of us who read a wide variety of papers from near and far, there can be no doubt that what the world needs is not critics but examples. Too many people in all ranks and walks of life are too ready to condemn and criticize policies and ways of life that are strange to them. The more we know about our neighbors overseas, the more we are ready to sympathize and help in a constructive manner.

"Each country has its own particular problems and all the factors involved must be known and understood. People and nations must be accepted as they are and not as they should be. This does not necessarily make us blind or condone their errors but, generally speaking, we accept our friends with their vices as well as their virtues and it is only when we have them as our friends that we can hope to influence them for better—so it is with nations.

"God willing, we will draw them all closer together by positive leadership and example. The international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast is one small step in the right direction. Would that there were more places with similar programs."

C. S. Rao, of Bangalore, India, reports:

"It is very gratifying to note that you have successfully steered these meetings over this long period, providing opportunities for such of those pilgrims who come to your great city of Washington, who come in contact with you. You are rendering a great service to humanity by helping to bring these unofficial ambassadors of different nations together, under one roof, for some time. The benefits that these meetings at the international crossroads bring about cannot be measured by any known standards of measurements. The harvest such human contacts yield is rich as it is at such places, freemen can meet, discuss and get to know one another. There can be no greater pleasure for one who thinks in the larger interests of humanity than to meet people from all corners of the globe.

"I cannot forget the wonderful experience I felt when I heard Mr. Julius N. Cahn address one of the meetings which I had the good fortune to attend in the last week of September. His philosophy of 'Live a full life cheerfully in the present, without brooding over the past and thinking too much of the future,' is a dictum which all of us should strive to practice today in the strife-torn world, as this attitude of the individual in society will help to shape the destiny of nations and the world."

Heinz Wieland, a dairy farmer in Germany, and a former exchange student in 1956, quotes from Rudyard Kipling's "Ballad of East and West":

"Oh, east is east and west is west, and never the twain shall meet,
Till earth and sky stand presently at God's great judgment seat.
But there is neither east nor west border (Berlin) nor breed nor birth (Jew or Gentile),
When two strong (in faith) men stand face to face,
Though they come from the ends of the earth (to the crossroads table)."

H. L. D. Selvaratnam, of the Central Bank of Ceylon, and former speaker when he was here, writes that he has had a miraculous recovery from a serious accident and quotes a verse from Isaiah:

"They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings of eagles; they shall run and not be weary and they shall walk and not faint."

George Peters, a retired professor of engineering, of Cuxhaven, Germany, has completed a trip around the world, visiting a great many YMCA's:

"I felt quite at home among friendly people, especially in the United States. I like America and I hope to visit this wonderful country again. I send my heartiest congratulations to the 17th anniversary with cordial greetings."

Santokh Singh, aviation adviser, India, who addressed the breakfast when he was here, writes:

"I may assure you that in spite of so many years having passed, I distinctly remember that pleasant time I had in the States generally, and for a few days that I stayed at YMCA in particular. I wish the ICSMB and you as its soul, to prosper forever."

John Swain, an engineer, writes from Australia:

"In writing of international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast I am deeply conscious of the numerous inspired compliments which the organization has already received from its fraternity now scattered far and wide. Since meeting at the crossroads, perhaps seeking an ideal, they have journeyed on stronger in friendship and the exchange of knowledge.

"An ancient proverb says, 'When thou seest an eagle, thou seest a portion of genius; lift up thy head.'

"Surely the inaugurators of international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast, under the wing of the American eagle, assumed some of this genius in creating a common ground of understanding for the people of the world, at a time when the world greatly needs it, in a country which so admirably has the capacity to provide it."

V. O. de Alwis Gunawardane, manager, book publishing department, Associated Newspapers of Ceylon, who toured publishing businesses in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Western Europe, writes:

"I always think of the YMCA of Washington and you as one living unit inseparable, one the embodiment of the other. And to me this has become a symbol of the goodness, the generosity and the helpfulness I always received from the people of the United States of America in March and April of 1961.

"I remember that 1961—April—breakfast vividly: a gathering of the inquiring minds of many nations, the masterly digest of the essence of the American Constitution by a Congressman, the lively, dignified discussion that followed, and my own observation of the British rule of law that obtains here, as being the counterpart of the checks and balances of your Constitution.

"On May 5, between 9 p.m. and 10:30 p.m. (corresponding to the hour of the anniversary celebration), I will take up for reading a clipping I have of General MacArthur's speech to Congress upon his recall from Japan. He acted as God gave him the light to act, and my prayer is that the crossroads breakfast will ever be the helpful traffic lights to the precious stream of travelers from the four corners of the earth."

Eric Freeborn, photographer-journalist, Orpington, England, writes:

"When I attended the crossroads breakfast in September 1960, I was thrilled at the idea of men from so many widely differing nationalities and cultures having that simple meal and words of wisdom from the guest speaker, in an atmosphere of peace and happiness. I think this atmosphere was the result of two driving forces; the first was your own driving force in arranging the regular series of meetings, and in maintaining written contact with the many members; the second force was the search for knowledge (and with knowledge comes truth) which appeared to be the common denominator among that assembly.

"When I left that 1960 breakfast I assumed I would hear no more of it; and even when I received a printed progress report the following year, I still took it to be no more than an automatic followup circular; but the regular flow of personal letters which arrived, and still arrive, has shown me that my chance attendance at a breakfast in Washington nearly 3 years ago, had forged a link which was to prove more lasting, and more personal than I had anticipated.

"How has this affected my feelings and actions?

"1. I assume that the object of the international crossroads breakfasts is to promote international friendship, and through that, peace.

"2. Although Paul Brindle may be a powerful and admirable driving force behind this movement, I and other members, must not leave all the driving to him.

"3. I endeavor to take every opportunity to advance the ideals of friendship and peace, regardless of national or political barriers—in other words, I accept a share in the driving.

"4. To this end I suggest that an interchange of names and addresses at the breakfasts, with the intention of promoting a flow of friendly correspondence, criss-crossing the globe, may be a useful extension of the activities reports."

Kenneth T. C. Chang, director, Taiwan Weather Bureau, writes:

"The international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast has and is making a great contribution to the promotion of world peace and the exchange of mutual understandings from the people of different nationalities. Such an organization is really in a position of prominent importance to the world and is very worthwhile to have an expansion of such activities to those friendly countries to the United States. At present, the religious activities are very popular in China and you will meet those missionaries everywhere. So far the work of international crossroads has yet not been taken up by anyone here. I strongly believe the contribution of international crossroads should be a world success and must be carried out in a worldwide scale. May I ask you to convey the sincerities of the people of China to the anniversary for their glorious success in the past and in the future."

Herbert De Four, a public health educator, of Trinidad, writes:

"I cannot now recall the name of the world figure who addressed the breakfast meeting in my time. Indeed, it would be dishonest of me to say that I remember the theme of his talk. What I remember clearly then, now, and perhaps as long as I live were thoughts that came to me during and after the meeting. I honestly felt that as long as there were men like you and others dedicated to bringing about world peace through fostering friendships and understanding among men of all races, there was reason to have faith in the future, for it meant that God was still in the hearts of man.

"I felt secure in the thought, too, that world leadership was in American hands. A nation that is guided by men, guided by God, must ultimately win the day.

"I feel certain that the thinking, and therefore the action, of every visitor to America who has had the privilege to attend an international crossroads breakfast meeting, would be influenced by its message."

Capt. C. K. Ullah, of Pakistan Army, writes:

"I very sincerely hope and pray that your organization may succeed in creating good will and better understanding among the people of various nations; also may rise above their racial, religious, and social prejudices, thus contributing to the well-being of all mankind."

Dr. S. V. Desai, of Malad, India, writes:

"My humble contribution of good wishes is after a lapse of 17 years of our meeting. This gives my a burning sense of duty to contribute my mite in creating goodwill which should cover all the world; with increasing rapidity of communications the world has shrunk, and the goodwill to bind mankind together is the duty of everyone and of all the races of the people.

"The crossroads has generated a feeling of fellowship knowing no racial or religious discrimination, and is voicing the sentiment of world brotherhood which is commendable. I wish its activities to widen the sphere of its influence."

Frank Gsell, teacher of agriculture in Germany, reports:

"I like to remember the year 1950, when I was favored to travel in the United States, and there I became the friend of land and people.

"Interesting were the Sundays in the YMCA, the international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast. Such an institution I am missing in Germany."

Matthew Francis Connor, of Ottawa, Canada, writes:

"In the presence of the world's highest, from Embassy, Government, and high authority of so many nations of the world, what a moving spirit of unity prevailed. Surely God's spirit was present, to inspire and strengthen, and to make known to many present that there was a Saviour for a needy world. I recall quite definitely the joyous (nothing less) spirit that prevailed in the meeting."

Jose Raymundo de Andrade Ramos, chief of section of geology of the Brazilian Government, reports:

"Let me refer to the words of Jimmy Williams, old American geologist, who died a few years ago. He used to repeat to me, when I was in the United States: 'Joe, remember, America has a heart.' To a normal Brazilian, which he used to place in the middle, between the known Spanish hotness and the traditional Anglo-Saxon coldness, these words mean that we have a heart, very similar to each other. Those Sunday breakfasts I attended are a proof of Jimmy Williams' words."

Akira I. Ohsawa, supervisor of Tokyo Metropolitan Board of Education, writes as follows:

"Men meet and part at a crossroad. Gladness of a crossroad is that men meet and have conversations. Sadness of a crossroad is that they part from each other as strangers unknown. The greatest sadness of a crossroad is that they cease to remember the gladness of a crossroad.

"International crossroads breakfast is the spot or crossroad where we met the people and parted from them as unforgettable friends. It is a symbol of the gladness of a crossroad. I never can forget it. I never do cease to remember it. It still teaches us 'smile and talk to each other.' Thank you."

Dr. Pedro M. Reyes, Jr., surgeon, Quezon City, Philippines, writes:

"The worthwhile contribution of the international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast to the promotion of good will and brotherhood among men is inestimable. As a lonely tourist passing through Washington, D.C., in the fall of 1950, I felt the warmth of companionship in the company of those also attending that Sunday breakfast. I trust that in the near future, I shall be privileged to attend once more another such session of cultural brotherhood. Again, best wishes for continued success."

Dr. Tatsuo Wakabayashi, dean, Department of Social Work, Meiji Gakuin University, Tokyo, reports:

"Meiji Gakuin University is an educational institution which has been a bridge of Christian faith and good will between your country and mine for more than 85 years. I have been the dean of the graduate school of social work which was organized on the top of the undergraduate department of social work and sociology 3 years ago.

"In 1957 I went to Hong Kong, India, and Pakistan. A United Nations seminar on training for community development and social work was held in Lahore, west Pakistan. The following year I was the chairman of the program committee of the Ninth International Congress of Schools of Social Work held in Tokyo. In 1961 I had an oportunity of going to Europe, attending several international social work conferences held in Rome and visiting social work schools in 15 West European cities.

"I often think of the international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast meeting I attended while I stayed at your YMCA. The other day I talked with Dr. Yamada about that meeting. Dr. Yamada is a professor of the Tokyo Medical and Dental School, and also had attended the meeting in 1956. We both miss it very much. God bless you and your valuable work."

S. Rangarajan, lecturer in chemical engineering, Annamalai University, India, writes:

"The first person to greet me when I came to Washington, D.C., as a trainee on the ICA program was Mr. Paul L. Brindle, at the YMCA buildings. The international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast meeting gives an opportunity for all to acquaint with each other, and the friendship is bonded permanent. I send my hearty congratulations to all the member guests who are to attend the 17th anniversary of the association. I pray God for the continued glory of the association."

Prof. M. Ramaswamy, professor of constitutional law, University of Delhi, writes:

"I recall with great pleasure the occasion when I was present at the international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast on January 22, 1956. The atmosphere of friendliness, good fellowship, and cordiality noticeable on that occasion was most impressive."

Gerhard Geipel, of Vienna, writes:

"I am very happy that I had the opportunity to attend one of your Sunday morning breakfast meetings. It is an excellent idea to further understanding and respect between people from different walks of life and other nations. It gives them a chance to have an active part in exchanging ideas and views in a relaxed atmosphere and to meet interesting people.

"Only through knowledge, better mutual understanding and respect for each other can we hope to make this world a better place in which to live. I couldn't think of a nicer way to spend a Sunday morning."

Shyam Sundar Misra, Servants of India Society, Cuttack, writes:

"I had the privilege of attending these breakfasts when I was a visitor to your country in 1950. It was a wonderful experience, this free mixing of persons belonging to different parts of the globe. We mixed and discussed world problems as absolute friends. It is my firm conviction that nothing is more conducive to establishing peace and amity in the world than this free mixing of members of all nations on an absolutely equal footing. We want peace everywhere in the world so that we may march toward prosperity."

Setsuzo Tsuji, professor of engineering, Kyushu University, who was a visiting research scholar at the University of Michigan in 1962, writes:

"While I attended only one breakfast of the international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast, it has been one of the most delightful remembrances for me. When I attended the international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast last year I could find the invisible but splendid road which is constructed for the security of minds and the warming of friendship of peoples of the whole world."

Woo, Wen-Wai, of the Hong Kong YMCA, writes:

"May I send greetings and hearty congratulations from Hong Kong and with sincere hope that 'crossroads' will continue to carry on its meaningful service to others in the days ahead. I shall be thinking and praying for you all on the 5th."

Raul Gonzales, founder of the Forest School of Pucon, Chile, writes:

"It was my pleasure to be a member of the 'crossroads' on December 11, 1960, when

William J. Handley, of the U.S. Information Agency, spoke on 'Our Overseas Libraries.' I remember that I was seated at the table between a Korean and an American student. I had an opportunity to explain to the group the purpose of my trip—the organization of our forestry school, which has since grown to 45 boys, and various school buildings on 200 acres of land. I wish to express my deepest feeling about the 'crossroads' and how this marvelous example has helped us in our people-to-people project."

Gert von Riesenfelder of Vienna, who made a study of New York Stock Exchange in 1962, writes:

"In a country like Austria, where in the past few years, historical changes have taken place, a vicinity close to the Iron Curtain, the understanding of people of different idealogies became a must of vital necessity. The 'crossroads' idea shows how the must, as in Austria, becomes a willingness and constant changing appreciation of each one of the other people. Meetings of like-minded travelers can help more in the maturing process of understanding than many high-level meetings."

C. S. Parthasarathy, Assistant Chief (Irrigation), Planning Commission, New Delhi, writes:

"It is my firm belief that it is exchange of messages like this, that brings more closely the members of the 'international crossroads' from different parts of the world, and keeps the stars of universal brotherhood, cooperation and understanding, as also of peace, freedom and hope in the world, twinkling forever and forever. It would also have served its purpose if it helps to make its humble contribution to stimulate inspiration and spontaneous response from many others who have had the good fortune to visit the 'crossroads.'

"The memories of many friendships and contacts I picked up while in the United States of America in 1956–57 are green as ever. I continue to be engaged on the fascinating and exciting task of planning and designing the vast water resources development projects in our country. The knowledge and experience I gained during my visit to the United States of America and the 'international crossroads' stand me in good stead and occasions are not infrequent when that knowledge and experience take a practical shape in the discharge of my duties and responsibilities—professional as well as otherwise.

"Nothing would have given me greater joy and happiness now than to have been able to be physically present there in your midst to participate in the forthcoming anniversary celebrations, but, as you know, circumstances would not permit me me to do so. However, my heart will be there then. This letter goes to you with an ardent longing that the objectives of the 'international crossroads' would appeal more and more to those who visit it from all over the world, thus contributing to its flourishing growth and advancement. May I prayerfully wish the 17th anniversary celebrations all the best, as also the 'international crossroads' an ever-increasing measure of success in its wonderful mission and universal service."

Masahi Mori, an attorney, of Urawa-shi, Japan, writes:

"One of the most important things that I learned through my stay in the United States is that we, the people coming from various countries of the world, had the chance of talking with each other and could gain deeper mutual understanding. This mutual understanding, I believe, is the basis for friendly and peaceful existence of all the nations of the world. I pray that international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast may continue to discuss various matters that are interesting and thus establish warm friendship."

Kyros L. Savvides, a soil conservationist of Cyprus, writes:

"With the occasion of the 17th anniversary my thoughts are with you and I send you, my brethren, greetings from Cyprus, the small Mediterranean island where Aphrodite, the goddess of beauty, was born, and later on Apostole Vamaras taught the Christian religion.

"The international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast promotes the better understanding among nations, as at our meeting today, and so the principles of Christianity for peace, love, and mutual help are established in the interest and well-being of all human beings, so I wish you every success."

A. V. Phadke, senior geologist in the Indian Atomic Energy Commission, writes:

"On the occasion of the 17th anniversary, coming off on the 5th of May, I would like to say that I feel we can all be really proud of the part the 'crossroads' is playing in the life of the community as a whole, and I wish it all success in the years to come."

Terence Morahan, a student of economics at Queen's University, Belfast, writes:

"It was the 23d of September 1962 when I attended your Sunday morning breakfast for the first and also only time. The excellent and inspiring talk by Dr. Leon Dostert on Europe I will not quickly forget.

"My holiday in America was continually enriched by experiences similar to your 'international crossroads' meetings. Americans still display a vitality and vigor, an enthusiasm which we in Europe seem to have lost. Your meetings are typical of the hospitality that Americans proffer to visitors, a hospitality that turns visitors into friends and firm allies of America."

Hsueh Si Yeh, civil engineer, of Taipei, writes:

"It was on July 8, 1962 that I attended the breakfast table and heard Dr. J. Southeland Frame, professor of mathematics of Michigan State, but I will never forget the impression that people made upon me. I believe it is an effective means of giving an individual an opportunity to share his own faith and experience. Moreover, it is significant in spreading the idea of world freedom through mutual understanding and cooperation of people meeting at the 'crossroads.' The word 'crossroads', in Chinese, has another meaning of 'wondering whichever way to go.' Only following the rule of love and appreciation, people can help each other to choose the right way which they can accept. I rejoice that in this work, all of us may have a part."

Miss Edith Pezoa Reyes, of Santiago, Chile, writes:

"I can still remember with emotion the friendly welcome you gave a group of Chileans on a not far away Sunday at the end of last September. Your kindness and warmth made an impression which we will not forget. We extend our warmest and sincere congratulations."

Eric Nedergaard, of Denmark, writes:

"Thank you very much for your kind letter of April 11 and for activity reports, and so forth.

"It is always a pleasure to me when I get news from United States of America and especially the 'Crossroads News' because when I came to Washington, D.C., on my 3 months trip around United States of America I did not know anybody in your Capitol. I saw something about the Sunday morning breakfast at the YMCA and I never regret I went there.

"The kind of meeting was something I had hoped to find before but never did. You go straight into a foreign party and at once you have friends.

"Unfortunately I had to leave for New York City after breakfast but I could have spent lots of time in Washington, D.C., because suddenly I had friends there and they would help me to see more of your very interesting Capital if I had had the time.

"Now I run a small hotel in wonderful Copenhagen and everytime I have a guest here, alone or in a party, I remember what people did to me at the breakfast. It might be help to find a street, to go shopping, to find the best things to see, and so forth."

Raymond Issid, a national of Beirut, Lebanon, graduate of the University of Montana and now teaching engineering at K.T.I. in Khartoum, Sudan, writes:

"An idea of inspiration that could be thought of by any member or guest present around the big table on May 5, 1963: 'If there are more roundtables of the type international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast in every capital city around the world, if there are more active members to spread the word around and create subcenters of international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast in every city they come from, the world tension and misunderstanding will disappear gradually, the love of brotherhood and the desire to help one another will dominate the universe.' This is not of imagination but of real life. Many people that I ran into from different countries, and who never heard of international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast, could be good members and helpful for others if they just received the right directions. Why don't we adopt the idea seriously?"

Edward H. C. Tang writes from Taiwan:

"As you may remember, I got my M.A. degree in political science at Pennsylvania and also studied at the Graduate School of International and Public Affairs, in the University of Pittsburgh. I am a 100-percent American trained person. Now I am serving in the Kuo Ming Tang in addition to my teaching responsibilities. I am trying to do my best in both of these areas, as a result of my learning and training in the United States.

"I often remember the fine experience I had at the international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast. Please extend my hearty greeting to all who are present."

Dr. V. Satchidanandam, Madras Veterinary College, India writes:

"Happy memories of my stay in your country come to my mind when I receive your letters. The YMCA brings together people of all nations building up universal fellowship. During my stay of about a year in your great country, I have had the privilege of studying in four YMCA's the pleasant thoughts of which I continue to cherish. The Sunday morning breakfast session—whoever invented it—is a great and ingenious idea to foster friendship and brotherhood. Yours is a wonderful country and you Americans succeed in making every foreigner feel quite at home while he or she is over there. I pray to God to give you all the energy and luck to carry on your good work."

H. C. Shih, an electrical engineer of Taiwan Aluminum Corp., writes:

"While I tell my friends of the inspiration of my trip to your country, I especially tell of my attendance at a meeting of the 'crossroads breakfast.' This particular form of meeting I find the progressive idea on the one hand and the simplified program on the other hand. It is the best way to make friends. I will keep you and all friends of the 'crossroads' throughout the world in my thoughts at the same time as you will be seated around the 17th anniversary table, which in my home will be 9 p.m. on May 6. I would like to pray for a successful meeting by introducing the words which Jesus said to his disciples: 'For verily I say unto you if you have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, remove hence to yonder place, and it shall move and nothing shall be impossible unto you.' "

David O. de Gale, an English barrister-at-law writes from Germany:

"The breakfast table meeting I was lucky enough to attend on the 23d of September was addressed by Dr. Dostert and had as its theme 'Europe: Federation or Union' and it just so happens that for the last 3 days I have been attending a European lawyers' congress of some interest, and may be of some consequence, at Cologne University. Our aim was to consider the court that now serves, in common, the three European Community Organizations—the Coal and Steel Community, Euratom, and the Common Market—and to review the progress made during the first 10 years of its existence in the development of what lawyers can now reasonably and correctly call community law. This European experiment seems to have a close connection, to my mind, with the aims and methods of the 'crossroads' organization. Good luck and success to 'crossroads' for the coming and successive years: May we remain, as ever, single-minded in the aims that we find are common to us; may we, in the pursuit of these aims, look to the accumulated wisdom and experience of others as well as ourselves; and may we be tolerant, patient, and above all honest with ourselves and each other in the expression of our views and in the attention that we do in fact give to the views expressed to us by others."

P. B. Murthy, geologist in the AEC, India, writes:

"Technological advances have dwindled physical distances. The next thing to achieve is mental proximity. I believe international gatherings like the "crossroads" will pave the way for mutual understanding and reduce the tensions of the world."

Gerald I. Durrant, principal education officer, Ministry of Education, Kingston, Jamaica, writes:

"One of the most memorable of the 180 days I spent in the United States as a guest of the U.S. Government in 1959–60 was the occasion when I had the privilege of joining in your breakfast fellowship in February 1960. The kinship shared with all the others assembled on that Sunday morning indelibly underscored the fact that in this world we are all members one of another and that selfishness is the grand refusal of a full life. It is activities such as the international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast that will ultimately unite men into that society of friends and brothers among whom no contention will ever arise either at the national or international level."

Dr. Shigeaki Hinohara, chief physician of St. Luke's International Hospital, and chairman of executive committee, Christian Medical Association of Japan, writes from Tokyo:

"It was 11 years ago, back in 1952, that I first attended your breakfast. I certainly enjoyed the fruitful talks and fellowship of the 'crossroads,' before going to visit Mr. Grew, former Ambassador to Japan, who really knew and loved Japan.

"I believe that the continuation of this sort of meeting does contribute a great deal to the future of peace on earth.

"I, on this side of the ocean, will be praying at the same hour on May 5 when you folks get together around the big breakfast table at the YMCA in your great Capital."

John L. Handley, writes from Birmingham, England:

"It hardly seems as though a full year has elapsed since I last had the pleasure of being among you all at the 16th anniversary in 1962. The warm welcome that I received I will always remember, and I do hope that it will not be long before I may have the opportunity of meeting you all again.

"It is certainly a tremendous achievement that you have now reached your 17th anniversary, and you can feel sure that I shall be thinking of you on this occasion."

Chiro S. Thapa, student from Nepal, who was our 14,000th visitor while a student at Dickinson College, writes from Fribourg (Switzerland) University:

"I do not know of any other place, in America or elsewhere, where people of widely different backgrounds can come together in a spirit of spontaneous conviviality as at the 'crossroads breakfast.' What better idea than to make possible for everyone to come together at breakfast, hear an authority on questions of topical interest, followed by a discussion on the speech as well as on other topics. By making it possible for a get-together on a day of rest, Americans learn about other lands and foreigners learn about America, about the people, their customs, and their ways of thinking. The breakfast participants are able to appreciate the variety of human existence but always in the context of the essential unity of mankind. To a large extent, Paul, you are responsible for this. Even those that come only in brief contact with you are able to appreciate your friendliness, your idealism, and your overpowering humanism. To others like me, who have had the privilege of being on a footing of intimacy with you, it is simply a privilege knowing you.

"The international crossroads breakfast is an example of the fact of human interdependence. By demonstrating that human beings are essentially the same, the international crossroads breakfast demonstrates, in these times of peril, the better sidelights of human life and gives all much to hope for in the future."

Antti Tamminen, a psychologist in Helsinki, writes:

"Really, we must continue to strengthen the bridges of good will and mutual understanding between different countries. We must trust to realities existing in this world though not possible to see, touch, hear."

John E. Fuller, a young accountant from Australia, seeing the world before settling down, writes:

"There are many unfortunate events occurring in the world today that tend to give one a rather dispirited and pessimistic outlook on the future. Wherever I have traveled I have met people who, although earnestly desiring a peaceful and happy world, have given up hope of it ever being attained and have merely shrugged and said: 'There's nothing I can do about it.' I have often felt myself thinking along the same lines—then, thankful, one meets people, or organizations, who have not given up hope and who are active in their endeavours to secure peace and happiness, not only for themselves, but for all mankind. Such an organization is the international crossroads Sunday morning breakfast.

"If the spirit of good will and understanding, that I witnessed at the breakfast, was emulated throughout the entire world, then our hopes for the future might become justifiably optimistic.

"I thank you sincerely for providing me with such a rewarding experience and for helping me realize the importance of not giving up the fight."

Dr. M. J. Maimandi-Nejad, associate professor, College of Agriculture, University of Tehran, writes:

"I shall await to see the coming of age of this youthful, active and useful endeavor which has proved its significance in the lives of many who have visited beautiful Washington, D.C."

Juan Cortez, television writer and producer, London, writes:

"It was on Trinity Sunday, June 12, 1960, that I had the pleasure of breakfasting with you, an experience I have not forgotten—nor hesitated to speak of—during my not infrequent journeys abroad.

"When I read or hear of color or class discrimination, I think of that breakfast where there were representatives of so many nations.

"God willing, I will be in the United States of America again within the next 12 months and I assure you, high on my engagement list will be another breakfast."

Urpo Ratia, of Helsinki, Finland, a prominent manufacturer and exporter and a respected leader in many civic and educational affairs writes:

"This visit to the United States of America in the year 1958–59 has helped me to find broader basis for my activities. It opened my eyes to see things differently. It encouraged me to win the natural frightness and shyness of human beings.

"My message to your 17th anniversary is: Let us try, everyone individually and in groups, to develop our own ability to build a better world by participating not only in implementations but even in decision-making."

Johannes Pedersen, busdriver of Denmark, writes:

"I hope your organization can tell people around the world, that if we want peace and happiness we have to change the hate between the people, with love and forgiveness; without these two words the world some day may destroy itself. I appreciate that you keep on going, very much."

Lt. Col. (ret.) Mohd Sadiq, M.B.E., and sugarcane farmer in Pakistan, writes:

"I have traveled the world over and stayed at many institutions but it is only at the YMCA's where I have found peace of mind. The atmosphere at every YMCA I have visited has benefited me physically, morally and mentally. I have learned much from the many personalities of high spiritual and moral caliber whom one always meets at YMCA gatherings."

Dr. Ugo M. Colombo, director of public assistance for the city of Milan, Italy, writes:

"Although many years have passed since my visit to Washington, D.C., my spirit has unchanged. A spirit of comprehension and fraternity among men and nations, a spirit of trust in God and in the future. This spirit I found admirably 10 years ago in your meetings and this spirit I maintain during my scientific and practical activity."

---

## THE SENATE'S SUPREME TEST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota, which I have the privilege of representing, is ably served by a host of excellent daily and weekly newspapers. In addition to 5 dailies in our district, we have 78 weekly papers, published and edited by some of the most enlightened and dedicated people in our Nation.

One of those weekly editors is Mr. George F. Etzell, who publishes the Clarissa Independent at Clarissa, Minn. His ability has been recognized to the extent of his being selected as Minnesota's Republican national committeeman. His editorials in that small newspaper are a challenge to all Americans who are concerned with the future of our great country.

I would like to share George Etzell's latest editorial with my colleagues to-

day. It offers much food for thought as the United States enters into a limited nuclear test ban treaty:

THE SENATE'S SUPREME TEST

Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman has assented to a tentative form of agreement to ban nuclear tests in the three-power talks in Moscow.

President Kennedy has alerted the Democratic leadership in the Senate to prepare for swift ratification of a nuclear test ban treaty limited to atmosphere, space and underwater tests. He wants the treaty approved by a vote well in excess of the required two-thirds majority to emphasize to the world his desire to work for peace.

The debate over this proposed treaty in the next few weeks therefore will be crucial to the security and the survival of the United States. It calls for the greatest care that we are not again trapped into signing something that will insure our ultimate defeat and the communization of the world.

Let us look backward. The United States enjoyed a monopoly in nuclear power for many years. The monopoly was broken primarily by spies who stole our secrets. With them, the Soviet Union speedily developed its own nuclear capability.

In 1958, Soviet Premier Khrushchev arranged a nuclear test moratorium by a gentleman's agreement. Under its cover, Khrushchev ordered a speedup of nuclear technological development. In 1961, he broke the moratorium with a series of atmospheric tests that robbed us of our superiority and changed the balance of nuclear power, all in 3 years of clandestine planning.

Again in October of 1962, Khrushchev sneaked a complex of intermediate missiles into Cuba. He had them zeroed on the United States in such a way that he could annihilate most of the country with a surprise attack. As Gen. David M. Shoup, Commandant of the Marine Corps said, "but for the grace of God and an aerial photograph," Khrushchev would have had us at his mercy. For an attack from Cuba could be launched without giving us time to retaliate, whereas an attack from the Soviet Union gives us 30 minutes to mount a strike that would devastate Russia.

In the intervening 9 months, Khrushchev has not completely changed. He is still a dedicated Communist. He still wants to bury us. Yet, in a few days, he now has offered us a nuclear test ban treaty. Why?

The only sensible reason, from his viewpoint, is that he has discovered through the moratorium how to get ahead of the United States in nuclear power, and through the confrontation in Cuba, how to achieve a short cut to our destruction. Given a treaty-insured test ban, with freedom to test underground, he can go ahead and refine his superiority with immunity, and sneak another Cuba setup.

It would be wonderful to relieve the taxpayers of the cost of nuclear testing, and the world of the hazard of nuclear fallout generated by atmospheric tests, if we could be sure that Khrushchev and his successors would not cheat. But the whole history of nuclear development belies this.

A test ban treaty is a suicide pact for the United States. It can be nothing else, unless we step up our own nuclear development and testing underground, the one area that remains open to us. It would be surer, however, for the security and survival of the Nation, to repudiate any such treaty now and so long as Communists insist on winning the world by burying us.

## NORTHEAST AIRLINES: MANAGED NEWS A BLOW TO NEW ENGLAND

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, New England's economy has suffered a severe blow at the hands of the CAB and sharp cries are ringing out in protest against the Board's decision to cripple Northeast Airlines. During the past week I have pointed out to my colleagues several aspects of the situation—the dangers of monopoly, the value of healthy competition, the expense to the public, the evidence of a leak in information which caused Eastern Airlines' stock to rise markedly before the public announcement of the ruling.

Today I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the serious effect of the decision on New England. An editorial from the Boston Record American discusses the question, bringing out that 1,500 jobs have been imperiled in Boston alone. This was dramatically demonstrated at Hyannis Port last weekend as a single-engined airplane conducted an aerial picket over the summer White House towing a huge streamer that read "J.F.K.—Please Help Northeast Airlines." The picket was in reply to Presidential Press Secretary Pierre Salinger's statement that he was unaware of any communication to the President concerning Northeast Airlines.

I applaud this show of Yankee ingenuity in getting past the protective curtain which apparently shields the President from knowledge of such vital matters, after hundreds of telegrams seemingly failed to get his attention. It is interesting to note this aspect of news management. That news out of this administration is managed has been the subject of much comment. Now it would appear that news is also managed on the way in.

The excellent editorial from the Record American, which I commend to my colleagues, follows:

SAVE NORTHEAST

The decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board to take away Northeast Airlines' license to continue operation of its busy Boston-to-Florida routes, including service to Philadelphia, Washington, and other markets, is not simply an action affecting an airline; it is a matter of grave concern to all New England.

The CAB has ruled, with absurd illogic, that this eastern seaboard commercial air corridor which is constantly growing and now accommodates 2 million travelers yearly, can be serviced by just two airlines.

The CAB has moved to eliminate Northeast, which transports 60 percent of those 2 million passengers, and thus set up a monopoly for New England air traffic.

It has threatened a needless crippling blow to this region's economy—the loss of 1,500 skilled jobs and an annual payroll of $12,300,000 in Greater Boston alone.

It has imperiled regional air service within New England, a service Northeast has provided without subsidy for the past 7 years.

It has jeopardized the continuation of Northeast's efficient and dependable and frequent Boston-New York service (250,000 passengers a year; one of the top two carriers).

Northeast's fight to retain its eastern seaboard routes is also New England's fight. That is obvious for this needed air service is vital to our economy.

Massachusetts' two U.S. Senators already have petitioned the Justice Department to determine if antitrust laws are being violated; if a monopoly is being set up for the two remaining airlines by eliminating Northeast from the commercial routes all three now serve.

This investigation is mandatory on the basis of CAB's own figures which show that in the first 3 months of this year Northeast carried 27,500 passengers between Boston and Philadelphia as against 47 passengers for one competing airline; and that Northeast carried 38,114 between Washington and Boston as against 103 for the third-place airline. Yet it is Northeast which the CAB would oust from these runs.

A monopoly investigation is warranted by the facts and is a good start, but it is not enough. In addition, all members of the New England congressional delegation should unite in demanding that the CAB revoke this unfair action.

And all of this region's civic, labor, business, and industry leaders should besiege the CAB to change its decision. If this fails, they should carry their protests to the President who certainly is aware of the terrible impact this move by a governmental regulatory agency will have on the New England economy.

Here is an opportunity for the administration not simply to do more for Massachusetts, but to do something which New England has an honest right to expect—protection from this indefensible and discriminatory action by the CAB.

## A LOOK AT "A REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT" ON THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, in these days of national and international crises, Congress is devoting much of its time and efforts on the nuclear testing problems, racial problems, foreign aid, military procurement, space activities and many, many other matters of paramount importance to our Nation's welfare.

In doing so, I fear we are unable to give adequate study and consideration to some developments taking place right under our nose which might very well in the long run have a greater adverse impact on this Nation's well-being and future progress than many of the so-called priority matters which I mentioned earlier.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House a once "secret" report which has just recently been exposed to public view entitled "A Report to the President," by the Petroleum Study Committee.

This report had its beginning back in 1961, when on December 2 of that year, President Kennedy announced:

> A comprehensive study of petroleum requirements and supplies in relation to national security objectives will be undertaken under the leadership of the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning (OEP).

Pursuant to this directive, Edward A. McDermott, Director of OEP, organized an interagency study under his chairmanship, with equal participation by the Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, Justice, Interior, Commerce, and Labor.

Mr. Speaker, this report, although I think it could better be characterized as a bunch of conclusions and recommendations totally lacking in basic data and information to back up its conclusions, only came to light as a result of the fine efforts of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, WALTER ROGERS.

Further, I might have missed the full implication of the document had I not read an excellent analysis by Minor S. Jameson, Jr., executive vice president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, in which he effectively pointed up the many dangerous aspects of the report which—as Mr. Jameson put it, the report "reveals the thinking of those in Government whose philosophy would lead to complete control of the petroleum industry. This dangerous document spells out the strategy of the advocates of Federal control."

Mr. Speaker, after making a study of this so-called report, I am gravely concerned that what Mr. Jameson has concluded is correct; and further and even worse, I find that many of the recommendations contained in this document have already been, or are in process of being, put into effect.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to defer until later my remarks on the implementation of this report.

First, allow me to comment on who put these conclusions together and how they were developed and ask my friends in this body to decide for themselves whether this is a proper way to develop and put into practice basic policies directly affecting an industry which is vital to our national security and the general welfare of our Nation.

As I mentioned earlier, OEP Director McDermott stated in his letter to the President that each Department was allowed equal participation in this endeavor. That is, the conclusions and recommendations of each Department were given equal weight.

Now, Mr. Speaker, without intending to question the abilities of the various departmental representatives, I wish to point out that without exception the participants on this Petroleum Study Committee were at best a sub-Cabinet level study group. No doubt, all were and are competent in their respective jobs. But, I submit, Mr. Speaker, this study group—no matter how dedicated—faced the handicap of not being in a position to weigh all the pertinent factors which, of necessity, are basic ingredients in construction of basic national policies. Stated simply, this Study Committee is a perfect example of sending forth a group of boys to do a man's job.

Unfortunately, the sum total of their work, no matter how inadequate, can without challenge be elevated into the position of basic national policy. This document can become set in concrete and serve as the pattern for the future. The longer it goes without challenge the more difficult it will be to undo the existing and potential damage flowing from the half-baked, and unfounded conclusions making up this nefarious document.

Mr. Speaker, as an example of what I mean when I refer to half-baked and unfounded conclusions, I cite this statement in the report:

> It has been estimated that complete abandonment of (import) controls could lead to a reduction in the price of domestic crude oil of $1 per barrel (to approximate the world price).

Later in this discussion, I hope we can set forth how ridiculous it is to state that the price of crude oil can be reduced by more than 33⅓ percent and still have an oil and gas industry in the United States.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, no greater disservice could be performed on this Nation's security and economic welfare than to advocate or even suggest abandonment of our domestic petroleum industry. Yet, in effect, that is exactly what these uninformed—though admittedly dedicated departmental representatives—are doing when they state to the President of the United States that "without controls, the price of domestic crude oil could be reduced by $1 per barrel." More about this aspect later.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most difficult aspects of the study for me to understand is the cavalier manner in which the Department of the Interior was relegated to a minor role in the study to the extent that this Department observed, among other things in the transmittal letter which accompanied the report, that the report's "conclusions relating to costs and benefits are potentially misleading."

What does this mean? It means simply that this Department does not agree with the report.

One might ask why be concerned about what the Department of the Interior thinks in this matter. The answer is that historically and under the Defense Production Act and related legislation, the Department of the Interior is charged by Congress with "responsibilities relating to petroleum and gas" and "the jurisdiction of the Department extends over the conservation and development of mineral resources."

The Department of the Interior has as one of its functions the Office of Oil and Gas. According to the U.S. Government Organization Manual, this Office of Oil and Gas does the following:

> The Office of Oil and Gas, under the supervision of the Assistant Secretary—mineral resources:
>
> 1. Provides staff advice and assistance to the Assistant Secretary in the development, coordination, and management of oil and gas programs and functions which are assigned to the Department by the President or the Congress.
>
> 2. Provides leadership in obtaining coordination and unification of oil and gas policies and related administrative activities of all Federal agencies and enlists their cooperation to assure adequate development, distribution, and utilization of petroleum and gas resources and facilities to meet civilian, industrial, and military requirements in time of peace or national emergency.
>
> 3. Serves as the principal channel of communication between the Federal Government and the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, State regulatory bodies, and the petroleum and gas industries (primarily through the National Petroleum Council, the Military Petroleum Advisory Board, and the Foreign Petroleum Supply Committee).
>
> 4. Carries out functions and responsibilities authorized by the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, with respect to petroleum and gas. These functions are aimed at assuring adequate supplies of these products and facilities to fulfill civilian, industrial, and military requirements and are similar to those performed jointly by the Office of Minerals Mobilization and General Services Administration with respect to metals and minerals.

The Interior Department historically has served as the expert on, and coordinating department for, government in all matters dealing with the petroleum industry.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior is charged with making economic and statistical studies many of which concern the petroleum industry. The official U.S. Government Organization Manual states on page 236:

> Economics and statistics: Economics and statistical studies are made of domestic and foreign mineral production, distribution, and consumption. These studies provide the Government with information necessary for policy and program formulation and supply industry with information necessary for its operations. Further, a health and safety statistical program is conducted and correlated with the commodity program.

OIL IMPORT ADMINISTRATION

Another very important activity of the Interior Department concerning petroleum policies and activities is that of the Oil Import Administration. As to this, the U.S. Government Organization Manual has this to say on pages 230–231:

> Oil import administration: The Oil Import Administration under the supervision of the Assistant Secretary—Mineral Resources, discharges the responsibilities imposed upon the Secretary of the Interior by Presidential Proclamation 3279 of March 10, 1959, "Adjusting Imports of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Into the United States." This proclamation, in the interests of national security, imposes restrictions upon the importation of crude oil, unfinished petroleum oils, and finished petroleum products. The Administration allocates imports of these commodities among qualified applicants and issue import licenses on the basis of such allocations.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken the trouble to detail some of the more important responsibilities of the Interior Department concerning the Petroleum Industry to show the great and vital role this Department plays with respect thereto in accordance with statute and historical precedence.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, when one reads this report and the letter of transmittal to the President, only one conclusion can be reached; namely, the Department of the Interior has been completely bypassed and overruled. Here the expert Department on oil and gas, by way of law and experience, was relegated to the backroom when this report was put together.

Mr. Speaker, before proceeding further, I would like to call the attention of the House to two more statements from the "Memorandum for the President":

> Interior contends that "while estimates purportedly covering costs to the economy are included in the report, the counterbalancing benefits which flow from the maintenance of the petroleum industry in its

present state of health were not reduced to comparable terms." The Interior member also states "that existing legislation and delegations vest the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning with adequate authority to deal with the security aspects of the petroleum problem and that, in consequence, the recommendation in the report dealing with coordination of interagency activities is unnecessary and could lead to future difficulty in assessing responsibility for development and coordination of petroleum policy within the executive branch."

I am sure that, by now, any thinking person must conclude that this report does not reflect the approval of the Department of the Interior. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I need very little surmise to conclude that the Department of the Interior by its own words as quoted herein has branded the report as a dishonest report among other things. To me, such words as "potentially misleading," and "the counterbalancing benefits were not reduced to comparable terms," are just a diplomatic way of saying the report is dishonest and completely lacking in objectivity.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is real cause for alarm when a study group gives equal participation to such Departments as Labor, Justice, and Treasury on oil matters and while ignoring the Department of Interior—the best qualified department in Government on oil matters.

Yet, this by the very words of the report, is exactly what has happened.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to dwell on briefly before discussing the actual conclusions and recommendations of the report, is the statement found in the President's instructions directing that "a comprehensive study of petroleum be undertaken."

Where is this comprehensive study? None is available.

Where are the facts and supporting data backing up the far-reaching conclusions in the report? There are none available.

Were public hearings held? The answer is "No."

Were written briefs from interested parties invited and really encouraged? The answer to the latter part of the question is "No."

As a matter of fact, material and suggestions from industry were discouraged when OEP announced:

> The committee believes there is no immediate need for submission of views and material by the public.

Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial appearing in the highly respected Oil and Gas Journal summed up my thoughts as follows:

> If this is our national oil policy, it is well that we know it. Some people will be pleased by parts of it; others will object violently to parts or all of it.
>
> But all can object to its method of preparation. It was a sort of star-chamber proceeding, done in the guise of a private study to aid the President in implementing a congressional directive to control imports. The report was kept secret for 10 months after completion.
>
> No hearings were held. No one knew the full scope of the study. Many Federal agencies and some industry groups submitted material, but there is no way of telling how well this supported the final conclusions.
>
> If we are to have a national oil policy it should be an open covenant, openly arrived at, subject to rebuttal, qualification, and amplification, so that industry as well as Government can know where we are heading.

It is bad enough to learn how this report was put together, but possibly even worse we do not know to what extent the President agrees with it and to what extent it will serve as the foundation for future national policies on oil and gas.

We do know that already many of the planks in the report have been implemented, calling for greater Federal activity in state regulatory functions, and a shifting away from the Interior Department of its functions of collecting data and information on oil industry activities.

Mr. Speaker, I think it only proper that the President make his views known with respect to the report, and for him to inform Congress as to what has been done and what the plans are for the future in regard to this sub-Cabinet level report on the oil and gas industry.

It could be that Congress does not agree with what he and his administration have in mind, and we in Congress may very well wish to have our Government steer a different course on national oil and gas policies.

Mr. Speaker, I have great confidence that once appraised of what is taking place, President Kennedy will wish to take the necessary action to disregard this so-called report and return to more responsible hands the job of developing our Nation's policies affecting this vital and basic industry—oil and gas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to analyze and throw open for consideration by the House, some of the observations, conclusions, and recommendations contained in the report.

I invite my colleagues to join with me in this endeavor.

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

Mr. FOREMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman on the fine statement which he has made. I want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and to say that I think bringing this very vital matter to the attention of the House and to the country at this time is a distinguished public service.

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEED. This report in my estimation is at least as dangerous as the gentleman has stated it to be.

Mr. Speaker, the Petroleum Study Committee's report groped and erred in many directions as it reached conclusions and made recommendations regarding the oil and gas industry.

Much of the report reflects more idealism than realism as it clearly points toward greater Federal control of the industry as the perfect route to maximum efficiency and competitiveness. In reaching at least one conclusion, however, the Committee failed to consider the consequences of what it proposed.

It is imperative—

The report said—

> that domestic petroleum costs be reduced to permit a narrowing of the difference between United States and foreign prices.

Examine this utopian concept with any degree of understanding and it becomes evident that this is a virtual impossibility unless the Federal Government wishes to find and produce the oil, then give it away. The report fails to tell us how to go about this cost cutting. Actually, even now cost-cutting methods are being found and used, but there is a point beyond which they can't be cut.

Considering the cost of exploring for and finding the oil, even if it could be brought from the ground for nothing, I still doubt that U.S. oil could compete seriously in the world marketplace with foreign oil.

We have to wonder what approach the Committee would have the industry take to cut costs. Do the Committee members recommend that fringe benefits be reduced, that unemployment compensation or minimum wage laws be changed to reduce industry costs? Would they advocate tax reductions at the Federal, State, and local levels to lower the cost of producing our oil so that it would be more competitive abroad with oil produced in foreign areas?

The Committee's report to the President presumes to advise that the domestic industry's costs of operation should somehow be miraculously reduced to the point that we can wedge our 12-barrel-a-day wells into the international competition with wells that produce, in some cases, as much as 5,000 barrels daily. In the Middle East, for example, the average daily production per well exceeds 4,000 barrels daily.

The report says that at this juncture, "information is inadequate to assess the extent of foreign markets which might be developed."

For the benefit of the report's drafters, I would like to point out that the only way to significantly reduce the domestic petroleum industry's costs is to reduce exploration and development in the United States. If national security, employment and tax revenues have any consideration in this matter, and I am convinced they do, then reducing our domestic operations would be the initial step on the road to disaster.

To be more blunt and self-serving from our national standpoint, why should we ask one of our most important defense industries to commit economic suicide by slashing costs to a level from which the industry could not recover just to match finding costs with foreign oil? What would be gained?

Is it worthwhile to expand oil exports at a loss, as Russia appears to do, and compound our balance-of-payments problem just so we can say, "Look at us moving into the world petroleum market"?

Does it make sense to cripple an industry just to reduce "the small percentage of the cost of manufactured products" which the Committee attributes to petroleum? Does it not make more sense to avoid actions which would make it impossible for us to have a healthy, domestic petroleum industry for national security purposes?

We can only hope that those who would be responsible for placing the Committee's recommendations into effect will have perspective and greater understanding of the consequences than did those who did the recommending.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words about the oil import program and its relationship to the coal industry of Pennsylvania and other coal-producing States.

There is no question in my mind but that oil imports, and particularly imports of residual fuel oil, have had an adverse effect upon coal production and employment in this Nation.

I was chairman of a subcommittee of the House Labor Committee which held hearings in 1961, on the impact of imports and exports on employment. Two days of those hearings were devoted to coal and residual oil.

The record of those hearings make most interesting reading, Mr. Speaker, and I invite Members of the House who have not already done so, to secure a copy of them and read that testimony.

Since those hearings were held, the situation insofar as coal is concerned has grown progressively worse. The amount of oil which can be imported under the oil import program has steadily increased. Today, imports are the equivalent of some 50 million tons of coal annually, and almost all of this imported oil goes into the east coast market where it competes directly with coal produced in Pennsylvania and other Appalachian States.

The present oil import program needs strengthening, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, most of the talk emanating from those charged with the responsibility for administering the program concerns itself with either relaxing the program even further or doing away with it entirely.

First, there was a report from the Office of Emergency Planning which called for a "meaningful relaxation" of restrictions on residual oil imports. As I read that report, it became abundantly clear that what "meaningful relaxation" as used by the OEP really meant was an abandonment of import controls and the opening up of the entire Nation to a flood of foreign oil. Fortunately, the President wisely decided to ignore the OEP report and to maintain controls, but in so doing he opened the dike a little more and permitted an increase of 50,000 barrels a day in the amount of allowable oil imports.

The report on oil imports by the Cabinet Committee which is under discussion here today is another indication that certain elements in the executive branch seem to be determined to get rid of this program.

Just recently, the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia issued a report which stated that many of the unemployment problems which have plagued Pennsylvania for a number of years can be traced to a decline in coal production. It should be obvious to anyone that, in turn, a great part of the coal unemployment is directly due to increased residual oil imports on the east coast. The cause and effect is clear.

The coal industry of this Nation, and the railroads which haul most of the coal to market, are making a determined and successful effort to reduce both production and transportation costs and to insure a lower delivered cost to consumers along the east coast. Yet, it seems that all of the progress the coal industry has made is jeopardized by increased oil imports which are offered for sale on the east coast in competition with coal at prices which are guaranteed to be under that of coal.

This is a serious situation, Mr. Speaker, and for officials of this Government to think for one minute about doing away with oil imports, or relaxing import controls even further, is beyond my comprehension.

These Government officials ought to be thinking about plugging the holes in the present program and stemming the growing tide of residual oil imports. They ought to be thinking more about the men in Pennsylvania and other States who cannot find jobs in coal mines and less about the need for strengthening the economy of foreign nations which produce fuel in competition with that produced by domestic oil and coal industries.

I think it is clear, in light of the abundant evidence which has been submitted over the years to Congress by spokesmen for these two vital industries, that domestic oil and coal cannot compete against unlimited imports. Removal of controls can mean only one thing. These two industries, essential to continued industrial growth and military strength, will decline in importance. Rather than looking to our domestic oil wells and coal mines for the strength we need, we would look instead to foreign oil wells.

Fuel is too important to this Nation for me to ever agree to such a course of action. The economy of this Nation needs the strength which an active oil and coal industry imparts to it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to join my colleagues here today and urge upon the executive branch, and upon my fellow Members of Congress, the extreme urgency of maintaining and strengthening the oil import program. It is only through the continuation of import controls can we maintain a sound domestic fuels economy that will strengthen the national security.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, particular attention is given exempt imports by the Office of Emergency Planning Committee in its report to the President.

On the whole, this section of the report is factual and embodies a sound recommendation. The latter, however, is nothing new.

I find myself impressed by certain evidence in this section of the report which is not mentioned by the Committee. I refer to the tendency for imports to have a wild growth when uncontrolled. In the case of Canada, whose crude oil exports to the United States were exempt from the import program during the period under purview by the Committee, the imported volume increased from 83,000 barrels per day in 1958 to 270,000 barrels per day in 1962. In other words, the volume more than tripled during these years.

Through a change in the control program since the Committee's study, Canadian imports are included in the overall import allowable. This is constructive and in keeping with the overall concept of continental petroleum security.

However, it is necessary that imports from Canada be coordinated with our own supply as well as with oversea imports. Otherwise, the entire program could degenerate into a state of serious imbalance.

Therefore I heartily endorse the Committee's recommendation that talks with Canadian officials, with the view of stabilizing this situation, be continued.

I think, also, that the increase in imports from Canada, while they were exempt, constitutes a clear warning to this Nation that the control program must not be relaxed.

The Committee also gives attention to imports from Mexico in a manner with which I heartily disagree.

The Committee states that, and I quote:

> Exempt imports from Mexico (they are no longer exempt, it should be observed) have not created a problem since they were stabilized in May 1961 at 30,000 barrels per day.

In my interpretation of this import schedule, which is clearly a circumvention of the intent of the program, these imports still create a problem. They constitute a 30,000-barrel-per-day problem. In my opinion it is the problem which has been stabilized, not merely the daily volume of influx.

In my view, the Committee's findings in this area should provide two points for emphasis. First, and already mentioned, coordination with Canada, and second, the absolute need to contain all imports under the overall program regardless of source.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most erroneous and indefensible conclusions reached by the Petroleum Study Committee pertains to oil prices. The report of this Committee infers very strongly that oil prices have been and are out of line with general price levels at both the wholesale and retail level and that the import control program is keeping them there. Neither could be further from the truth.

It is a recognized fact that throughout the world the standard of living in a given country is directly dependent upon the quantities of energy consumed. The people of the United States have long enjoyed the highest standard of living in the world because they had available to them adequate supplies of energy fuels at reasonable prices. Since well over two-thirds of that energy is supplied by the petroleum industry, oil prices have had to be fairly well in line with general price levels or the present rate of energy consumption and resulting high standard of living would never have been achieved.

This fact is also borne out by a comparison of the official Government wholesale price index data for all commodities, excluding farm products and foods, with the index of crude oil prices. Following World War II these two indexes followed

the same trend and were at about the same level. The crude oil index went slightly above the index for all commodities, excluding farm products and foods, in 1957, the year the first voluntary oil import program became effective. Since that time the trends in these two official Government price index series have been as follows:

*Index numbers*

[1957-59=100]

| | Wholesale price index all commodities (excluding farm products and foods) | Crude petroleum |
|---|---|---|
| 1957 | 99.2 | 101.0 |
| 1958 | 99.5 | 101.2 |
| 1959 | 101.3 | 97.8 |
| 1960 | 101.3 | 97.2 |
| 1961 | 100.8 | 97.5 |
| 1962 | 100.8 | 97.8 |
| | *Percent* | *Percent* |
| 1962 versus 1957 | +1.6 | −3.2 |

During the time we have had an import control program, crude oil prices actually declined 3.2 percent while prices, other than farm products and foods, increased 1.6 percent.

At the retail level, about the same trends have prevailed. Following World War II, the price index for regular grade gasoline, excluding taxes, increased at a slightly faster rate than the consumer price index for all commodities excluding foods. However, since 1957 gasoline prices have declined steadily each year while consumer prices in general have continued to rise. Data for each year since 1957 have been as follows:

| | Consumer Price Index (all commodities except foods) | Regular grade gasoline (excise taxes) |
|---|---|---|
| 1957 | 98.9 | 10[illegible].4 |
| 1958 | 99.8 | 99.5 |
| 1959 | 101.3 | 98.1 |
| 1960 | 101.8 | 97.2 |
| 1961 | 102.1 | 95.1 |
| 1962 | 102.8 | 93.8 |
| | *Percent* | *Percent* |
| 1962 versus 1957 | +3.9 | −8.4 |

Even though both crude oil and refined product prices have declined since 1957 when general price trends have been upward, there is no doubt but that they would have declined even more if there had been no import control program or production controls in the States with substantial shut-in capacity. It is entirely possible that for a short period crude prices might decline much more than the $1 per barrel estimated by the Petroleum Study Committee. However, would the inevitable result be worth it?

If this happened it would be the end of the road for a vital U.S. industry that provided the fuel to win two World Wars. It would mean the wasting away of our most valuable natural resource. Billions of barrels of oil, now recoverable only because of conservation measures enacted many years ago, would never be produced. The United States would be dependent upon insecure sources such as the Middle East and Venezuela for vital petroleum supplies. Although we might have "cheap" oil for a short time, in the long run it would be the most expensive oil in our history.

Six years ago a special Cabinet Committee reported on its investigation of the crude oil import problem. This Committee was also concerned with the effect of possible import controls on consumers and came to the following conclusion on this point:

"Domestic consumers are utilizing an increasing amount of petroleum products for transportation, fuel, heating, and many other aspects of consumer life. In the event of a national emergency, it is essential to these consumers that there be adequate supplies at reasonable cost, both now and in the future. The low cost of imported oil is attractive, but excessive reliance upon it in the short run may put the Nation in a long-term vulnerable position. Imported supplies could be cut off in an emergency and might well be diminished by events beyond our control. This vulnerability could easily result in a much higher cost, or even in the unavailability, of oil to consumers. It is therefore believed that the best interests of domestic consumers, as well as of national security, will be served if a reasonable balance is maintained between domestic and foreign supplies."

The relatively low price at which oil is presently sold may also be demonstrated by the fact that crude oil today sells for less than 7 cents per gallon and is the cheapest liquid bought and sold in our economy. Because of this low cost some 2,500 petroleum products are available at prices within the means of all Americans. A gallon of gasoline, for example, not including taxes, costs about the same as two cups of coffee, about half as much as a gallon of distilled water and one-fifth as much as a gallon of milk.

In view of these facts it is inconceivable that any study group could conclude that oil prices are high in comparison with general price levels or that they are being maintained at unreasonably high levels because of either the import control program or State production controls.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the present oil import program is to insure our national security in times of emergencies. Our reserve petroleum productive capacity has enabled us, from a position of strength, to build up our military capability to meet any eventuality. At all times we must maintain a position of strength to prevent and deter war. In this effort, experience has proven that no munition is more important than oil.

On several occasions during recent years, the United States has been called upon to make additional petroleum supplies available from our oilfields to help meet emergency conditions in which friendly foreign nations found themselves when their normal oil supplies were cut off. The nationalization of the Iranian oilfields cut off some 600,000 barrels daily of vital oil supplies to all of the countries of the free world for 3 years while a solution to the nationalization problem was being sought. The U.S. oil reserve productive capacity was called on to help overcome the shortage of oil that affected many nations of the world and Western Europe in particular. When the Suez Canal was nationalized in 1956, subsequent sinkings of ships in the canal effectively blocked all transit through this key link between the vast Middle East oilfields and the countries of Western Europe and northern Africa which were utterly dependent on Middle East oil. War was imminent and in fact, European troops were landed in Egypt to recapture the canal by force. The bargaining position of the United States in this crisis was materially strengthened by our reserve supply of oil and we were able successfully to demand that these European troops be withdrawn from Egypt and world war III was averted. U.S. shipments of oil to Europe during this crisis increased some 700,000 barrels daily and greatly assisted Western Europe's industry from coming to a grinding halt.

Today, Communist agents from Cuba periodically blow up oil pipelines in Venezuela and harass the Government. Oil installations are continually threatened in Venezuela which happens to be the largest oil exporter in the entire world.

Yet, this report from the Petroleum Study Committee blandly states that there could be an additional but undetermined requirement to meet some portion of the needs of friendly foreign nations in such emergencies. Although generally considered, no complete appraisal of supply-requirements interrelationships of the entire free world was made. The extent to which the United States must undertake to maintain spare capacity for other free world emergency requirements has not been determined by this Government nor made the subject of international discussion.

I submit that the omission of such consideration from a so-called comprehensive study of petroleum supplies and requirements in relation to national security objectives is a major blunder and should be corrected immediately.

As I previously pointed out in my discussion of the Suez Canal crisis, two European countries almost triggered world war III because their oil supply from the Middle East was cut off when the Canal was nationalized. If we cannot arrange to deliver the oil that is required, no choice is available to them, if a similar emergency should arise, except to fight to regain the oil supply they must have to survive. We must assume that the unexpected could happen and we cannot ignore the consequences if it does happen.

If we lack ample reserve supplies in this country to fill the gap caused by the denial of oil from a normal supply source, I am afraid that our requests for restraint with the friendly foreign country or countries affected would be completely ignored. We would be bargaining not from a position of strength but from one of weakness and we can anticipate the results.

Therefore, I am fearful that this Petroleum Study Committee report is not, in fact, based on a comprehensive study of petroleum requirements and supplies in relation to our national security objectives as stated. Perhaps, I would be less

apprehensive if I could examine the referred to "comprehensive" study which has not been made available to me or to anyone to my knowledge. We must be sure that all relevant facts bearing on our national security position have received full consideration. The Congress has the responsibility to know all the facts when policy matters affecting this Nation's security is involved.

I believe that we should have hearings to discuss this report and that the experts from the Office of Emergency Planning should be called to answer these pressing questions that are a matter of concern to many of us.

Is this report merely a report to the President or is it a new policy statement affecting the entire petroleum industry in this country and our national security as to oil. Has the report been approved by the President or has it been rejected in whole or in part? These, among many other questions, are begging an answer and since they remain unanswered it is our duty as Representatives to find out.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN] for arranging for a discussion of this important matter on the floor of the House.

The oil import program is of deep concern to every American citizen, for it is only through the maintenance of Government-imposed restrictions upon oil imports that this Nation can hope to maintain a strong and healthy domestic fuels industry.

Should the oil import program be abandoned, it would signify that we as a nation have decided that in the future we will place our reliance for fuel and energy upon foreign sources to the detriment of domestic oil and coal.

Such a decision would entail a basic and fundamental change in national policy and I am firmly of the opinion that no such change in national policy should be made without long and considered debate. Certainly, a change as far reaching as that involved in abolishing the oil import program, or weakening it significantly, should not be based upon a study made by a committee of the executive branch without the advice and counsel of the Congress.

The Nation must in the future have a safe and secure supply of fuel and energy. Without this fuel and energy we cannot hope to maintain our industrial supremacy or to continue our military dominance.

I seriously doubt that we can maintain the supply of fuel and energy the Nation must have if we write off the domestic coal and oil industries and turn to foreign producing countries for our fuel. The world is too unsettled, and the future to obscure, for such a step to be even contemplated.

I trust the words spoken on the floor of this House today will be heeded by the administration and will be regarded as an expression of concern over the threat raised by the Cabinet Committee report to the future of the oil import program.

This program to limit oil imports, and thereby provide an opportunity for the domestic oil and coal industries to grow and expand to meet the Nation's growing demands for fuel and energy, must be continued.

And the program should be strengthened, both as to imports of crude and residual oil. It must not be fatally weakened, as would be the case if the recommendations of the Cabinet Committee were put into effect.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that removal of import controls on residual oil could well mean the end to hopes the West has of developing vast reserves of coal. In my State of Wyoming alone, recoverable reserves are estimated at more than 60 billion tons.

There is a definite possibility of developing a market for this coal on the west coast. But how can this be done if we permit imports to destroy the strength and financial stability of the domestic coal industry? These vast reserves of coal are a great national asset and they should be protected.

In closing, let me again commend my colleague from Texas for his initiative and wisdom in calling this most important matter to the attention of the House.

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

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

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, another matter of concern to our Government and to all of our citizens is the chronic imbalance in our international payments. I find no mention in the report of the Petroleum Study Committee concerning this vital problem which must be solved, and soon, if our dollar is to continue to command respect in the commerce of the world.

During the last 13 years the U.S. deficit in our balance of payments has totaled $26 billion or an average of some $2 billion a year. Since 1950, only one year showed a favorable balance, indicating that our income from abroad exceeded our payments to foreign countries. These annual deficits, in effect, are due bills which must be settled either with goods or with gold.

The impact of petroleum on our balance of payments is quite significant. For example, the U.S. No. 1 import dollarwise is petroleum. Last year the value of petroleum imports was $1.8 billion according to Department of Commerce data. However, even this enormous sum is on the conservative side since it does not include the freight charge which is not included in the Department's value figures. During the year 1962, the United States exported petroleum and products valued at $442 million again excluding freight. So our trade balance in petroleum resulted in a deficit of $1.3 billion. Our deficit position in petroleum trade has exceeded a billion dollars for each of the last 5 years and this does not include military purchases of oil abroad which during the last 5 years have averaged some $300 million annually and are running at about $350 million. Therefore our petroleum trade deficit constitutes a significant item in our overall balance-of-payments problem.

Last year we managed to hold our balance-of-payments deficit to $2.2 billion. This was possible because of special circumstances including loan repayments by foreign governments of debts, advance payments on German military purchases here and the U.S. Treasury's borrowings in Italy and Switzerland. Without these special receipts, which we cannot expect to be repeated, last year's deficit would have totaled $3 billion. The balance of payments in the first quarter of this year ran at an annual rate of $3.3 billion and the second quarter will be no better.

Our gold situation today reflects the fact that the time is fast approaching when we must face this problem and take definite measures to alleviate the situation or in truth our dollar will not be worth a "continental." Currently, we have some $16 billion in gold reserves. About $12 billion of this $16 billion is reserved or "frozen" as the backing of our currency. The remainder, or $4 billion, is what is left to settle foreign claims of $25 billion which have piled up from our spending more abroad than we have received. These foreign claims of $25 billion are payable in gold should the foreign creditor ask for gold. It is clear that demand for payment in gold beyond the $4 billion available in the Treasury would create a serious payment problem. We simply do not have the gold to settle these claims unless we use the gold that backs our money. If we use this gold, what stands behind our currency? Again, I repeat that we must come to grips with this problem now. We cannot forestall the inevitable result if we continue to ignore this most serious crisis.

Therefore, the recommendation made in this committee report to increase the crude oil import level will also increase our trade deficit in oil and have an adverse impact on our already serious balance-of-payments difficulties.

With 2.5 million barrels a day of shut-in oil in this country, I believe our national security and national objectives would be more properly served if we utilized more of our own oil and reduced imports accordingly. Such action would reduce our petroleum trade deficit and improve our balance-of-payments position.

It might be asked if oil remittances from U.S. companies' oil operations abroad offset our trade deficit in oil. The answer is negative. Even if every oil-related item is taken into account, there remains a petroleum trade deficit of one-half billion dollars. Including U.S. oil company dividends to and remittances from foreign oil operations, added to the value of total petroleum exports, plus the value of all exports of casing and line pipe and oilfield equipment still fell far short of balancing the petroleum ledger last year.

I believe that the importance of petroleum in our trade accounts and balance-of-payments difficulties should be explored with the petroleum study group in detail and a clear record established concerning the weight that was given to our gold outflow problem in the deliberations of the group.

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

Mr. FOREMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding. I want to commend him for taking this time to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress and the public the reality of the current condition of the oil industry in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when the administration says it is committed to a policy of stimulating our domestic economy and creating new jobs, national policy with relation to the petroleum industry seems headed in the opposite direction.

In my State oil production is small in relation to total national production yet petroleum exploration and production is the second largest source of income in North Dakota. We are witnessing a marked decline in oil exploration and development of new fields. Oil company offices have been closing up and a recent article in the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune indicated that the last major oil company maintaining an office in North Dakota—Texaco—was moving out this month.

This all obviously is a part of a national petroleum policy based on allowing a maximum of crude petroleum importation and increasing amounts of residual fuel oil.

The justification is a simple one—namely that foreign petroleum products are cheaper than those produced domestically. This is true and I might add that this is true of almost any product you want to name that can be obtained from a foreign source. It is also true that this policy does not contribute to stimulating our domestic economy.

It just does not make good practical sense not to maintain a healthy domestic petroleum industry—oil is an indispensible fuel in our present-day economy. We must not become dependent upon a foreign source for such a basic commodity when the interference of an unfriendly country could cut off our supply. This to say nothing of the potential increase in employment that could result from expanding our domestic petroleum industry.

Mr. Speaker, the recent report by the President's Petroleum Study Committee unfortunately tends to exaggerate the benefits that would accrue to the economy if certain steps were taken to further control or penalize the oil and gas industry. Conversely, the study tended to gloss over and minimize the actual damage that would be inflicted on the oil industry itself.

For example, the Committee implies that import controls should be abandoned and suggests obliquely that this would drive U.S.-produced oil prices downward by $1 a barrel, or below the cost of finding and producing it. It was magnanimously conceded, however, that "a sharp decline in the level of prices or of production would create pockets of economic distress and unemployment."

Economic distress and unemployment would indeed result in the United States as a result of such sharp declines. But to refer to the broad areas that would be hard hit as pockets indicates astounding unfamiliarity with the scope of petroleum industry activities and the thousands of communities which rely on these operations as a primary source of trade and income.

Consider what has happened since the midfifties in a period of rising imports and even without what the Committee might call a sharp decline in prices.

Between 1955 and 1962, there was a 50-percent decline in the number of crew months logged in geophysical exploration while the annual drilling rate fell more than 10,000 wells. And in just 5 years, between 1957 and 1962, the number of jobs in oil and gas production declined by 40,000.

Observing what has happened in this period when such drastic measures as were hinted at by the Committee were not even in effect, it is frightening to contemplate what might occur if these steps were initiated.

Rather than "pockets" of distress, I assure you we would have a vast blighted area covering parts, and in some cases most, of the 33 oil- and gas-producing States.

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for his very appropriate remarks. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, first I wish to thank the gentleman for yielding and also to compliment him for the contribution he is making by bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress and the country at this time. I can hardly think of a subject more really serious in importance on the domestic front than that of the plight of our domestic oil industry. And no one is better qualified to discuss that and to appraise it than is my colleague [Mr. FOREMAN] who represents a district that is so vitally affected by the excessive imports with which this country has been plagued in recent years. And I might add I represent a district that is likewise very vitally affected.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much disturbed by a rather vague passage in this so-called Petroleum Study Committee report. The report states that, "Taking account of all factors, there is an area of choice within which action can be begun to accommodate petroleum policy to other relevant national objectives." The referred to factors are not enumerated but the inference is that every significant fact bearing on petroleum policy has been weighed in line with relevant national objectives—again not enumerated—leading to a conclusion that "a modest increase in the level of licensed crude oil imports above that which would be provided by the present program for districts I–IV can now be undertaken."

This conclusion flies in the face of all of the relevant facts available to me concerning the economic health of the domestic petroleum industry. I have reviewed the record of earnings of the oil industry, the level of shut-in production seeking a market, the level of exploratory activity and drilling activity, the volumes of our proved oil and natural gas reserves, the level of employment in the industry and I have reviewed the price record for crude oil and refined petroleum products. The facts simply do not support the conclusion that the oil import volumes should be increased.

The petroleum industry's rate of return at 8.6 percent on invested capital is below that for all manufacturing industries despite a considerably greater risk factor. Earnings in the industry for the period 1955–61 averaged 9.1 percent and have persisted below that for manufacturing industries in general which averaged 10.4 percent for this same 7-year period.

The volume of U.S. oil shut in for lack of market exceeds 2.5 million barrels per day at the present time and has remained around this level since the oil import program went into effect. Exploration activity as measured by geophysical activity is at the lowest point in a decade. The number of active rotary rigs drilling for oil and gas has set a new low in each of the last 3 years and currently rigs active are 40 percent below the year 1955. Exploratory or wildcat well completions drilled last year totaled only 9,000 down steadily each year since 1959 and currently only two-thirds as many wildcat wells are being drilled as was the case in 1955. The total number of wells completed has dropped steadily for 4 straight years and today is running 20 percent under 1955 levels. The price of domestic crude oil has decreased steadily since 1957 and today crude sells for $2.89 compared with $3.09 as recently as 1957. It is difficult to recall any other commodity that sells for less today than it did 6 years ago. The decline in the price of crude oil is clear evidence that the volume of oil already being imported is excessive. Gasoline prices in 1962, when taxes are excluded, were lower than in 1961 and are one-half cent lower than 5 years ago. Crude oil reserves in the United States actually decreased slightly last year and have hovered around the 31 billion barrel mark for the last 3 years.

Despite these facts the report concludes that more imports rather than less should be allowed to enter the country. I am unable to follow the logic that lower employment, fewer wells being drilled, lower prices for crude oil and products, an actual depression in the well-drilling industry with dozens of companies going out of business, and a smaller reserve position indicate that more imports are indicated to further our national security objectives. Larger volume imports will further depress the domestic industry's health and weaken our national security as to oil.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very fine remarks and join with him in this effort to bring to the American public the true picture of this vitally important industry.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER.]

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from the State of West Virginia, the largest coal-producing State in the Union, I wish to urge not only the retention of the present oil import program but also a strengthening of those provisions of the program applying to residual fuel oil.

From the very first day I took the oath of office as a Member of this body, I have worked with my West Virginia colleagues and those from other States in an attempt to limit the quotas on the importation of residual oil.

The program must be strengthened in order to hold the line against residual oil imports, which have increased from 357,000 barrels daily, when the program was started in March of 1957, to 575,000 barrels per day at the present time.

This vast amount of oil—equivalent to 50 million tons of coal annually—is sold in competition with coal, chiefly on the east coast.

This competition has created very difficult conditions for the coal industry and those people who rely upon the production and transportation of coal for a livelihood.

The coal industry has shown very heartening signs of recovering some of the ground it has lost in past years. Thanks to an almost unprecedented increase in efficiency and productivity, both in producing coal and in transporting it to market in one form or another, and in improved efficiency in the burning of coal to produce electric power, some improvement in production has been evident in recent years.

At this point I would like to compliment both the coal and power industries for the teamwork they have shown in the development and utilization of coal.

But all of this progress can be seriously retarded by any further increase in residual oil imports.

The very nature of residual oil—a waste product of foreign refining operations—and the manner in which it is and can be sold to always undersell coal assures it of a ready market. The only thing which stands between the coal industry and further substantial losses of markets to imported oil is the oil import program.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it crystal clear that I am a strong supporter of President Kennedy, and I do not entirely share the criticisms which have been made against the Kennedy administration on the floor today. I happen to be one of the hundreds of thousands of West Virginians who deeply appreciate the steadfast efforts of President Kennedy to give an economic upsurge to the economy of our State and other areas with high numbers of unemployed. We in West Virginia are grateful, Mr. Speaker, that we have a President in the White House named John F. Kennedy.

Yet the economy of West Virginia is geared to coal—its production and transportation—and the oil import program is essential to the economic resurgence which our State is making against heavy odds.

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for giving me the opportunity to have my remarks follow the remarks of the gentleman from West Virginia.

A group of us from the Atlantic Seaboard discussed in the well of the House the residual oil problem last March. At page 4951 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 28 my remarks on this subject are more fully set out. In part they are as follows:

> The coal industry is spending millions through the National Coal Association and the National Coal Policy Conference Board in Washington to sell false propaganda. Throughout the world the coal industry is fighting not only for the status quo, but a turning back of the clock. Because of their unity they are temporarily winning this battle through various forms of controls and unfair taxation on competitive fuels.
>
> The price the New England taxpayer is paying for a few New Frontier West Virginia votes is very high indeed.
>
> According to the Congressional Quarterly magazine, some U.S. oil interests have joined the coal industry in favoring residual oil quotas. There is no convincing evidence that removal of residual oil restrictions would hurt American oil companies. All the evidence suggests the opposite.
>
> SYMPATHY MAY WEAR THIN
>
> American oil companies should carefully consider the facts before joining an embargo movement on New England progress. One of these facts that I hope they will pay particular attention to is: they traditionally look to intelligent Representatives of New England for assistance in their annual fight to maintain the 27½-percent depletion allowance. One of the main purposes of this allowance is to insure an abundance of petroleum products to benefit the American consumer. This allowance was never intended to act as a handmaiden of restrictions. Intelligent and thoughtful people in New England are sympathetic to the needs of the U.S. oil industry. However, when we find the oil industry combining with groups who want to unnecessarily raise the price of New England fuel, I think it is reasonable to point out that our sympathy may wear thin.

I call to the attention of the gentleman from Texas and many who have joined with him today that the patience of some of us in New England will wear extremely thin if we find they are in coalition with the coal people to embargo New England.

I call attention to the fact that recently President Kennedy and Secretary Udall in recommending the Passamaquoddy project pointed out that New England electrical rates are the highest in the country. One of the reasons they are so high is the embargo created by the administration, which has raised the price of residual oil and has resulted in high prices for New England fuel. Despite the position taken by the gentleman from West Virginia, we urge that you people who are truly interested in the oil industry not to be beguiled into joining a coalition with them. As I suggested last March there may come a time when you will call for our help when we are considering such things as depletion allowances.

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. Speaker, I think that those of us from the western oil and gas States should make it quite clear that the problems of crude oil imports and residual oil imports are two quite separate and distinct problems. This distinction is extremely important, and we should keep it in mind as the discussion on import problems progresses. The factors which influence these two programs are highly diverse; there is little, if any, relationship between the two.

In the case of crude oil, there is available from many points around the world, in Venezuela, in the Middle East, in North Africa, a flood of low-cost crude oil which, if permitted to flow into this country unrestricted, would shut down the domestic petroleum industry completely. Such a situation would leave this Nation at the mercy of the foreign nations which control the production of that crude oil—or of the foreign nation which chose to interrupt commerce on the high seas during a time of national emergency.

There has been bipartisan agreement since the mid-1950's, Mr. Speaker, that the influx of foreign crude oil should be regulated so that this Nation could continue to rely on a healthy, strong domestic oil producing industry to supply us with a ample outflow of inexpensive energy for our domestic economy, and for our war machine if it should ever have to be placed in motion.

No one has ever seriously suggested that the oil wells of the United States, producing as they do hundreds or less barrels of crude daily, could compete with the giant outflow of the Middle East fields, where the daily production from a single well may run into the thousands of barrels.

This is an open and shut question, Mr. Speaker, and the United States should not place itself in the position where it has to import the major part of its energy supplies, any more than we would wish to be in the spot where most of our food came from oversea sources. The truth is that, if we were to lose our low-cost energy sources at home, we would very shortly lose our food supplies, too, because the one is dependent upon the other.

But heavy fuel oil presents a different problem. Unlike domestic crude, there is a shortage of domestically produced residual. During the postwar period, domestic refineries have continuously reduced their production of residual fuel oil for basically economic reasons. U.S. refiners find themselves selling this product today for $2.50—less than they pay for an equivalent quantity of crude oil, and that allows nothing for the processing cost, the transportation, and marketing cost. Residual oil produced in the United States, Mr. Speaker, is sold in order to reduce the loss involved in disposing of the product. Since residual oil is not a profitable item, it is not surprising that U.S. refiners make just as little of it as they can. There was a time when nearly one-third of every barrel of crude oil ended up as residual oil. But that was decades ago when refineries amounted to nothing more than topping operations. In these days of modern refinery technology, with catalytic cracking producing new advances each day, more and more of the black, sticky residual oil is turned into valuable products such as gasoline, and home heating oil. Modern refineries today are able to convert more than nine-tenths of each barrel of crude into valuable products, leaving only about 8 percent to be disposed of as heavy fuel oil. Further-

more, this 8 percent constitutes only about 4 percent of the value of the total barrel of crude. This downward trend in the production of domestic residual can be noted in inland refineries which have been relatively insulated from imported supplies as well as in the coastal refineries. Therefore, this trend has been essentially independent of the magnitude of imports and is therefore incorrect to relate the residual fuel oil problem to the national security interests of the domestic oil industry.

Residual oil, Mr. Speaker, is used under large boilers, in industrial and commercial installations which have the special equipment needed in order to burn the product. It is never used in private homes. And, as the domestic supply of this product has dwindled over the years, its markets have gradually been taken over by natural gas and coal, depending upon the location of the market. In the southwestern States, and in areas near them served by efficient pipelines, natural gas today supplies much of the market which once went to residual oil.

Similarly, in States near large bodies of coal, this fuel tends to be the product which is used in industrial and commercial heating, although it has lost large markets to oil and gas in home heating, and from dieselization of the railroads.

The shrinking domestic output of heavy fuel oil has also been supplemented in recent years by imported heavy fuel oil, produced primarily from heavy Venezuelan crudes which are particularly adapted to it. But this imported residual oil is competitive in the United States only in a narrow strip along our eastern seaboard, at points comparatively distant from coal producing areas. This underscores the fact, Mr. Speaker, that imported residual oil is competitive primarily with coal, and then only in a very limited area.

The basic reason for this is that, paradoxically, coal and heavy fuel oil share two basic characteristics: First, they are both available at very low cost at the point of production. But, second, their costs rise very sharply when they have to be transported over great distances, and particularly if they are transported by land. Thus, coal can be shipped by rail to Hampton Roads and transported to Western Europe at prices less than European coal companies can deliver their own coal to industrial consumers.

But when coal has to be shipped by rail to New England, it competes with heavy fuel oil brought in by sea from the Caribbean.

Similarly, residual oil can be brought to the United States from the Caribbean, and brought up our eastern rivers and waterways for a short distance, at a price competitive with coal. But when it reaches a point about 100 miles up the waterways from the coast, the costs of the special equipment required to handle the gummy stuff brings its price up to the point where coal takes over.

Residual oil, actually, does not compete with western coal deposits, Mr. Speaker, because by the time it was brought into the Western States from the Nation's refining centers, its price would be prohibitive. So imports of heavy fuel oil are no threat to western coal producers.

But the point which I really intend to drive home, Mr. Speaker, is that imported heavy fuel is not competitive with domestic crude oil. I know of no U.S. refiner who would increase his production of heavy fuel oil in the event that imports of the product were cut off. No domestic refiner can be found who will state that he has increased his output of residual in the several years since import quotas were imposed on residual oil. In fact, domestic production of residual oil has continued to decline, as refiners improved their facilities in an effort to minimize their production of a loss item.

To state my point in another way, Mr. Speaker, the curtailment of residual oil imports does not provide a market for domestic crude oil. Elimination of residual oil imports would not necessarily enhance the market for domestic crude oil. Consumers of heavy fuel oil would, under those circumstances, simply have to use an alternative fuel.

Now, it might be argued that domestic refiners and producers would suffer from excessive imports of heavy fuel oil because the consequent drop in the market price for the product would reduce refiners' realizations on their sales of residual oil, and thus depress the price they were able to pay for our own U.S. crude oil. But even this argument will not stand inspection.

In the first place, residual oil is not imported in huge quantities which are determined without regard to whether there is a market for the product. It is, as I have said, costly to handle and to store. Therefore, importations have traditionally been regulated by the demand for the product along the eastern seaboard. It is not brought in in a flood, which gluts the market and breaks the price.

But let us suppose that residual oil imports should reduce the market price in the United States by as much as 50 cents a barrel—and this is a very extreme assumption, Mr. Speaker. In that case, the composite price of a barrel of refined products would decline by only about 1 percent.

We must remember that residual fuel sells for $2.50 or less, compared with $3 for a barrel of crude oil, while products such as gasoline bring as much as $6 a barrel, and home heating oils bring as much as $4 a barrel.

I think that all of these facts make it apparent why domestic refiners and crude producers have little, if any, economic interest in restricting imports of residual fuel oil into the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER].

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Texas for taking this opportunity to call to the attention of the Members of Congress some of the disturbing factors which are having an adverse effect upon an industry which is so vital to the national security and economic progress of the United States.

The petroleum industry is one of the most important segments of the economy of my State of Kansas. Kansas ranks sixth among the oil producing States in the Nation. It is disheartening to one from an oil State to witness a gradual deterioration of this industry in a period of only a few years.

More than a year ago there were efforts in the Congress to assist this ailing industry by introducing legislation which would have strengthened limitations on oil imports. These efforts were denied; and oil imports have been allowed to increase.

This year the administration has submitted to Congress tax proposals which would further suppress the normal and natural progress of the petroleum industry. It is difficult to comprehend the reasoning for placing additional tax burdens upon this industry, when the administration's announced goal is to stimulate the industrial economy through a program of tax reduction.

Now we have before us the report of the Petroleum Study Committee which until a few weeks ago had remained a well-guarded secret. The overall implications of this report to the President, drafted by representatives of seven executive departments, are cause for further alarm. The conclusion of this study appears to be more Federal control of the petroleum industry.

Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with a number of my colleagues in the House, who share a mutual concern for the health and vitality of this industry, in discussing certain aspects of the Petroleum Study Committee's report.

First, the Committee claims that the system of production controls "has strongly tended to increase excess capacity and production costs and to distort competition."

It is vitally important for national security purposes to maintain petroleum producing capacity substantially in excess of peacetime needs, and to expand capacity each year to stay well ahead of rising consumer requirements. It is most difficult to understand the criticism of excess petroleum producing capacity. As long as petroleum continues to be our industrial life's blood, with vast and instantly expanded demands on the industry in times of emergency, the challenge will be to keep expanding our capacity rather than shrinking it as this "secret report" says we should.

The value of U.S. oil to national security has been demonstrated over a period of 45 years of meeting various types of emergencies. Oil has been the key to victory for this Nation in two World Wars.

More recently, and of perhaps more significance as a deterrent to World War III, a number of political crises have emphasized the essentiality of maintaining adequate oil supplies within the United States. In 1951, the production of oil in Iran was shut down and 600,000 barrels daily were cut off as a source of supply to the free world. Five years later, in 1956, the closing of the Suez Canal posed a grave threat to world peace. The availability of reserve supplies from the United States and, to a lesser extent, from other Western Hemisphere sources averted this threat of

war. Today, Communist activities in Cuba again threaten the availability of oil supplied from foreign sources through infiltration and sabotage activities in South America.

The Committee's report inaccuratley charges that State regulation of production has increased costs. On the contrary there is strong evidence that State regulation has tended to eliminate waste and conserve our mineral wealth. Without States regulation of production, there would be a severe waste of our resources through overproduction of petroleum for which there would be neither market nor facilities for storage.

In regards to competition, State proration and conservation systems have not distorted competition as the report claims. The exact opposite is true. The system of State controls has preserved industry competition through the setting of production allowables designed to provide for each well its equitable portion of petroleum demand.

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] for his very appropriate remarks in this discussion.

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

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

Mr. RUMSFELD. I first want to commend the gentleman from Texas on his very fine presentation here this evening and for bringing this matter to the attention of the Members of the House. The gentleman from New Hampshire raised the question of percentage depletion. I would like very briefly, if the gentleman from Texas would explain or account for this special tax treatment which is allowed the oil and gas industry. I think it would be of interest to the Members of the House as well as to this one Member. I am from a district that does not produce oil but we are big users of oil.

Mr. FOREMAN. I appreciate the question of the gentleman from Illinois and I am pleased to answer.

Percentage depletion is simply a depreciation allowance on a depleting capital asset. Percentage depletion merely recognizes that oil in the ground is the producer's capital, and that this capital is depleted—or used up—by the operation of an oil well. The provision is based on the accepted tax principle that only income from capital should be taxed, not the capital itself.

It is my belief that the highest national interest is served by maintaining a healthy dynamic oil industry and that to insure that it is important to preserve incentives—such as the percentage depletion principle—which encourage the search for oil. It is not enough to find as much oil as we consume. We must find more oil than we consume. Our reserves must be kept high for they are the base of our national security. In order for us to maintain the necessary reserves of the oil and gas fuel energy requirements of our Nation without the oil percentage depletion principle, one of two steps, if not both, would have to be taken. First, the consumer price for petroleum products would rise sharply, and/or secondly, the Federal Government would have to subsidize the oil industry with our tax money, and eventually control it completely. Every American will be required to pay the price, if these socialistic steps are taken. Percentage depletion has been incomparably effective for a generation. Who can doubt that it will prove as effective for the generation that lies ahead.

If a man is going to bet on a horse race or a poker hand, he had better know the odds. This same advice holds for a man considering investing in a wildcat oil venture. Let us consider the case of an oilman about to invest in the hunt for oil. And this is an open game. Oilmen are constantly on the search for investment capital. Anyone can get in who wants to play, whether it is for $10, $100, or any larger amount that he dares to risk. Now, the odds of finding any oil, getting any return, are 1 in 9. The odds of getting your money back or slightly better, are 1 in 44. The odds of hitting the jackpot—that is, finding a 50 million barrel field are one in a thousand. Only the most venturesome will play in this kind of "game," and many operators play a long time before they beat even the 1 to 9 odds; many never do.

In view of the general misunderstanding and confusion regarding the basic issues involved in the question of the depletion provision, I felt this letter, published by the Empire Trust Co., New York, N.Y., might help in clarifying its importance to our economy and security. Therefore, I wish to insert the letter at this point:

[From the Empire Trust Letter]

THE OIL PERCENTAGE DEPLETION PRINCIPLE—HOW IT WORKS FOR AMERICA

Suppose you wanted to stop—and reverse—the wheels of progress. Suppose you wanted to turn back the clock—sending American life and living standards back to the early 19th century. What would be the quickest way of foisting backwardness on your fellow Americans?

The answer is very simple and as effective as it is simple: You would find a way of cutting off the Nation's oil resources.

We call these resources—in accurate but unilluminating terms—the principal source of our fuel energy. And so they are. But the reality is at once accurate, more striking, and more compelling. It is this:

OIL IS THE FOUNTAINHEAD OF AMERICA'S PROGRESS

Oil alone did not bring us to our present high place of military and industrial power. But it is equally clear that without oil we could not have grown to our present stature: that without constantly increasing quantities of oil in the future we cannot grow in stature. It seems scarcely too much to say that it occupies among us a position almost of industrial omnipotence and the reasons are not far to seek.

Ranking behind Red China, India, and the Soviet Union, we are the fourth largest grouping of people in the world. But we are small on the scale of the world's total population. We account for only 6 percent of all men.

We loom large in the industrial and political affairs of the world—and in the careful calculations of would-be aggressor nations—because of this fact:

The United States uses almost 40 percent of the world's total commercial energy consumption.

Let us look back for a moment in order to better look forward. Just a short while ago—on August 27—the Nation celebrated its oil centenary. For on that day in 1859, Edwin L. Drake, a former train conductor, struck oil at 69½ feet at Titusville, Pa.

Drake's well produced 20 barrels of oil a day at its peak. One hundred years later the United States produces more than 7 million barrels daily from its own wells and consumes more than 9 million barrels daily. What then, is the measure of our rapidly growing appetite for oil? It is this:

It took 77 years—from 1859 to 1936—for domestic petroleum consumption to reach a billion barrels annually. But the jump from 1 billion to 2 was accomplished in a mere 12 years. And 7 years from then—in 1955—America's annual petroleum consumption surged past the 3-billion-barrel mark.

The United States cannot lead a summer grasshopper's life. It must prepare for the future if it is to survive in the present. Even if there were no great powers antagonistic to us, we would still have to provide more oil for the years ahead.

OIL FOR THE SPACE AGE

As we move into a new world, it becomes clearer that America's greatest days lie ahead.

What do they hold for oil? It is estimated that by 1975—only 12 years hence—our annual petroleum consumption will rise from its present 3¼ billion barrels to 6 billion barrels. Annual petrochemical production alone will be 85 billion pounds by 1965.

These estimates may well be on the conservative side. For, as experience shows, future estimates of petroleum consumption in the United States have often lagged behind the fact. Hence the 1975 demand may be on the order of more than 6 million barrels or over twice today's consumption.

We have often worked industrial wonders but ingenious as we are we can't suddenly pull 2 or 3 additional billion barrels of oil out of the earth every year. It must be found, developed, and financed in advance of the event.

OIL IS THE FLAME OF OUR NATIONAL LIFE

Oil and natural gas together furnish nearly three-fourths of the fuel energy requirements of the Nation.

And while our population grows, our industry grows to meet the increasing demands of an increasing population, and our standard of living, long ago risen past the meat-and-potatoes stage, annually permits more of us to live better and better.

Thus tomorrow's demands for oil and gas may well dwarf those of today.

THE SHIRT LOSERS AND THE WINNERS

The first requisite of producing oil is to find it. And finding oil in the United States has always been a risky business. The oil seeker has to be an odd combination of Brodie, who took a chance by jumping off the Brooklyn Bridge, and a businessman.

Some oil explorers became rich. But thousands of them lost their shirts. There is a hard luck story in every one of America's 472,000 dry holes.

THE BIGGER THEY ARE

Let us see how it is today even when the explorer for oil is widely experienced, has at his disposal all that modern science can provide for petroleum exploration, and is well-heeled financially. Do these factors insure success in the gamble of looking for oil?

Early this year one of the major oil companies abandoned its most expensive dry hole. We do not know how much was invested in the venture, but the company magazine does tell us of the awesome conditions under which its men worked in their search for indispensable oil.

A long campaign of preparation preceded the actual drilling. As though getting ready for invading a foreign country, housing fa-

cilities and a mountain of supplies were assembled at Seattle and loaded on barges. Then the barges were towed 2,500 miles to Jute Bay on the Alaskan coast. There they were hauled over a newly built road from the beach to the drill site which was, we are told, "330 trackless miles from Anchorage."

Here was established a self-contained community in a remote and bleak wilderness which was, so to speak, 3,000 miles from a lemon. In this unrelentingly hostile environment men endured terrible hardships for more than 500 days while their drilling bit was slowly driven through the eternally frozen tundra to the great depth of 14,374 feet, or nearly 3 miles.

But what lay at the end of this arctic rainbow? A dry hole.

THE HUNTERS AND THE HUNTED

The moral of this story of a dry hole points up the dilemma of our oil industry. The country's economic and industrial power floats upon oil. But there is still no sure-fire way of finding it directly. Thus Everett de Golyer, the father of modern petroleum geophysics, at the time of his death in 1956, was planning a conference of Americans in many fields of science to ascertain if men outside the oil industry, by a freshness of point of view and novel approach, could develop a technique that has so far eluded men everywhere: The technique that would enable them to find oil directly.

Over the years there have been notable advances in the art, or science, of oil exploration. But as we all know even men employing the most ingenious scientific devices can never be sure they are going to find oil until by the expensive trial-and-error method of drilling they find it or they strike a dry hole. There is no inexpensive short cut to success.

SLOT MACHINE ODDS

Hence the would-be oil explorer must have two tools. The first is his belief that he knows where oil may be found in commercial quantities. The second is his courage to risk his money in the belief that he is right. His courage must be great and his conviction in his rightness fervent because he knows he is working against slot machine odds. They are no less than 8 to 1; that is, for every hole that finds some oil or gas in unexplored territory in the United States we have drilled 8 "dusters." These are appalling odds. Few men would enter so risky an enterprise—or could remain in it—if its high perils were not tempered, or compensated, by rewards somewhat commensurate with these risks.

AND 'RITHMETIC

Even finding oil is not enough to endow you with what Mark Twain called "the calm confidence of a Christian with four aces in his hand." The arithmetic is stark. It now can cost well over $100,000 and sometimes over $1 million to drill a wildcat. Men are drilling deeper all the time. The deeper you go into the ground, the deeper you go into your pocket and we must remember that since only 1 exploratory well in 8 uncovers any petroleum—and only about 1 in 50 makes a commercially successful strike—the prospector must be prepared to invest large sums of capital without any guarantee of success.

NATURE AND THE CONGRESS

Nature has already stacked the cards against the oil prospector. If the tax laws added unduly to these built-in hazards of his business, by making it virtually impossible for him to come out ahead even when he did find oil, there would be no incentive to take the risks. The hunt for oil would end abruptly.

Congress recognized this when the Federal income tax took effect back in 1913. After some experimentation with the principle of discovery value depletion it adopted the present percentage depletion provision a third of a century ago at a rate that still stands—27½ percent.

When this happened our population was about 115 million: our gross national product less than $100 billion. No one could have foreseen the United States, or the world, of today. But the country owes it to this wisdom of Congress that we have held our position as the world's leading oil producer and so a world leader in peace and war.

For Congress realized that looking for oil hidden far below the surface of the earth was an extremely risky business. It knew that just as there is a difference between courage and foolhardiness, so there is also a difference, compelling to sensible men, between taking the ordinary risks of ordinary business and the extraordinary risks of looking for oil. Hence Congress, aware of the vital importance of abundant oil supplies among us, and aware, too, that men must be encouraged to look for oil, adopted the realistic tax treatment method that is called percentage depletion.

WHAT IS PERCENTAGE DEPLETION?

Briefly, percentage depletion merely recognizes that oil in the ground is the producer's capital, and that this capital is depleted—or used up—by the operation of an oil well. The provision is based on the accepted tax principle that only income from capital should be taxed, not the capital itself.

To prevent an oil producer's capital from being taxed as income, he is permitted to deduct from his gross income—for tax purposes—up to 27½ percent of the value of the oil and gas he produces during the course of the year. The deduction is figured by each oil and gas lease or property, and it is limited to 50 percent of the net income of each lease or property, i.e., no income, no deduction. Because of this limitation it is estimated the 27½ percent is reduced to about 23 percent. The deduction approximates the capital value of the oil in the ground. Such treatment provides the producer with part of the funds needed to find more oil and thus stay in business.

Percentage depletion is not confined to the petroleum industry. It applies to practically all the other extractive industries—the mining of coal, lead, uranium, granite, limestone, and clay to name a few of the scores of raw materials covered. The rates vary roughly for the different minerals according to costs and risks of exploration and the variation in value of the resources in the ground.

The principle in all cases is the same. For the law recognizes that taxation of the value of these natural resources, as if they were part of the producer's income, would discourage their discovery and development. Percentage depletion encourages producers to find and develop new reserves of oil and other natural resources. This is exactly what Congress intended.

WHAT HAS THE DEPLETION PROVISION DONE FOR AMERICA?

When the depletion provision became effective in 1925, our oil reserves were 8.5 billion barrels. But in the period 1925–58, our domestic oil industry produced 52.4 billion barrels, or six times our reserves at the time percentage depletion was adopted. It has been brilliantly successful in making America supreme industrially and militarily. Presently, our proved oil reserves are at an alltime high.

WHAT DOES OIL PLENTY MEAN TO EVERY ONE OF US?

Abundant oil is the essence of our industrial-military might. It is the very heart of our world leadership. Lord Curzon, British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, observed that in the First World War "the Allies floated to victory on a sea of oil." We supplied 90 percent of that sea. After the war every American knew oil was the key to our power.

Recently, Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz pointed out that the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor might have been decisive if they had destroyed a tank farm at the base that contained 4½ million barrels of fuel oil.

"The loss of that great fuel supply would have been well-nigh irreparable," Nimitz said. "The campaigns against the Japanese would have been so much delayed and the enemy might have established themselves so strongly in the Western Pacific that years of effort would be needed for their expulsion."

PEACE HAS ITS OIL PROBLEMS NO LESS THAN WAR

Peacetime demands for petroleum exceed those of wartime. Consumption has increased 86 percent over the wartime demands of 1945. And in this dangerous period, that is neither war nor peace, our petroleum demands will continue to rise.

It is not enough to find as much oil as we consume. We must find more oil than we consume. Our reserves must be kept high for they are the base of our national security.

WHEN GOOD NEIGHBORS GET TOGETHER THEY DISCUSS OIL

Earlier this year the United States-Canadian Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs met in Ottawa. The presence of three members of the President's Cabinet in our delegation attests to its importance. Not surprisingly, the Committee talked oil.

It first reviewed the factors affecting petroleum supply and demand everywhere including, of course, Canada and the United States. Then, in the light of its review, it stated three principles upon which its members agreed:

First. Continued oil exploration and development were needed on defense grounds.

Second. There must be constant growth and stability within the oil industry. But this could be had only when there were incentives for further exploration and development.

Third. A healthy, dynamic oil industry must be maintained throughout the western Pacific.

This is sound counsel. It is also compelling in the matter of national survival. Here oil plays an overwhelming role. As a prime instrument of national survival, it can best be served by: Retaining tax incentives, and other incentives, that encourage risk-taking men to search for more oil.

DOES THE DEPLETION PROVISION WORK?

We Americans are a practical people. Hence when we are dealing with almost anything whether it be as trivial as a new kind of cigarette lighter or as important as a new public policy, we ask: Does it work?

Let's apply this question to the depletion principle. The answer—based on a generation of experience—must be yes.

Has the depletion principle worked not only in peace but in the life-or-death time of war?

Here again the answer is yes. During the Second World War we fueled with oil the mightiest fighting machine ever assembled by man.

We supplied the multimillion forces of our fighting allies with oil fuel. More than half of the tonnage we sent around the world in the course of man's greatest war, was made up of petroleum products. Nor is this all.

Here at home, oil and natural gas supplied the larger part of the fuel energy that kept going our colossal war industrial machine, and superimposed upon it, a civilian production so great and diverse that all retail sales reached an all-time high and no American suffered for lack of anything essential to his well-being.

Fortunately, by the time of Pearl Harbor, oil men had already been stimulated by the

depletion principle during the preceding 16 years to hunt for oil.

IS THE DEPLETION PROVISION EFFECTIVE IN THE COLD WAR?

Again the answer is yes. Current drilling activity is at the rate of 10,000 wildcats this year. But we need more. This may be barely sufficient to maintain our reserve position.

Let this be said. Our wildcatters are risking their own money to find oil in a country where it daily becomes harder to find. What of the Soviet Union against whom, in a way, they are pitted? There a state-owned enterprise that does not have to concern itself with profits or taxes is employing its giant resources to exploit the oil resources of continental Russia whose land area is three times greater than ours.

It would seem illogical to impose an artificial handicap upon the oil industry in its struggle against this colossus, by increasing its risks through any weakening of the depletion principle.

HAS DEPLETION WORKED SUCCESSFULLY FOR INDUSTRY?

The question answers itself since oil and natural gas supply about three-fourths of the fuel energy requirements of the world's greatest producer of farm and factory products.

HAS DEPLETION WORKED FOR THE CONSUMER?

The fact that it has is apparent in that the consumer has full access to all the petroleum energy he wants—whether it is diesel fuel to run a machine, fuel oil or natural gas to heat his home or cook his dinner, or the most familiar of all petroleum products—gasoline to power his car. And this energy comes to him at reasonable cost. Take the record of gasoline, for instance.

In the period 1949–58, prices of all items rose 21 percent. Many showed greater increases. But the motorist's gasoline (excluding taxes) sold for only 6 percent more at the service station in 1958 than in 1949.

DOES THE OIL INDUSTRY ESCAPE TAXATION THROUGH DEPLETION?

Hardly. In 1957, for example, taxes derived from the petroleum industry and its products totaled nearly $6.9 billion. Contrast this with taxes paid by other industries. They were:

| | *Billion* |
|---|---|
| Alcoholic beverages | $4.2 |
| Automobiles | 3.2 |
| Tobacco | 2.7 |
| Telephone and telegraph | 1.9 |
| Steel | 1.4 |

DOES THE DEPLETION PRINCIPLE EXCESSIVELY ENRICH THE OIL INDUSTRY?

During the years that the depletion principle has been effective, oil companies' after-tax earnings have averaged only 9.6 percent of invested capital. For all manufacturing companies the average figure was 10.4 percent.

WHAT OF TOMORROW?

The big day in the oil industry's calendar is tomorrow. Every time a barrel of oil is sold, 1½ new barrels must be found to meet tomorrow's rising demand and maintain reserves.

The industry also knows that its tomorrows—and those of the Nation—are likely to be bright. For there still remains hidden beneath our soil and coastal waters huge undiscovered stores of oil. If this is true, then there remains to be brought to bear upon our national life great, unrealized potentials of industrial-military power that will increase the prosperity and security of the country.

The stimulus to the realization of these potentials is the same stimulus that for a generation has been so effective in producing the petroleum and natural gas that have provided the energies for the world's greatest industrial, automotive, agricultural nation: The stimulus—the depletion principle.

It has been incomparably effective for a generation. Who can doubt that it will prove as effective for the generation that lies ahead: perhaps the most dangerous, and certainly the most challenging period, in the 6,000 years of man's recorded life on earth.

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

Mr. FOREMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN], in alerting the House to the dangers inherent in the secret Cabinet committee report on the oil import program. There is no question whatever that if the philosophy set forth in this document is followed the domestic fuels industries will be exposed to increased harmful competition from cheap foreign oil.

Kansas was blessed with large reserves of all fuels—oil, natural gas, and coal. The men who have had the foresight and initiative to develop these vast amounts of natural resources are entitled to the protection which the oil import program provides.

All but 8 of the 58 counties in the First District have producing oil or gas wells. In Kansas the total value of production from oil and gas wells amounted to almost one-half billion dollars in 1961. This activity and related industries provided employment for 28,800 persons.

Eastern Kansas has recoverable coal reserves estimated at 10 billion tons. Production has been limited in recent years but there exists in these rich coal deposits the potential for another large and profitable industrial activity for our State.

Thus, it is readily obvious that the First District has a big stake in the oil import program.

The producers of oil and coal in Kansas are concerned, and rightfully so, about the future of the program. They are aware that within this administration there is an inherent hostility to the program. Top officials in this administration make no secret of the fact they believe controls on imports of oil should be removed, and this foreign oil be permitted to enter the country and compete with our domestic oil and coal for markets.

Oil production in Kansas is severely limited at the present time and production in Kansas has not increased as rapidly as oil imports. The percentage of total crude petroleum produced in the United States by Kansas has steadily fallen since 1952—from 5 to 4.3 percent in 1961. Average production in barrels produced daily has fallen from 327,500 in 1959 to 307,050 in 1962. While production has continued to fall, producers, in face of rising consumer demands, have been faced with fluctuating prices of crude oil. Average value in 1952 was $2.53, in 1958 the price was $3.01, and in 1963, it is $2.91.

Every barrel of crude oil imported replaced a barrel of domestically produced crude. Imports of crude oil and refined products have risen from a total of 952,000 in 1952 to 2,079,000 in 1962.

Every barrel of residual oil imported not only takes a market for domestic coal, but it also is rapidly taking away a market for domestic residual oil, which amounts to about 10 percent of refinery runs.

The oil import program must be continued and strengthened. The Kennedy administration may very well consider the domestic oil and coal industries expendable in the interests of foreign policy, but the men and women of Kansas, who have such a big stake in strong and expanding oil and coal industries, disagree strongly with this point of view.

I trust that we have, by speaking out here today, let the administration know that the oil import program is in the best interests of the Nation, its economy, and its security, and we will not stand idly by and permit this vital program be scuttled, either openly or through secret documents.

OIL AND GAS IN KANSAS

All figures are for Kansas except where noted.

Ninety counties produce oil and/or gas.

Fifty counties produced oil and/or gas in First District (those not producing are Greeley, Smith, Jewell, Mitchell, Cloud, Ottawa, Lincoln, Republic).

Five million twenty-five thousand acres have proved productive of oil or gas.

Twenty-two percent of total land area is productive or leased for 1963.

Seven billion two hundred and ninety-one million two hundred and sixty-seven thousand dollars is the value for all time to January 1, 1963, at wells, of crude oil produced—$425,884,000 is the estimated value of petroleum production in Kansas in 1962.

Two dollars and ninety-one cents is the average field price of crude oil per barrel in 1962—same as in 1959.

In relation to other mineral products crude petroleum is first in value; natural gas is second; cement is third.

Crude petroleum comprises 85.9 percent of the total value of all minerals.

Thirty and one-tenth of 1 percent of total State taxes received from fuels and vehicles taxes.

Kansas is fourth in total wells drilled of oil and gas for all time to January 1, 1963.

Kansas is fifth in estimated number of employees engaged in crude oil and natural gas production—13,800 individuals. This does not include refining process, pipeline transportation, gas companies and systems and gasoline service stations. If those were included, Kansas would have an estimated total of 28,800 individuals, but would be ninth in the Nation in total employees.

Following are national figures published by the Department of the Interior, March 11, 1963: 1,913,631 barrels of crude and unfinished oil, finished petroleum products and residual fuel oil were imported daily into the United States and Puerto Rico in the last half of 1962.

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the gentleman from Kansas for his very fine and appropriate remarks in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my thanks and appreciation to the various Members of this body who have joined

me today in expressing our concern over this report as well as to the many Members who have asked to extend their remarks in the RECORD concerning this subject.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks on the subject of this discussion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the question under discussion here today is one which is of vital interest to the State of Kentucky.

Kentucky is the second largest coal producing State in the Nation, with a production of 65 million tons in 1962. The mining of this coal provided jobs for about 25,000 persons and a total payroll in excess of $123 million. In addition, the transportation of this coal to market by the railroads serving the State provided a substantial portion of their revenues and payroll of about $107 million.

With the coal industry playing such a large part in the economy of the State, Kentucky is extremely interested in seeing to it that realistic and effective controls are maintained on imports of residual fuel oil. Much of the coal produced in the State must compete for markets against this imported waste oil, and if import controls should be removed the coal economy of Kentucky would suffer an irreparable damage.

Coal is a basic American commodity, the Nation's No. 1 energy fuel. In the interests of the economy of the entire Nation, and of the national security, the present oil import program must be retained and strengthened.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the New England States are envious of their fellow citizens in Texas, in Oklahoma, in Kansas, and in the other great oil and gas producing States. The fortunate residents of those States have lying beneath their feet vast reserves of petroleum and natural gas which warm them in winter, cool them in summer, and fuel their industries and commerce the year around. Furthermore, these vast sources of inexpensive energy, when transported to the other States of the Union by pipeline, tanker and barge, provide vital energy for all of our citizens, and a handsome source of revenues to those States which have been fortunate enough to find such liquid gold beneath their plains.

But Mr. Speaker, the eyes of New England residents turn from the green of envy to the red of anger when they discover the representatives of the great oil and gas States collaborating with New England's enemies in a campaign to cut off the limited supplies of energy which are available to us. We in New England necessarily must find a source of energy from outside our borders. All we ask is that the energy-rich States, secure in their treasures, refrain from political logrolling which threatens to cut off the limited supplies of inexpensive energy which are available to us.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that my colleagues from the Southwestern States, speaking today on the subject of Federal regulation of the domestic crude oil industry, would refrain from coupling this subject with the question of importations of heavy fuel oil.

In actuality, the two products—crude oil and heavy fuel oil—are as different as the gingham dog and the calico cat, and the producers of the two products have even less interest in each other than did Eugene Field's imaginary animals.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there has been sufficient confusion and misunderstanding in connection with this very controversial and very political question of oil imports, without any of us contributing to the confusion by trying to correct matters which are totally unrelated to each other.

As a matter of fact, the domestic oil industry has less than no interest in imports of residual fuel oil. If all imports of heavy fuel oil were to be cut off, the domestic oil industry could not expect to produce one more barrel of U.S. crude oil. I am quite certain that most of my colleagues from the great oil producing States understand this thoroughly—much more thoroughly than I do—and will acknowledge the accuracy of what I am saying.

In order to understand this, one has only to learn that a barrel of heavy fuel oil sells for substantially less than the price of a barrel of U.S. crude oil. For example, according to the official data published monthly by the Office of Emergency Planning, a public utility in New England could secure a full tanker cargo of heavy fuel oil last January—at the height of the winter heating season, when prices are at their peak—for $2.11 a barrel. Purchasers in barge lots had to pay $2.18 for heavy fuel oil delivered to their facilities. If it was delivered by truck or tank car, then the price rose to $2.46 a barrel.

Once one has these figures, he does not have to be an economist, or capable of higher mathematics, to understand that U.S. refiners will not willingly and knowingly purchase U.S. domestic crude oil at around $3 a barrel, and convert it into a product which sells for less than $2.50 a barrel delivered into the customer's tank.

With gasoline selling for $6 a barrel, and home heating oils selling for about $4 a barrel, why in the world would a businessman reduce his output of these products in order to meet the demand for a product bringing $2.50 a barrel?

By the time processing, marketing, transportation, and overhead costs are included, the losses on an operation of this kind would be truly astronomical.

Being well aware of these facts, Mr. Speaker, the refiners of the United States have consistently striven to minimize their output of the heavy residual oil. They have gradually developed and installed facilities which will convert all but a fraction of the barrel of crude oil into the lighter, more valuable products, such as gasoline, jet fuel, kerosene, and light home heating oils the sale of which leads to greater profits. I understand that some modern petroleum refineries are being designed to produce no heavy fuel oil at all. Accordingly, in such refineries, the production of residual will be eliminated entirely. And, as I said a minute ago, if the entire supply of heavy fuel oil from overseas were to be cut off at the customs house, no refiner would make a move to increase his output of the heavy oil, because he could only lose money by doing so.

Actually, U.S. refiners have been quite successful in reducing their yield of the residual product. As of 1930, about 31 percent of each barrel of crude oil processed in the United States became residual oil. Refinery techniques and equipment were not sufficiently advanced to further reduce this leftover portion. Since then, however, there has been steady improvement, and heavy fuel oil now constitutes 10 percent or less of the output of U.S. refineries. As the years go by, this proportion will continue to shrink, as it does each year, and eventually, I predict, there will be no residual fuel oil produced in the United States.

Under these circumstances, it is easy to see clearly, Mr. Speaker, that the domestic oil producers and the great oil-producing States have no stake in restrictions on importations of heavy fuel oil. They could not care less. They just are not affected by the flow of commerce in this product, which comes into the east coast areas, in order to make up the deficits in supply which have resulted from the economic trends which I have just described. I am told, Mr. Speaker, that the heavier crude oils of Venezuela are more suited to the production of heavy fuel oil than are typical of U.S. crude oils, and that the production and importation of this product produced a reasonable profit for the importing firms and for the Government of Venezuela, which is heavily dependent upon revenues from this trade to finance its development and improvement programs, so vital in order to counteract the Communist terrorists who are so active in that nation at present.

Of course, these imports of heavy fuel oil are restricted, without one scintilla of justification, as a result of a cynical political liaison of the present administration and the coal industry. Actually, as has been proven by studies conducted by the executive branch and in the other body, these import quotas provide little enough assistance to the coal industry, whose competitive difficulties stem from quite different sources than heavy fuel oil imports. The quotas are in actuality just a gratuitous burden on the shoulders of New England and east coast consumers, who pay higher light and utility bills mounting into the millions of dollars annually so that the present occupant of the White House, who opposed these quotas when he was a Member of the other body, can curry political favor in West Virginia and Pennsylvania.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma knows full well the truth of the situation as I have portrayed it today. In fact, as he may have suspected, most of the data which I have presented to the House today were drawn from the gentleman's own hearings on petroleum imports, conducted in his capacity as chairman of a subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business. The gentleman's own printed

hearings refute the contentions which he made here today, as to the interests of the domestic petroleum industry in importations of heavy fuel oil.

So, Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat what I said at the beginning of these remarks. New England wishes only good fortune to the great oil producing States of the West. New England sees no conflict between its interests and those of the oil producers of this Nation. Unfortunately the New England States do not enjoy an abundant, inexpensive source of energy such as exists in Texas and Oklahoma. We wish we did have such a low-cost energy source.

What we do earnestly request of our colleagues from the West is that they not contribute to our difficulties by lending assistance to the coal industry in its selfish and pointless efforts to cut us off from our imported source of energy. This is little enough to grant since the oil producers of the United States have no stake in the matter whatsoever.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the gentleman from Texas bring to mind a number of questions, questions which we in New England have been asking for a long time. We are still waiting for the answers.

What, Mr. Speaker, is the legal justification for the imposition of restrictions on the import of residual oil? Is it not that such restrictions are necessary for the national security? In fact, is this not the only possible legal justification? If this is the case, then I want to ask why it is that the report of the Office of Emergency Planning, an office which is part of the Executive Offices of the President, has been so completely ignored by the administration. This report makes it abundantly clear that there is no national security justification whatsoever for restrictions on the import of residual oil. The Department of Defense and the Department of State have concurred in this view. Apparently only the gentlemen of the coal industry believe that these restrictions are necessary for the national security. Is the administration prepared to accept their view of national security requirements in opposition to the judgments of its own OEP and the Departments of Defense and State?

Further, Mr. Speaker, what do these inequitable restrictions do to our international relations? The President has emphasized the need for liberalized trade policies as the key to continued American leadership in the world marketplace. Is it not terribly inconsistent to try to implement such a program and at the same time maintain such unjustified restrictions on such a vital commodity as residual oil? Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the effect of these restrictions is to take away with one hand what we are giving in foreign aid with the other hand.

Let us take, for example, the situation in Venezuela. President Kennedy has emphasized the importance of economic development in Latin America. Millions of dollars have been poured into Venezuela under the Alliance for Progress. Yet all the aid that we can put into the country will not have the desired effect unless we eliminate prohibitive restrictions on foreign trade with Venezuela. Ninety-five percent of Venezuela's foreign trade income is from the export of petroleum products. Fifty-five percent of Venezuela's crude oil production ends up as residual. The United States has been its No. 1 customer. Obviously these unjustified restrictions have severely injured the foreign trade position of one of our most important Latin American friends.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the question which is now of the greatest concern to us in New England. What is the reason for the coal industry's unreasonable and unjustified demands for the continuation of residual oil restrictions? Is the coal industry making residual oil the scapegoat for their unemployment problem? The answer is "Yes." Let us look at the facts. Coal and residual oil are competitive in only one area of the country. That is the area along the east coast. Yet in this area, between 1954 and 1958, the coal industry showed a 9.7 million ton increase in the electric utility market. This, Mr. Speaker, was prior to controls on residual oil. It graphically shows that coal can compete with residual in a free market. Coal's problems are not due to residual oil imports. They are due to increased mechanization in the coal industry and the loss of a major market by reason of the dieselization of our railroads. We would all be better off if the coal people started to think coolly about their problems instead of hysterically demanding the worthless panacea of continued residual oil restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad the opportunity has arisen to ask these questions. As I said at the outset, we in New England have waited a long time for the answers. But we are becoming impatient. We have a right to choose the type of fuel which best serves our needs and to buy it in a free competitive market where we are not penalized for our choice. I hope my friends from the coal producing States can finally give us in New England the answers we seek.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to add my voice to that of my colleagues in support of the oil import program. It is important to both the national security and to the economy of the Nation that this program to protect the important domestic fuels industries against unlimited competition from foreign oils be maintained.

The State which I am privileged to represent in the Congress is a major producer of bituminous coal, with a production of almost 50 million tons annually. With recoverable reserves estimated at 68 billion tons, there is no reason why, in this energy-hungry Nation, we cannot look toward even greater production in the years ahead and substantially larger employment for our people.

I am concerned that increasing imports of residual oil will slow down or even reverse the steady progress the coal industry has made in recent years in Illinois.

It is true that imported residual oil at the present time competes against coal only on the east coast. But when coal is displaced from markets there, it is forced to seek outlets elsewhere and this, of course, has a decided effect in the Midwest. Also, it is generally predicted that should import controls be removed, foreign residual oil would become a factor in the Midwest fuel markets.

Recently, a bank in Princeton, N.J., published a report on the electric utility industry in the Midwest. It was the conclusion of this report that because of the almost unlimited reserves of coal, and the present trend toward lower delivered coal prices, there is no reason why this industry should not continue to grow and expand. The Midwest electric utility industry is based on coal as a dependable, low cost fuel.

The coal industry of Illinois and other Midwest States needs the protection which this oil import program provides. I am happy to join today in urging the retention and strengthening of the program.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN], upon his initiative in arranging this special order, and thereby bringing together this group of my distinguished colleagues who are prepared to speak on the subject of oil. As an Alaskan, I think first of gold, but have come to recognize oil as the black gold which is proving so important to the 49th State, and welcome this opportunity to speak briefly about it.

At the outset I wish to remark that I have read the report of the President, dated September 4, 1962, by the Petroleum Study Committee, chaired by Mr. Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. Having done so I share the concern which has been expressed by the Independent Petroleum Association of America that the report divulges the thinking of several executive departments, exclusive of the Department of Interior, to the effect that there should be increased Federal control. To this I will say generally that I believe there is already enough Federal control in this area, and that the depletion allowance presently allowed under the Federal income tax law should be retained. The fact that the oil depletion allowance makes needed money available to the petroleum industry for the costly and highly risky enterprise of oil and gas exploration is highlighted by the situation in Alaska where, after 50 years of off-and-on searching, oil was discovered in commercial quantities in 1957. As yet, however, Alaska has but one producing oilfield on the Kenai Peninsula and large-scale explorations ahead to prove or disprove the value of many other areas. The approximately $17 million invested in Alaska in 29 dry holes in 1962 came from depletion taken on producing properties in other parts of the United States. These figures have, I am sure, already alerted you to the fact that with great distances and rugged terrains, plus cold winters and high costs, the average cost of drilling a well in Alaska is very high. In short, exploration and development costs in Alaska are 2¼ times the average for all producing areas in the United States. The average cost of drilling a well in Alaska being $535,000. Because of these high costs any action which would cut

down on the availability of venture capital would be doubly damaging to oil and gas exploration and development in Alaska.

It follows that any substantial reduction in funds derived from the oil depletion allowance would result in curtailment of oil exploration all over, but with a particularly heavy impact upon such activity in Alaska. Please join me in recognizing the fact that Alaska must compete with other areas in attracting capital into the risky business of exploring for new deposits, and that because of the high costs and the difficulties mentioned would be the first to undergo a curtailment of exploration. Of course this would be a curtailment based upon the economics involved. By the same token any new limitations upon production and exploration stemming from an increase in Federal Government controls would first militate against Alaska. For this reason and upon general principles I do not want the Government, in effect, to take over the oil industry or even cut back on it to any appreciable extent, and will govern myself accordingly.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of an area in which both the coal and petroleum industries are operating on a marginal basis, I strenuously oppose any further relaxation of crude and residual oil import quotas.

The coal industry in Utah is one of the most depressed areas in the State's economy. Many of our mines work only 2 or 3 days a week if at all. A similar situation exists in many other regions of our Nation.

Utah is not a large gas and oil producing State but nevertheless this industry represents a vital part of the State's economy. Our markets are generally located in the West. However, the cost per well is high, production expenses are high, and the yield is somewhat low.

The marginal conditions under which the coal and oil industries of Utah are now operating would only be aggravated if import quotas on crude and residual oil are in any measure relaxed.

As a Representative from a State where liberal import quotas would seriously further depress our economy, I oppose such liberalization.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the very enlightening and thoughtful comments we have heard today from our distinguished colleagues on the subject of foreign oil imports and their effect on the Nation have been most encouraging to me.

I believe they will be equally encouraging to the millions of Americans who believe, as I do, that America must maintain and strengthen the domestic source of its energy fuels if it is to survive.

It seems to me that this is a premise with which no responsible citizen can quarrel; certainly no one would contend that we would long exist as a nation without the resources to provide power for practically every facet of modern existence, as well as our ability to defend ourselves if ever again the need arises.

Moreover, it seems an obvious truth to me that we can be sure of this energy capability that is so essential only if we, ourselves, possess the safe and dependable source of it. The fuel which is vital to our industrial capacity, to our daily living and to our military strength must be preponderantly derived from within the safe confines of our own borders. Only then can we be certain that it cannot be denied us in any hour of extremity by enemy submarine action, or even by political upheaval such as the further spread of Communist-Castroism in formerly friendly supplying nations in either our hemisphere or the Middle East.

I need not dwell on the economic damage already plaguing many areas of the Nation, including important sections of my own State of Pennsylvania, because of the loss of fuel markets to cheap imported oil. These facts are on the record for anyone who cares enough to investigate. They tell the clear and heart-rendering story of human despair and even hunger, of loss of dignity and self-respect, by American families whose means of livelihood have been sacrificed to cheap foreign fuel flooding our shores.

They tell further of the steady wearing away of the independent domestic petroleum industry, with exploration and drilling of new wells dropping year after year as foreign produced crude oil continues to usurp U.S. markets.

Considering one category of fuel imports alone—that of residual fuel oil for use largely under large steam boilers—we are struck by these alarming facts:

First. Residual imports, although nominally restricted by the import control program proclaimed by Executive order in 1959, have increased steadily under permitted import quotas. The first quotas established, for the last 9 months of 1958, were at an annual rate of 131 million barrels. But in 1963, under the vastly increased quotas that have taken place despite the control program, importers will be permitted to bring in 198 million barrels of residual.

Second. During the past 10 years imports of residual oil have increased from the equivalent in heating value of 22 tons of coal to the equivalent of more than 50 tons—or about 11 percent of the anticipated total U.S. bituminous coal production this year.

I should point out that each million tons of Appalachian region coal for which there is a market means, on an average, about 350 to 400 jobs for U.S. miners plus another 200 jobs for railroad workers who haul 75 percent of our coal to market.

Third. Growing residual imports are having a like effect on domestic residual oil production. The U.S. Bureau of Mines reports that U.S. annual production of domestic residual, which cannot compete in price with that produced overseas, declined by some 50 million barrels between 1959 and 1962. When we realize that about 10 percent of all crude oil put through U.S. refineries must wind up and be sold as residual, we can understand the impact of this lost market on the producers of American crude oil.

In fact, my friends in the oil industry tell me that some 900,000 barrels of American crude oil daily must find a market in the form of residual—yet domestic residual is steadily being forced out of east coast markets by imports.

I believe my colleagues will concede that I am deeply interested in our Nation's relations with its friends among the countries of the free world, and that I believe we should take no steps that will unduly penalize any of them in terms of trade and commerce. Thus, I do not advocate an unreasonable limitation on oil imports which would do damage to the economy of Venezuela or other supplying nations, particularly those in the Western Hemisphere. But the fact is that, even during the import control program, Venezuelan oil exports to the United States, particularly of residual oil, have continued to increase and her favorable trade balance with us is now greater than ever before. But, by the same token, we must be realistic and accept the fact that we cannot continue to sacrifice more American jobs and the security of fuel supply which is so essential to our national welfare needlessly. And without a more effective import control program, which will halt the continued increase in quotas, this is bound to happen.

Crude oil from foreign wells generally flows at a daily rate many, many times the production of domestic oil wells. In addition, production costs are lower. Thus, foreign crude can be produced and shipped to our shores at about $1 a barrel cheaper than we can produce it and move it to market.

Residual oil, as the name implies, is the residue left after more valuable products such as gasoline, kerosene, light distillates for home heating, and lubricants are refined from the crude. Since it can be burned only in large utility, industrial, or similar boiler plants, it has a substantial market only in advanced, high industrialized nations such as America, Western Europe or Japan. Thus, except when it can be dumped on markets like the United States, at cutrate prices to enable it to drive out domestic fuels, Caribbean residual oil is virtually a waste product. It has no market at home because there is not sufficient industry to consume it. Likewise, it cannot compete with Middle East oil in Europe. That is the reason that it can be, and is, sold on the eastern seaboard of the United States for any price necessary in order to drive domestic fuels from the markets.

And that is why we must have a more effective program to restrict the further growth of these imports, at least to a proportionate share of the U.S. energy market.

I do not blame the executive branch of Government for the fact that residual imports have increased about 10 percent a year since the program began. I believe that conscientious efforts have been made to keep them within reason. But I also recognize that the political and international pressures to constantly increase imports are severe, when the determination of quotas is merely a matter of human judgment, without proper guidelines to follow. I might point out that the original, and only guidelines that existed—the warning by a Special Cabinet Committee that residual imports should not exceed 1957 levels without imperiling our national security—were abandoned long ago by the previous administration.

Thus, it seems to me that we must give most serious consideration to establishing a new petroleum import control program by law. This could have the effect of assuring that a fair share of the domestic fuel market would still be open to friendly foreign producer nations, while at the same time guaranteeing an opportunity to compete for the remainder by domestic producers. It would also set up a formula which each could depend on to determine that share in future years, and thus establish a stability in the fuels market which does not now exist. I believe this action would go far toward solving the complex and serious problems which now plague American fuels producers, would greatly help to restore economic prosperity to some many hard-pressed communities of our country where the production and transportation of fuels is the major income producer and, certainly, would assure our friends abroad that we are committed to share our vast industrial fuel markets with them on an equitable basis.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN], for arranging this special order and to express my appreciation for this opportunity to speak briefly.

I share the alarm expressed by other speakers here today over the continuing attacks on the oil import program. I agree that the influx of foreign oil has had an adverse affect upon the domestic economy and that by itself, to my mind, constitutes a grave national problem.

But I would like to emphasize the national security implication of this whole question of oil imports. This, to my mind, is the most important element of all in the whole question and, unfortunately, it has not received the attention on the part of our policymakers it deserves.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, this Nation must have an ample supply of fuel at all times but in time of emergency the need becomes even more compelling than ever. It seems obvious therefore that we should look first to the great oil and coal industries in this country to provide the fuel that would be needed to power our industrial and military machines.

What has alarmed me is what appears to be the philosophy behind these continued attacks on the oil import program—a philosophy apparently designed to shift our reliance for fuel from these domestic industries and to oil produced in foreign nations. Aside from the damage these increased imports cause to the domestic fuels industries, perhaps a policy of greater dependence upon foreign oil would not create any serious security problems if we could be assured of continued free movement of oil tankers over the world oceans.

But what happens if these foreign sources of oil are interrupted or cut off by a political or military emergency? What would we do then?

We would turn to our domestic oil and coal industries in desperation, just as we did in World War II. The Government would urge them in the name of patriotism and security, to increase production and provide the Nation with the fuel that is an indispensable ingredient of any victory.

But here is where the Nation faces a dangerous and serious problem. For the oil import program, as it has been administered, seems to consider domestic fuels industries—especially coal—expendable as a part of our foreign policy. We have given preference to foreign fuels, so foreign producing nations could be strengthened politically and economically. These are laudable objectives, but the price to our domestic industry has been too high. At home, we have experienced decreased production and a weakening of our domestic fuels industries to a point where, if this trend is not checked and reversed, they will be unable to produce the fuel the Nation must have.

We know what happened in World War II when the oil supply from the Caribbean was suddenly cut off. For 24 months there was an acute shortage of oil which forced a slowdown in production and a hasty conversion to coal. The threat today would be compounded several times for the Government's oil import policies have so operated that oil imports are today some five times what they were in 1942 and many more vital defense plants of all kinds are dependent solely upon imported oil.

We managed to survive the 1942 submarine blockade only by dint of an unprecedented concentration of antisubmarine forces—which, incidentally, prevented this sizable naval force from being brought to bear directly upon the enemy. But we know any wartime blockade now would be much more difficult to overcome. The Russians have a fleet of modern, long-range nuclear submarines equipped with atomic devices. Any war, short of a hydrogen holocaust, could well be decided in the waters off our own shores.

But there does not have to be a war to create a full-scale fuel crisis for the east coast and the entire Nation. Fidel Castro could trigger such a crisis by taking over Venezuela—a development, unfortunately, which is not as unlikely as we might like to believe.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from a pamphlet published recently by the National Coal Policy Conference in which this very point—the danger to the Nation of a Castro takeover of Venezuela—is discussed. This publication declared:

> The present Government of Venezuela is living under a virtual state of siege imposed by Castro. Terrorists roam the streets of Caracas. Oil wells are blown up, the power supply dynamited and ships are hijacked by the Communists. The government is gravely imperiled.
>
> The Castro objective in Venezuela is clear: It is nothing less than seizing the government and imposing upon the country a Communist state, subservient to Russia and dedicated in its opposition to the United States. The threat of Castroism to Venezuela cannot be dismissed. Nor can the implications of such a development be lightly disregarded.
>
> In addition to its effect upon the military balance of power, and the disastrous political results of a Communist government in the heart of South America, the question of the east coast's fuel supply would become a matter of grave concern.
>
> The first step by a Communist government—dictated by classic Communist dogma—would be the expropriation of all oil fields. The next step would be to use the nation's vast oil production as an economic and political weapon, just as the Russians are so successfully using their rapidly expanding oil output.
>
> Under these circumstances, would the east coast continue to receive from Venezuela the vast amount of oil which it must have to exist?
>
> Assume that a Communist government in Venezuela would find it expedient to sell oil to the United States for economic reasons.
>
> Then, the United States would be forced into the untenable position of providing to a Communist regime urgently needed dollars—which would be used to step up subversion throughout South America—as the price for ransoming the vital East Coast industrial complex from crippling fuel shortages.
>
> Thus, the consequences of present Government policies relating to oil imports are clear:
>
> Not only in time of war would the east coast fuel supply be jeopardized.
>
> The more immediate and pressing threat springs from the persistent and determined Communist plot to take over Venezuela—a plot that is well-financed in Moscow and manipulated from Cuba.
>
> In effect, our own Government's policies have created a situation which threatens to deliver as a hostage to Castro the capability of our east coast industrial complex to produce at peak efficiency.
>
> Such a possibility—the ability to play so vital a role in our own domestic industrial and economic life—adds to the incentive for Castro to succeed in Venezuela.
>
> The alternative to a sudden interruption of oil from Venezuela—on which east coast plants have come to depend to an alarming extent—would be the buying of oil for dollars from a hostile Communist regime.

It seems obvious to me, Mr. Speaker, that a continuation and strengthening of the oil import program is necessary for at least two reasons:

First. The national security could be seriously, if not fatally, weakened by abandoning the present restrictions upon oil imports, or weakening them further to the point of complete ineffectiveness.

Second. The domestic economy would be gravely damaged by permitting oil imports to take over domestic markets from the domestic fuels industries, thus creating additional unemployment with all of the social dislocations that would cause.

I sincerely trust that the statements which have been made on the floor of the House today will clearly demonstrate to the administration the seriousness with which we regard efforts to do away with this important program or to destroy its effectiveness.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the report to President Kennedy by his Petroleum Study Committee makes a wide-ranging series of nonspecific suggestions and conclusions. Such a study, properly and impartially conducted by the experts in Government, with the assistance which would have been made available from the industry itself, could possibly have had merit as an idea and utility as an accomplishment.

There is neither merit nor usefulness, however, in a report by nonexperts who appear to have twisted and turned their way through the so-called study with preconceived ideas which they hoped to

support with assumptions and sometimes unrelated statistics.

To give the illusion of objectivity, the Committee sometimes tempered its recommendations with language to assuage the alarm which the report deserves to cause.

Discussing the mandatory oil import program, the Committee said it is "difficult to make any precise judgment as to the cost of the program to the economy." This statement is true. While I am sure it is not what the Committee had in mind, it probably could be proved that the program costs little or nothing if all facts are considered—such as national security plus employment and the tax revenues that result from the U.S. production that would not be possible without the imports program.

Seeming to prove that such broad-based thinking was not intended, however, is an earlier section observing the abandonment of import controls could lead to a reduction in the price of domestic crude oil of $1 a barrel. Then, with the observation that the United States consumes approximately 3.5 billion barrels of oil, the report appears to be inviting you to come to the conclusion that elimination of the import program would mean billions of dollars in savings to our economy.

Such conclusions, either expressed or implied, make the rest of the report suspect and render it useless.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing concern over what appears to be a continuing attack from certain quarters of the Government on the oil import program.

As the representative of a major coal-producing State, an industry which has long provided a major source of employment for our people, I am naturally concerned that any successful effort to weaken or remove import controls on crude oil would be immediately reflected in a weakened or abandoned control program on residual fuel oil.

We, in Pennsylvania, have had to live with the threat of imported residual oil for years. We have seen markets for coal on the east coast taken away by this waste product of foreign refining operations and, furthermore, we have seen this loss of coal markets translated into declining job opportunities in the coal and railroad industry.

You cannot permit the entry into the east coast fuels market of the equivalent of some 50 million tons of coal each year—which is the current total amount of residual fuel oil imports—without it disrupting the entire domestic fuels market.

This imported oil has taken over coal markets. And in addition, domestically produced residual oil, produced in the refineries of the great inland oil-producing States, have been pushed out of a traditional market.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, we see that residual oil imports have a very grave effect upon two of the Nation's most important industries—oil and coal.

The Cabinet Committee report under discussion today is directed toward the crude oil import control program. But no Member of this House is naive enough to believe that if this crude oil import control program is abandoned, or weakened to a point where it is meaningless, that the program to control residual oil imports will be long continued.

This matter of oil imports is of overriding concern to all domestic fuels industries and to the millions of people who depend directly and indirectly upon them for a livelihood. But even more important is the relationship of oil imports, as it affects these two industries, to the national economy and the national security.

To my mind, there can be no question about the urgent necessity for this Nation preserving and maintaining strong fuels industries, capable of providing the Nation with the fuel and energy it must have under any circumstances.

I want this Nation to continue to place primary reliance for fuel and energy upon domestic sources. We know our own oil wells and coal mines are secure within our own borders and can produce to meet the national requirements whatever might happen in the political situation throughout the world.

But can we have such assurances about oil produced in other nations? Surely not, Mr. Speaker. We know oil produced abroad and shipped over long distances is vulnerable to interruption by either a military or political emergency.

If we abandon import controls on oil—if we permit unlimited imports of oil of all kinds—we will in effect be transferring our reliance for fuel and energy from safe and secure domestic sources to unreliable and undependable foreign sources.

There is too much at stake to take an unnecessary and dangerous gamble like this.

We have oil and coal in almost unlimited amounts here at home. Our primary task should be to see to it that the industries which produce and transport these fuels remain strong and be capable of expanding production to meet any national need.

We can assure the continued maintenance of strong domestic fuels industries, Mr. Speaker, only if the oil import program is continued and strengthened.

I hope the President will see fit at the earliest possible opportunity to reassure the Nation that this program is going to be continued on a realistic and effective basis.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues who are interested, as I am, in the question of importation of foreign and residual oil.

The Cabinet Committee report which has been discussed here today, indicates the pressure that is continuously being exerted to eliminate import controls on crude and residual oil.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

It, therefore, seems most timely that the Congress should pass legislation that will do two things: First, establish an equitable quota that would be fair to domestic energy fuels, as well as foreign suppliers of oil; and, second, relieve the executive branch of the Government from the constant pressures whenever new quotas are being considered each quarter.

I have long felt that legislation is the answer to this question and have introduced legislation to establish quotas on residual oil by law.

OIL IMPORTS AFFECT COAL

There is no question that imports of residual and crude oil have had a serious effect upon domestic fuels. Residual imports are the equivalent of 50 million tons of coal annually and crude oil imports run in the neighborhood of 15 percent of domestic production.

COAL IMPORTANT TO ALABAMA

The mining and transportation of coal is an important industry in Alabama, even under present conditions. In 1962 more than 14 million tons were mined and if the coal industry, which has recoverable reserves of 6 billion tons in Alabama, could be assured that in the future it would enjoy reasonable protection against increased oil imports there is every reason to believe this tonnage could be significantly increased, thereby providing additional employment for our people in the mines and on the railroads.

I trust this whole question of oil imports will receive the attention it warrants, in view of its importance to the entire economy and to the national security.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, the section of the Petroleum Study Committee's report that gives me greatest concern deals with what it describes as "inadequacies in the administrative machinery" to carry out national petroleum policies. Inadequate administrative machinery has only one clear implication: More Government control. Those who seek greater regulation by Government invariably ask for more administrative machinery, more personnel, and, of course, more of the funds provided by American taxpayers.

What are the inadequacies in administrative machinery that this Study Committee puts forth as matters calling for action by the Federal Government? The report claims there are three inadequacies which may be summarized as follows:

First. The report claims that it is urgent that steps be taken to change the oil and gas conservation programs of the producing States—which are improperly described as a "control system." The first step, according to the report, "must be to establish a basis of cooperation with the producing States." Note the word "must." The implications are obvious: We, the Federal Government, are going to see that you, the producing States, are going to do it our way—or else.

Second. The report concludes that a lack of close coordination between Federal agencies makes for inadequate administrative machinery. It proposes that the Office of Emergency Planning be the agency that takes the lead in coordinating petroleum activities of the Federal Government. All of us can subscribe to the advantage of coordination, but this recommendation moves in the direction of a petroleum bureaucracy within the executive branch of the Federal Government headed by an agency with little or no knowledge or experience as to oil and gas policies.

Third. The report calls for a coordinated program by the Federal Government to provide satisfactory information on petroleum reserves, producing capacity, deliverability, expansibility, and costs. There is a wealth of information now available from both Government and industry sources. Why this sudden and urgent need for satisfactory information as a correction for inadequacies in administrative machinery? The answer is simple for anyone familiar with governmental controls. Statistics piled on statistics are the tools of the trade for Federal regulators.

For those who may feel that my fears that this report threatens Government control of the petroleum industry are exaggerated, I suggest that they consider the fact that the conculsions and recommendations of the study are already being implemented. In fact, they were set in motion long before the report was made public.

Earlier this year, the Attorney General submitted a report under the obligation imposed by the Congress to investigate whether or not the activities of the producing States under the provisions of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas have been consistent with the purposes of the compact. The Attorney General's report went far beyond this congressional obligation. Although it was not generally known at that time, it is now clear that the Attorney General's report was based on and sought to implement the unpublished and "secret" report of the President's Petroleum Study Committee.

Mr. Harold Decker, president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, stated that the Attorney General's report amounted to an attempt to impose Federal regulation on all U.S. oil and gas production. He further said that it seemed part of a purposeful campaign by some in Government to nationalize the petroleum industry. The recent exposure of the secret report on which the Attorney General based his findings made Mr. Decker's comments prophetic. I ask that the full statement made by Mr. Decker on May 20, 1963 be incorporated as a part of my remarks at this time.

STATEMENT BY HAROLD DECKER, PRESIDENT, INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, MAY 20, 1963

The May 15 report of Attorney General Kennedy amounts to an attempt to impose Federal regulation on all U.S. oil and gas production. By overstressing the difficult problems in oil and gas conservation and understating the benefits of existing policies to the consumer, the attorney general has fabricated a case that invites further Government controls.

The report is reassuring only in that it makes no findings that the Interstate Oil Compact Commission has operated so as to limit production of oil and gas for the purpose of stabilizing and fixing the price thereof or create or perpetuate monopoly or to promote regimentation. The Attorney General then becomes gratuitous and goes beyond the purposes for which Congress authorized his report. Through innuendo and inference his report constitutes an unsupported attack upon State laws and State administrative officials as permitting an undesirable control by the industry over State conservation.

If the industry were exercising monopolistic controls over the production and price of petroleum, which it is not, the Attorney General under the Federal antitrust laws and the States under State antitrust laws have ample authority to deal with any abuses. The Attorney General seems unaware of these available procedures.

He argues that the Federal import program confers on the Federal Government "direct responsibility for performance of the whole supply control system." The law which provides statutory authority for the import program reveals absolutely no intent on the part of Congress to delegate such responsibility.

Certainly, the independent producer does face many difficulties in dealing with the unhealthy economic conditions that have prevailed since the mid-1950's. But under the guise that something should be done for the independent, there is a clear threat of something being done to him.

It is difficult to draw any inference from the report that does not point toward Federal control of oil production. Federal control is not the answer to the problems of the producing States or the industry. More important, it would be most harmful to the interest of the consuming public.

Let no one be mistaken. This report seems part of a purposeful campaign by some in Government to nationalize the petroleum industry. In the public interest, that should not, and must not, take place.

Both the Attorney General's report and the Petroleum Study Committee are highly critical of the conservation program that has been the primary responsibility of the producing States, supplemented by the interstate compact and Federal law prohibiting interstate shipments of oil produced in violation of State programs. No recognition is given to the established fact that this conservation program has added billions of barrels of oil to the Nation's available supply and thereby resulted in more oil and gas at lower prices to the consuming public. Certainly, State conservation programs can and should be improved in keeping with technological advances and changing economic conditions. This has been done and is being done. There continues to be, of course, conservation problems. But, the imposition of Federal control over petroleum exploration, development, and production is not the answer to the problems of oil and gas conservation. In effect, however, these reports point a gun at the head of every State conservation agency with the threat that the Federal Government will take over whenever the State does not act as someone in Washington thinks it should.

By condemning State conservation programs, calling for closer coordination of petroleum activities by Federal agencies, and demanding detailed information on the industry's operations, the Petroleum Study Committee has attempted to build a case for further Federal intervention into the business of finding and producing crude oil and natural gas. This is dangerous and unsound. Our Nation's strength as to petroleum supplies was built by men who were free to gain or lose in the arena of competition. Their successes and failures have served well the public interest. The United States, alone among the great powers of the free world, has been self-sufficient in oil and gas. This position has kept us secure in times of emergency. It has fueled our economic expansion at the lowest cost in the world. We cannot and must not permit a basic and essential industry to wither under the deadening hand of Federal control.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JOHANSEN (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for today, on account of death in family.

## 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. STRATTON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 60 minutes, on August 7, 1963; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) to extend his remarks during debate on H.R. 4955 and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana.

Mr. CAREY.

Mr. HANNA.

Mr. BURKHALTER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORSE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

Mr. MATHIAS.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 7, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1108. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Little Walnut-Hickory, Kans.; Bradley Brook, Mass.; Broad Brook, Mass.; Tri-County Turkey Creek, Okla.; Waterfall-Gilford Creek, Okla.; Nolan Creek, Tex.; and Monroe-Annabella, Utah, pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1109. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement

relating to the following watersheds: Mill Creek, Ala., and Pine Creek, Tex., pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

1110. A letter from the National Secretary, the National Woman's Relief Corps, transmitting the Annual Report of the National Woman's Relief Corps for the Fiscal Year 1961–62, pursuant to Public Law 87–650; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1111. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on noncompetitive procurement of military aircraft forgings from Aluminum Co. of America, Pittsburgh, Pa., at prices substantially higher than current and expected costs of production; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1112. A letter from the Acting Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the establishment of a community at or near the Nevada Test Site, Nev."; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 5542. A bill to assist the States in providing necessary instruction for adults not proficient in basic educational skills through grants to States for pilot projects, improvement of State services, and programs of instruction; with amendments (Rept. No. 638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 477. A Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7824, a bill to continue, for the period ending November 30, 1963, the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 639). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 7941. A bill to amend titles I, II, and III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 7942. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property to the county of Dare, State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 7943. A bill to amend section 102 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to provide for a study by the Secretary of Labor of the military manpower needs of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 7944. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 7945. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 7946. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 7947. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7948. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special U.S. postage stamp in commemoration of the crusade against cancer; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7949. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 7950. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of July 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 244), to provide that distribution system loan repayment contracts may be executed contingent upon the availability of appropriated funds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 7951. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 7952. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to create a presumption of service connection for diseases contracted by certain veterans who were prisoners of war of the Japanese Government during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7953. A bill to provide increased insurance benefits for certain persons who on April 19, 1942, were captured, besieged, or otherwise isolated by a nation then an enemy of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 7954. A bill to prohibit fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by persons other than nationals or inhabitants of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 7955. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 7956. A bill to authorize the acceptance of donations of land and the construction, administration, and maintenance of an extension of the Blue Ridge Parkway in the States of North Carolina and Georgia by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 7957. A bill to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration of Aging"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 7958. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 7959. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 7960. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 7961. A bill to make permanent the provisions of law authorizing certain suspension of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 7962. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7963. A bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 7964. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to grant a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc., and for other purposes," approved July 24, 1956; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 7965. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.J. Res. 630. Joint resolution to prohibit the Postmaster General from requiring that work measurement systems used by the Post Office Department be used to determine individual employee productivity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.J. Res. 631. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the offering of prayers and the reading of the Bible in public schools in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.J. Res. 632. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr PRICE:

H.J. Res. 633. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.J. Res. 634. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the establishment of an interstate school district by Hanover, N.H., and Norwich, Vt., and to an agreement between Hanover School District, New Hampshire, and Norwich Town School District, Vermont; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H. Res. 476. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate expenditures for research programs conducted by or sponsored by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRUCE:

H.R. 7966. A bill for the relief of Milagros Garcia Somera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILL:

H.R. 7967. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Air Force at Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 7968. A bill for the relief of Samuel Lipsih; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 7969. A bill for the relief of Nguyen Thai Son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7970. A bill for the relief of Dr. Maximo Deysine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 7971. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hotica Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7972. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ofra Bernstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 7973. A bill for the relief of Istvan Kelemen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of Michigan:

H.R. 7974. A bill for the relief of Sara Khalil Mohamed; Osmand Mohamed, her husband; and Hassen Mohamed, her son; 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:

230. By Mr. BROWN of California: Petition of Los Angeles Journeymen Plumbers Local Union 78, urging passage of H.R. 2582, which would equalize all rates of wartime disability compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

231. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Harry L. Stuver, president, National Geriatrical Society, San Francisco, Calif., requesting passage of civil rights legislation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

232. Also petition of Francis C. Flynn, city clerk, University City, Mo., relative to a resolution adopted relating to three proposed States rights amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Government Lotteries of Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, and Switzerland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, August 6, 1963*

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, among the 77 foreign countries which utilize government lotteries as a revenue-raising device are Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, and Switzerland. In these five foreign nations, like in all the other countries, the gambling spirit of its people is legally recognized, accepted, and regulated for the countries' needs and the people's benefit.

Norway, in addition to the lottery, also benefits from semiofficial football pools. In 1962, the gross receipts of the national lottery came to over $17 million. After payment of prizes, the total annual net income to the government came to over $5 million.

Poland has a government lottery which was established long before the Communists took over that country—it dates back to 1808. In Poland there are two countrywide lotteries. In 1962, the total gross wagered in these lotteries was over $53 million. The net profit to the government was over $18 million of which part is used for investments in sports installations and support of sporting activities. The other part is used for housing, historical monuments, and local cultural activities.

Portugal gives us another example of how the urge to gamble may be utilized on behalf of charitable organizations. In 1962, the total gross receipts were $25½ million. The net income came to over $6½ million which went to public assistance.

Sweden has found the lottery to be of great help to its people. Not only is the Swedish lottery the largest Scandinavian lottery but it is the most profitable. In 1962, the gross receipts came to $52 million. The net income to the government was almost $31 million. A good portion of this money is set aside for cultural activities and the rest is devoted to general budget purposes.

Switzerland has three lotteries which are operated on a multicantonal level. The 1962 figures show over $6¼ million in gross receipts. The net income came to close to $2 million which was used for private and public charities and for cultural organizations. Part of the moneys was used for conserving wildlife, for financing public buildings and maintaining public transportation systems.

Mr. Speaker, the lesson to be drawn from the example of these foreign nations is that a national lottery can be of great benefit to a country. This is not merely a case of the ends justifying the means, for if we were not so steeped in moral hypocrisy, we would realize that a national lottery is a time honored and tested financial device. With our own lottery we can produce over $10 billion a year in new revenue which can be used to reduce our high taxes and growing national debt. When will America wake up to the worth and value of national lottery?

## Independence of Jamaica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, August 6, 1963*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, August 5, Jamaica celebrated the first anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the Prime Minister of Jamaica, Sir Alexander Bustamente; and His Excellency the Jamaican Ambassador to the United States, Sir Neville Noel Ashenheim.

Hail to Jamaica, as it marks the first anniversary of its independence. One of the very oldest countries of the Western Hemisphere, in point of discovery, one of the youngest to join the ranks of independent nations of the Commonwealth, of the American nations, of the United Nations, of the world; Jamaica, we salute you.

Within your island you have happily combined the old and the new, the great and the small. It is pleasing to us in the United States to see our flag among those at your shrine of Columbus.

After Columbus discovered your island in 1494 and you remained a Spanish possession for the next half century, the British took over for some 300 years. Your institutions reflect the spirit of liberty, the respect for the individual, a belief in the rule of law, which are the hallmarks of the Western World. The great ideas of the past you have epitomized in the new constitution of your beautiful little island. As your self-government developed with the major constitutional changes of 1944, 1953, and 1959, you were well on your way to the independence of 1962.

We note the wisdom of the provisions of your new Constitution concerning the fundamental rights and freedoms of all persons within your shores. Not only are those fundamental freedoms of the individual safeguarded as in other free countries of the world, and not only so safeguarded irrespective of race, place of origin, color, creed, or sex, but also irrespective of political opinions, and in any case, "subject only to respect for the rights and freedoms of others and for the public interest." [1]

We note with gratification your readiness at cooperation internationally, and that you approached independence even prepared to assist in the common services to the small islands about you, as long as such assistance remained necessary, in the interests of the region as a whole. Among these common services are such deserving institutions as the University of the West Indies and the teaching hospital associated with it, which serve all the British Caribbean territories; the West India Regiment; the Federal Supreme Court; the West Indies Shipping Corporation, which operates an interisland shipping service with two ships given by the Canadian Government under its West Indies Aid Program; the West Indies Meteorological Service, and various other regional projects. We are glad that Jamaica wanted to join the United Nations and related agencies, which are working toward the betterment of mankind.

We welcome you as one of us. May your freedom be as pure, as pleasant, and are perpetuated as the fragrant white corona of lilies that is doubly self-perpetuating in your world-renowned gardens. May your future be as bright as the hibiscus flowers for which you are known the world over. Jamaica, it is with pride and hope for a happy future that we welcome you among the nations

[1] "Jamaica, the making of a Nation." British Information Services. London, Central Office of Information. April 1962. (No. RF.P. 5379) p. 10.